



STDF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

Application form

Abbreviation and Acronyms

EAA	Ethiopian Agricultural Authority
EBI	Ethiopian Biodiversity Institutes
EHPEA	Ethiopian Horticulture Producer Exporter Association
EIAR	Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research
EPOPSEA	Ethiopian Pulses and Oil Crops Spices Exporter Association
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FNP	National Food and Nutrition Policy
FNS	Food and Nutrition Strategy
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HO	Harmful organism
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organisation
PCE	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PPSE	Plant Protection Society of Ethiopia
PVS	Performance, Vision, and Strategy
RASFF	Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed
RPPO	Regional Plant Protection Organization
SPS	Sanitary and Phytosanitary
STDF	Standards and Trade Development Facility
UN	United Nations
WTO	World Trade Organization
EFDA	Ethiopian Food and Drug Authority
MOTRI	Ministry of Trade and Regional Integration
EAA	Ethiopian Agricultural Authority
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture

SUMMARY

PPG Title	Enhancing Phytosanitary Regulatory System in Ethiopia: A Foundation for Future Agricultural Trade and Food Security
Applicant	Ethiopian Agricultural Authority Plant Regulatory Deputy Directorate
Country/region	<i>Ethiopia</i>
Contact	<i>Wondale Habtamu Teferi NPPO & IPPC Focal point, FAO, UN DDG, Ethiopian Agricultural Authority Emails: wondalehabetamu00@gmail.com wondale.habetamu@yahoo.com phone: +251943544463</i>

0. What specific SPS problem(s) is affecting your country/region?

Ethiopia is a land-locked country in Eastern Africa. It has long borders with Kenya, South Sudan, the Republic of Sudan, Eritrea, Djibouti, and Somalia, with primarily informal trade flows. The country has diverse agroclimatic conditions suitable for crop production in various locations year-round. The favourable agroecological climate for producing multiple crops also makes it ideal for establishing quarantine pests that enter the country. During the last five years, 504,518 MT of plants and plant products are recorded as imports into the country. These include planting materials (cut flower propagative materials, seeds of vegetables, e.g. tomato, cabbage, spinach, onion, carrot, strawberry seedlings, avocado cuttings, banana plantlets). There are also imports of various fruits and vegetables (e.g. orange, apple, blackberry, blueberry, onions) and growing media.

Additionally, there are frequent food aid shipments for wheat, maize, and lentils. The country, therefore, needs very efficient and effective phytosanitary safeguards against potential pest risks that come with these imports; otherwise, new pest introductions would continue to pose significant threats to the production and trade of plants and plant products. Although Ethiopia has enormous potential to produce diverse agricultural and industrial food products, its competitiveness in the world market is low compared with other countries in the same region. Export levels still fall short of what is registered by other African countries with much smaller populations (e.g. both Uganda and Tanzania export more than \$3 billion per year). Exports of

goods from Ethiopia are only about 7% of the GDP, compared to an average of thirty % of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in Sub-Saharan Africa. Per capita export is only \$24 in Ethiopia compared to \$200 in Sub-Saharan Africa and \$580 in developing countries of Asia (Muhabaw, 2013; IMF International Financial Statistics Report, 2010).¹ Growth rates are also very modest if one compares them with those of Asian countries over a decade. For example, Ethiopia's total exports were higher than that of Vietnam in the 1980s but are now at \$2 billion compared to \$65 billion for Vietnam (Access Capital Research Ethiopia's export performance, 2010). Unless the SPS constraints to Ethiopia's agri-food trade are effectively addressed and the systems for SPS controls are updated and upgraded, the volume of traded agricultural products in the international market will decline further.

