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Executive Summary

The phytosanitary capacities in the pilot countries are at various stages of improvements. There was a direct relationship with the numbers of personnel available to the National Plant Protection Organization and the clear roles provided by the functions of the NPPO. There is a knowledge gap in most of the countries in terms of the staff that have been in the service longer as compared to those who have just begun their careers.

Staff capabilities in pest identification with reference to taxonomy seem to be nonexistent and there is clear absence of new scientific information flow to the new entrants. The few remaining specialists may be required to capacitate staff in other member countries in the region so that the precious knowledge is fully shared.

The team also noted clearly the challenges of human capacity and the need for capacity development across all the countries. The levels may vary in some aspects, but there was a need in various disciplines for improvements with an extra emphasis to training in International Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures and pest risk analysis.

The NPPOs in the member states visited showed the capacity to generate resources and become vibrant and respond to clients’ needs but were unable due to lack of authority from the Governments to appropriate the resources generated. In comparison to the Seed Services in all the countries, these were more active due to the appropriation of the funds that they generate. If the same could apply to the NPPO, more activities would be seen on the ground and the NPPOs will be more appreciated.

Some elements in the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool as described under the International Plant Protection Convention (PCE), were used to gather information.
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1.0 Introduction

1.2 Background
Seed is a key input for improving agricultural productivity and ensuring food security. It is a preferred tool for re-establishing livelihoods of farmers affected by disasters and to return them to a life of dignity, independent of food handouts. Access to high quality seed also facilitates for food resource diversification and prevention of genetic erosion in rural agriculture production systems. For that reason, seed trade and seed movement is essential for both agricultural growth and regional seed security. As a result of various factors, and in particular owing to the diversity of national regulatory systems in the member countries, farmers and growers continue to be seed insecure. Seed markets are segregated, small, and have challenges to access high grade seed.

The signed MOU covers the following protocols:

- The SADC Variety Release System
- The SADC Seed Certification and Quality Assurance System and
- The SADC Quarantine and Phytosanitary Measures for Seed

1.2 Objective of Study
The objective of this study was to look at the third protocol and analyze the current systems and identify gaps in the national phytosanitary systems and provide for avenues for the countries to harmonize towards the SADC protocol to ensure the objectives are met in the specified time frame.

The purpose of the third protocol on harmonized quarantine and phytosanitary measures for seed is to reduce the cost of doing business as related to seed trade, as well as encourage quicker and safer movement of seed. This will be reached through;

(i) establishment of transparent and science-based common standards and procedures for seed movement in the SADC region, supported by documentation;
(ii) the introduction of rationalized SADC pest lists for the movement of seed between Member States;
(iii) provide for common measures for seeds originating from outside the SADC region.
1.3 **The SADC Quarantine and Phytosanitary Measures for Seed**

Harmonization will be reached through (i) establishment of transparent and science-based common standards and procedures for seed movement in the SADC region, supported by documentation; and (ii) through the introduction of rationalized SADC pest lists for the movement of seed between Member States, and seed from outside countries into the SADC region. Two rationalized pest lists have been introduced: (i) a SADC list of pests which require control when seed is traded between SADC Member States, and (ii) a SADC list of pests which require control when seed is traded into a SADC country from outside the region. The lists only include pests that are of economic significance, are not common in the SADC region, and are seed borne.

1.4 **Term of Reference**

1. The Consultants will undertake the following tasks:
2. Review literature on the Harmonized SADC Seed Project.
3. Conduct a system wide phytosanitary capacity evaluation of the National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) of Malawi, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe to cover the physical auditing of the complete quarantine and phytosanitary system relating to seed, including laboratory procedures, infrastructure evaluation, availability and status of manuals, as well as the associated paper trail (i.e. the complete administration of the system).
4. Evaluate the readiness of the four pilot countries to implement the requirements of the SADC protocol on Quarantine and Phytosanitary Measures for seed, identify gaps and report on the status in each country.
5. Review the SADC rationalized pest lists based on current scientific knowledge. For each country report on the status regarding use of the two rationalized pest lists that were developed in SSSN Phase I.
6. Conduct a field visit to at least one port of entry in each country to assess capacity to implement the requirements of the SADC protocol on Quarantine and Phytosanitary Measures for seed.
7. Hold consultations with key informants.
8. Identify institutional and human resource capacity/knowledge gaps and training needs i.e. conduct a training needs assessment.
9. Prepare a consolidated report with recommendations for development of capacity to implement the SADC protocol in each country, and recommend appropriate infrastructure to enable implementation.
2.0 Strategy

The team held discussions with relevant stakeholders selected by the NPPO base on the information that was required to be obtained. The meetings and physical visitations to the laboratories and at least one border post in each country provided information on the infrastructure and on diagnostic and human resource capabilities.