Data from the Plant Health and Product Regulatory Directorate (PHPRD) indicates that in 2022, 5 million MT of white peas, red kidney beans, mung bean, soybean, chickpea, sesame, peanut, black cumin seed, coriander, horticultural crops including strawberry, tomato, banana, orange, rose. Other cut flowers and cuttings are exported from Ethiopia to different countries. The destination markets include the EU, the United Kingdom, China, India, Pakistan, Japan, Russia, the United States of America, South American countries (Ecuador, El Salvador) and the Middle East (Saudi Arabia, Israel, United Arab Emirates). However, the exports face challenges in complying with the SPS requirements of these trading partners. Ethiopia has also experienced several pest introductions exemplified by cotton mealybug, tomato leaf miner, white mango scale, new race of wheat stem rust, citrus woolly whitefly, fava bean gall disease, virus diseases on tomato and potato, white rot in onion, rotting fungi on garlic and onion, woolly apple aphid on apple, bacterial wilt on potato, American tomato fruit worm, and the maize lethal necrosis over the past few years. These pest species have resulted in high pressure on production practices and necessitate stringent phytosanitary measures on the country's exports.

According to the information in the EUROPHYT, fifty-three interceptions of various pests from 2013 to 2015 resulted in destroyed exported products or products refused entry into the importing countries, mainly *Rosa* spp., *Gypsophila* spp. and planting materials. The main pests

1

<http://etd.aau.edu.et/bitstream/handle/123456789/14259/Nega%20Muhabaw.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
and <https://www.elibrary.imf.org/display/book/9781451963915/9781451963915.xml>

of concern (harmful organisms) are thrips, leaf miners and white flies.² These challenges create a bottleneck to growing Ethiopia's agricultural trade and illustrate weaknesses in phytosanitary controls and systems for delivering phytosanitary services. Seemingly, several pest introductions go undetected, while other pests in the country may escape detection through inadequate phytosanitary export certification controls. The exchange of commodities through agricultural trade between Ethiopia and its trading partners faces constraints that compromise the phytosanitary security of the country due to weak measures applied on imports on the one hand and ineffective controls on export certification on the other. The lack of routine monitoring and surveillance, limited capacity for diagnosis and testing, and inability to establish pest-free areas, pest-free places or sites of production diminish opportunities for growing agricultural exports in the face of high pest pressure. The phytosanitary control system in the country is characterized by the absence of inspection points at most ports of entry/exit and limited capability to deliver domestic and international phytosanitary services. However, while improving Ethiopia's phytosanitary system, cognizance should be given to challenges related to the country's food control systems.

Just as in the case with EUROPHYT notifications, the EU Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) has reported food safety concerns in Ethiopian experts, e.g. those relating to pesticide residues on pulse crops, aflatoxins on oil crops and spices and *Salmonella* on sesame seeds.³—Just as continued reliance on traditional farming systems poses increasing risks from new pests of plants, it also provides no safeguards against hazards in food. Currently, the country has no integrated coordination mechanism to overcome challenges occasioned by overlaps in institutions' mandates on food safety or by the gaps in the country's food safety regulations. Interventions are needed to strengthen the system for good regulatory practice in the country's overall phytosanitary system. The national SPS committee was established to improve the coordination of activities of different ministries and authorities for prioritized interventions to solve concerns about food safety, but skills and competencies need to be strengthened for food safety management. Currently, this area lacks a comprehensive food safety training programme in the curricula of institutions of higher learning. Training centres specializing in food safety matters are also absent. As a result, the competency and skills

² https://food.ec.europa.eu/plants/plant-health-and-biosecurity/europhyt/interceptions-annual-reports_en.

³ https://food.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2023-02/acn_report_2022_overview.pdf

needed to ensure the application of best practices in food safety management are lacking, compromising the performance of food controls in Ethiopia.

This PPG will evaluate Ethiopia's phytosanitary capacity and incorporate elements from other national initiatives related to outcomes of assessments of food control systems in its final deliverable. The goal is to leverage the results of food control assessments to those of the PCE in a project proposal to enhance Ethiopia's capacity for SPS's good regulatory practices. The EAA will present the finalized project proposal to the STDF and other potential donors to mobilize the resources needed to bolster national SPS regulatory services in Ethiopia.

1. What is the purpose of this PPG?

1. Application of an SPS-related capacity evaluation or prioritization tool	X
2. Preparation of a feasibility study that precedes project development	
3. Preparation of a project proposal for consideration by the STDF or other donors	X

This PPG aims to craft a project proposal by leveraging the insights from the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool and findings from other national initiatives assessing food control systems in Ethiopia. Identified gaps from these assessments will be prioritized for targeted interventions, with the ultimate goal of enhancing capacity development support. The FAO will guide the proposal's development, collaborating with international and national SPS consultants who will closely partner with stakeholders across the public and private sectors of the agri-food system.

2. How was this PPG developed?

Ethiopian Agricultural Authority (EAA)⁴ is the regulatory body established under the Ministry of Agriculture responsible for phytosanitary and food safety services for primary products of plants and animals. The EAA initiated the development of this PPG. The PPG was developed through desk research, which was a consultative process. The initial draft of the PPG has been reviewed by plant health professionals from various Ethiopian institutions, including the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ethiopian Agricultural Authority (EAA), the Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR), the Plant Protection Society of Ethiopia (PPSE), the Ethiopian

⁴ <https://www.eaa.gov.et/en/home/>

Horticulture Producer Exporter Association (EHPEA), the Ethiopian Pulses and Oil Crops Spices Exporter Association (EPOPSEA), and the Ethiopian Biodiversity Institutes (EBI) and staff from plant regulatory institutions and the National Plant Protection Organisation (NPPO). Their valuable feedback has been integrated into this document. The letters of support from these stakeholder institutions are attached. The main activities to be conducted in implementing the PPG will consist of the following:

1. Engagement and Preparation for Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)
 - Engage with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat to facilitate using the PCE tool in Ethiopia, including securing support and guidance.
 - Conduct a rapid stakeholder assessment to identify and map stakeholders involved in the PCE process.
 - Identify key personnel to manage the PCE process, select the most relevant PCE modules for Ethiopia, and appoint a coordinator to oversee the process and
 - Facilitate consultations with the relevant national institutions and experts on outcomes and recommendations from food control assessment to identify priority areas not covered for interventions under the current ongoing projects.
2. Implementation of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation
 - Host workshops for relevant stakeholders to implement the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE).
 - Analyse gaps identified through the PCE process and propose areas to be addressed through project-based interventions for prioritization by stakeholders in a consultative project drafting workshop.
 - In consultation with the experts involved in the ongoing food safety projects, identify and prioritize necessary interventions alongside those derived from PCE under a new project proposal.
3. Project Proposal Development and Validation
 - Undertake project development activities, including drafting proposals, conducting reviews, and holding individualized stakeholder consultations.
 - Organize a consultation workshop to present the draft project proposal, gather stakeholder feedback, and incorporate recommendations.
 - Conduct a validation workshop, finalize the project proposal, and submit it to relevant institutions/organizations for approval and funding.

3. Have you discussed this PPG request – or funding for the project proposal, which would result from it – with potential donors?

Yes. EAA has discussed the potential project to fund phytosanitary capacity evaluation with various collaborators and donors but has not secured any commitment to funding support.

4. How does this PPG fit into the national/regional SPS context?

The PPG relates directly to the IPPC strategic framework 2020-2030, whose mission is to minimize the spread of plant pests through human interactions and effectively manage their impacts within member countries. The framework expects all countries to have harmonized standards and capacity to reduce pest spread and minimize the impact of established pests, improving trade, economic growth, food security, and environmental protection. The three objectives of the framework are to (i) facilitate trade development and economic growth, (ii) enhance global food security & protect sustainable agriculture, and (iii) protect the environment from the impacts of plant pests. The PPG has a bearing on the UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development regarding sustainable food production systems and resilient agricultural practices that provide healthy and affordable diets, tackle poverty, protect human rights and restore ecosystems.