The structure of questions and information that was sought was based on the elements as described in the IPPC PCE tool.

A comprehensive report on the findings of and recommendations for each of the four countries, in the order they were visited, are recorded on the following pages. The assessment criterion based on what would be considered ideal situation for relevant aspect or scale used for the conformity ruling is as follows:

1 - Compliant/ nothing in place;
2 - Urgent attention needed
3 - Improvement required;
4 - Adequate but needs refinement;
5 - Fully compliant

3.0 Observations

3.1 Malawi

Representatives from relevant institutions were interviewed during the period covering 31th July to 5th August, 2011. The names and institutions they represent are as follows:

Mrs. G. Kaudzu Chitedze Agric. Res. Station
G.J.S. Kambale Chitedze Agric. Res. Station
E.D.L. Mazuma Chitedze Agric. Res. Station
G.A. Timeyo Phiri Chitedze Agric. Res. Station
Mrs. Kavala Chitedze Agric. Res. Station
Mr. D. Mbalangwe Chitedze Agric. Res. Station
Mrs. Cecilia Mumba Chitedze Agric Research Station
Mrs. Emmie Butao Chitedze Agric. Res. Station
Mr. F. Jumbe Farmers Union of Malawi
Mr. Nessimu Nyama Association of Small Holder Seed Multiplication Action Group (ASSMAG)
Mr. Musopole Civil Society Agriculture Network
Ms. Irina Kireeva NCTM association d’avocats, Brussels
3.1.1 Policy

Malawi is member WTO, IPPC, OIE, CAC, IAPSC and within the region, it is a member of both SADC and COMESA grouping of countries. Movement of plant and plant products and regulated articles is governed by the Plant Protection Act (Chapter 64) which was enacted in 1964. It has since then not been reviewed. The Act provides for subsidiary regulations (schedule) which have been used since. The Act also has a list of pest of quarantine importance embedded into it. Some reviews of the schedule including the pest list were done three years ago and did not use the PRA process to derive the justifications for the pests for phytosanitary measures. With the challenges of lack of training for NPPO staff and the limited human and financial resources in the Plant Protection Commodity group, no plant pest assessments have been done. This has resulted in the NPPO not initiating the process of harmonization with SADC protocol including the pest list. The Malawi pest list however covers almost all the SADC quarantine pest list.

3.1.2 Institutional Issues

The Department of Agricultural Research Services hosts the NPPO. The officers managing the NPPO activities are Plant Protection Research Scientists whose core function is to conduct research in pest management. This has meant that priority is given to the core functions and not activities of the NPPO. The plant Protection Research facilities represent the NPPO facilities since there is no clear demarcation between the two especially at professional level. Although Malawi has an SPS committee, this committee is not very active and meets on a need basis and when resources allow. It was noted that there was very low inter-Ministerial interaction with very low information exchange. The NPPO has a total of eleven (31) staff members strictly in phytosanitary inspections and most of them are based at selected borders, with the professionals spread between Chitedze, Bvumbwe and Lunyangwa Research Station. Bvumbwe Research Station, where the IPPC contact person and WTO-SPS plant health National Enquiry Point is located, is 200 km from the capital. The NPPO does not have any documented procedures for its activities. Some specialist inspections like that of Forestry and Forest products and also of Tea and Coffee have been sub-contracted to Forestry Research Institute of Malawi and Tea Research Foundation respectively.

The NPPO generates some monies through issuance of certificates and permits but the pegged costs are very low to make appreciable impact even if appropriation was allowed. However, there is no provision for the revolving of these funds. The NPPO also conducts inspections for most of the export bound seed though not based on the prescribed schedules.
3.1.3 Diagnostic Capabilities

The challenge of having the NPPO embedded within the research institute did not provide a clear picture of where the diagnostic capabilities lie, and where the regulatory functions begin. However, it was noted that equipment was a challenge. Most of it was not functional or obsolete and the number of diagnosticians limited. Specialists in disciplines such as entomology, virology and bacteriology are not available in the NPPO; hence assistance is usually obtained from the research institute or Bunda University. Availability of chemicals and reagents is also a challenge. Bvumbwe Research Station has a glass house which is normally used for observations of sugar cane planting material and this was supported by the sugar cane company. There is need however to renovate one which has run down so that it can cater for other crops considering that sugarcane is a long term and usually varieties received fill all the cubicles.