The 2018 Ethiopian National Food and Nutrition Policy (FNP) and the 2021 Ethiopian National Food and Nutrition Strategy (FNS) food safety and nutrition are a government responsibility at the federal level. An effective food safety system is vital to safeguard the public from risks and hazards in food and the associated detrimental health consequences, including foodborne illnesses. One of the objectives of the Ethiopian FNP is *"to improve the safety and quality of food throughout the value chain"* as part of a goal that creates an enabling policy framework for strategies, laws, and regulations related to the safety of food across the country's food system (Feed the Future, 2022).⁵

5. Who will implement the PPG, and how?

FAO Ethiopia will spearhead the project implementation in collaboration with a team of multidisciplinary experts from the FAO Subregional Office for Eastern Africa (FAO-SFE). The Ethiopian Agricultural Authority will lead the implementation of the PPG activities, working closely with key public sector organizations and private sector stakeholders, including producers, processors, and exporters associations.

⁵ https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00Z882.pdf

6. Budget

The total budget for this PPG is USD 50,000. The budget includes the costs of international and local technical experts, stakeholder consultations, and minimal travel and daily subsistence allowances (based on official United Nations (UN) rates). The budgets for stakeholder meetings or workshops and general operating expenses will be paid based on actual costs incurred upon presenting receipts and invoices. The details of the budget are as follows:

7.1. Budget breakdown

No.	Activity	Scope	Budget (USD)
1: Stakeholder and expert engagement and preparation for PCE (premised upon pre-engagement of EAA with the IPPC Secretariat to facilitate the use of the PCE tool in Ethiopia, including securing support and guidance).			
1.1	Conduct a rapid stakeholder assessment to identify and map stakeholders involved in the PCE process (Stakeholder analysis and needs for PCE through technical consultations and a workshop to agree on the scope and identify institutions and individuals to be involved; Identify key personnel to manage the PCE process, select the most relevant PCE modules for Ethiopia, and appoint a coordinator to oversee the process.	One workshop organized by EAA for participants drawn from technical departments (agricultural regulatory services, research, academia) and private sector actors in	4,000.00
1.2	Facilitate consultations with the relevant national institutions and experts on outcomes and recommendations from food control assessment to identify priority areas that are not covered for interventions under the current ongoing projects (Technical consultation with relevant national institutions and experts on past and ongoing initiatives relating to food safety and/or outcomes of concluded food control assessments to identify areas that require interventions under new projects).	A virtual or hybrid technical consultation convened by EAA and FAO for experts involved in the current food safety initiatives	
2: Implementation of PCE and synthesis of gaps in national phytosanitary and food control systems into a project concept (involves technical facilitated PCE conducted in a workshop setting)			
2.1	Convene workshops for relevant stakeholders to implement the	One intensive (6 days) workshop	10,000

	Phyosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE).	organized by EAA for the technical staff of government institutions and private sector stakeholders to conduct PCE	
2.2	Analyse gaps identified through the PCE process and propose project-based interventions for prioritization by stakeholders in a consultative project drafting workshop.	Desk review, data extraction and analysis of gaps in national phyosanitary systems and derivation of possible project-based interventions (and food control, where necessary) systems for a potential capacity development project-based support (Professional time of a national expert	1,000.00
2.3	In consultation with the experts involved in the ongoing food safety projects, identify and prioritize interventions that are needed, alongside those derived from PCE, under a new project to be written in the project proposal alongside		
<p><i>3. Project proposal development and validation (A team of experts will develop the proposal. This process includes organizing two consecutive workshops by EAA. These workshops aim to draft and present the project proposal to stakeholders for discussion, revisions, and validation. One national consultant, national experts, and an international consultant will be engaged to support these activities. The international consultant will oversee the entire process, including drafting the project proposal.)</i></p>			
3.1	Draft the project proposal, conduct relevant reviews, and hold individualized consultations with stakeholders	Professional time of two international experts to guide the process of project proposal development	13,600.00
		Professional time of one national expert to support project proposal development.	7,400.00
3.2	Organize a consultative workshop to present the draft project proposal, gather stakeholder feedback, and incorporate recommendations in the project document.	Convening (logistical) costs – travel, venue, etc.	7,000.00
3.3	Travel and accommodation expenses for the international consultant	The cost to cover air tickets and DSA (UN rates)	7,000.00

	Total		50,000.00
--	--------------	--	------------------