3.1.4 PRA and Surveillance

Malawi has never conducted any PRA to justify its quarantine pest list. Surveillances have been proposed by the Plant Protection Group but have never been supported financially. While there may be some shortfalls in identification up to species level in some cases, there is a provision through CABI to process fungal and bacterial infected plant samples for free. The only cost is postage to the center. However some sponsored surveillance activities have been conducted for banana bunchy top virus (BBTV), *Bactrocera invendens* (BI) and the *Prostephenus truncatus* (PT or larger grain borer, (LGB)). Scheduled surveillances are conducted in Red Locust breeding areas. It was noted that there has never been any training in pest risk analysis and hence it is not conducted. The few staff members that have been exposed to PRA, have not transferred this knowledge to other staff members in the department.

3.1.5 Exotic Pest Responses

Due to the lack of an institutionalized surveillance system, Malawi has had no opportunity to record the presence of new pests let alone report presence of new pests. With the above, timely or rapid response would not be instituted.

3.1.6 Border Capacities

Based on the visit to one of the border posts and information from the Plant protection team it was noted that there was general short fall in accommodation, communication facilities and lack of front line diagnostic facilities or equipment and also lack of training, which directly affected their performance.
3.1.7 Summary

A summary of ratings of the phytosanitary capacity based on the above selected elements for Malawi is tabulated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>The Plant Protection Act (1969) is outdated in that in some aspects it is not in conformity with the IPPC and WTO-SPS Agreement, therefore the SADC Protocol on Trade. The Regulations are also outdated. Review of the Act initiated but not Regulations and pest list</td>
<td>The regulations to be reviewed including the pest list, using the available resources. Currently use other sources of information including CABI.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional issues</td>
<td>NPPO is within Plant Protection Commodity group in the Department of Agricultural research Services. Gets its resources form the Plant Protection Research Commodity allocation as such accorded little priority in terms of resource allocation. NPPO does not revolve the funds it generates, therefore not efficient at timely provision of services</td>
<td>Urgent need for re-structuring and also encourage joint implementation of activities. NPPO to incorporate some the issues in the Act to provide guidelines</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPO set up</td>
<td>There is no clear set up of the NPPO, but individuals involved in the day to day activities related to NPPO can be depicted, headed by a National Research Coordinator. The ethics of running the NPPO however are not instilled in the system.</td>
<td>Requires review and re-modeling so that there are individuals who are specifically deployed for Quarantine and Phytosanitary issues with clear responsibilities.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interaction with</td>
<td>Interaction between the NPPO and Seed services is only at issuance of certification documents. There is however a lot more interaction with the produce exporters because of phytosanitary certification.</td>
<td>Requires vigorous awareness campaigns</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other players</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visibility</td>
<td>The NPPO is not very visible as such phytosanitary issues are only known by very few individuals. This usually when somebody wants to export a commodity.</td>
<td>Requires vigorous awareness campaigns to bring awareness of the activities and also the importance of the NPPO.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td>It is usually the last to be considered</td>
<td>Needs to refocus so that the importance it plays in an agricultural industry-based economy is reflected in the way resources are allocated.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial</td>
<td>There is no allocation specifically for NPPO activities. The allocation is embedded in the Plant Protection research allocation every month. Priority given to research activities.</td>
<td>Dedicated allocation of funds for NPPO core activities and appropriation of funds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human resources</td>
<td>There is no human resource that is specifically for Phytosanitary activities apart from the Plant Health inspectors at the border posts and at the central offices. At professional level there is none.</td>
<td>Recruit or re-allocation of staff, and train them</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technical</td>
<td>New staff has just been recruited, posting to boarder post not yet fully implemented because of facilities and</td>
<td>Re-allocation of staff to continue but plausible facilities to be put in place at the</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
resources at the respective sites. 95% of this category of staff has not been formerly trained in phytosanitary work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Solution/Recommendation</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Inadequate. Need to develop the NPPO with its own specialist with very clear vision of how an NPPO should be run including pest identification.</td>
<td>Recruit or re-allocation of staff and training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic capabilities</td>
<td>Depended on Plant protection staff and equipment</td>
<td>NPPO capacity development program to be institutionalized</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equipment</td>
<td>Most of the equipment is old. Reagents are also very hard to come by. The NPPO has got good and functional Quarantine facilities.</td>
<td>Procurement of new equipment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diagnosticians</td>
<td>Since the NPPO activities are carried out by research staff, its capacity depend solely on the capacity of the Plant Protection unit specialists, despite their limited availability for Phytosanitary activities. Specialist in some fields are not available</td>
<td>Recruit and train especially mycologists, entomologists and taxonomists.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarder/inspection capacity</td>
<td>Very few old inspectors have the necessary skills to conduct most of the professional Phytosanitary work. These however can retire anytime and therefore create a very big gap.</td>
<td>Put in place plans for an intensive training program, while also developing some project proposals that would focus on capacity building in this area. Regional expertise or Centers of Excellency like COPE can provide this type training.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Skills</td>
<td>No computers and internet connectivity, but communicate through personal Cell phones, except in very few exceptions (2 boarders). No consistency in airtime allocation. The amount allocated is also insignificant.</td>
<td>Head office to facilitate provision of this basic good through procurement of computers and installation of internet</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>Not effective system in place, because of lack of skills, equipment and space for diagnostic work (lab).</td>
<td>Procurement of frontline equipment and training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Front line diagnosis</td>
<td>The inspectors are always available at the head offices, Auction Floors, and at some border posts. Serious shortfall in warehouse/facility inspections because of transport problems, mainly fuel.</td>
<td>Recruit or re-allocation of staff and training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity with SADC Protocol</td>
<td>No conformity for pest listing though most of the pests to be guarded against are also on the pest list for SADC. The country has an Enquiry Point for plant Protection and a</td>
<td>To speed up the process may require external assistance to review and align</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notification Authority. There is however a deficiency in PRA knowledge and skills, which remains a big challenge in drawing the pest list.

Scale: 1. : Compliant/ nothing in place; 2.: Urgent attention needed; 3.: Improvement required; 4.: Adequate but needs refinement; 5.: Fully compliant
3.2 Zambia

Zambia was visited between 8th and 11th August 2011 and information was obtained from Seed companies, the Research trust, Seed Control and Certification Institute, the NPPO and border posts. Individuals that provided information are listed below.

- Dr. Catherine Mugona  
  Seed Control and Certification Institute
- Dr. F. Miti  
  Seed Control and Certification Institute
- Mrs. Mable Simwaza  
  Seed Control and Certification Institute
- Mr. Zulu  
  Seed Control and Certification Institute
- Monde Zulu  
  Zambia Agric. Research station
- Vincent Simwinga  
  Zambia Agric. Research station
- Mukolo C. Taguma  
  Zambia Agric. Research station
- Rabson Mulenga  
  Zambia Agric. Research station
- Isaiah Ntenga  
  Zambia Agric. Research station
- Sylvia M. Tembo  
  Zambia Agric. Research station
- Mathias Tembo  
  Zambia Agric. Research station
- Maimouna Abass  
  Zambia Agric. Research station
- Mooya Nzila  
  Zambia Agric. Research station PQPS, LIA Office
- Brenda Mweemba  
  Zambia Agric. Research station
- Mr. D. Moono  
  Great Valley Agriculture Trust Research (GART)
- Mr. S. Simunji  
  Great Valley Agriculture Trust Research (GART)

3.2.1 Policy

Zambia is member WTO, IPPC, OIE, CAC, IAPSC, and within the region, it is a member of GLR, SADC and COMESA. The Plant Pests and Diseases Act (CAP 233) has undergone two reviews in the last ten years. In each of these, there was closer alignment made to the IPPC and WTO SPS Agreement. Zambia having the capacity and capabilities to conduct pest risk analysis, it has managed to review the SADC pest list and has aligned the requirements through this process.

3.2.2 Institutional Issues

Although the Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service (PQPS) which is the NPPO of Zambia evolved from the research institution, the mission observed that there was clear demarcation between the regulatory function of the PQPS and the activities of the Plant Protection Division. The PQPS has as its core functions regulatory issues, development of national regulatory positions and facilitation of movement of plants, plant parts and plant products.

There is a lot of inter ministerial interaction with the NPPO. It has a schedule for issuance of Phytosanitary certification, which is always in the morning. Issuance is also more central in that everybody must come to Chilanga or the Airport Exit facility to obtain a phytosanitary certificate. There is no
appropriation of funds; therefore the NPPO relies on apportioned funds from Zambia Research Institute. This poses as a challenge in terms of implementation of both scheduled and unscheduled activities.

3.2.3 Diagnostic Capabilities

The PQPS has within its building a small laboratory that is used for urgent import or export concerns. The close proximity to the Plant Protection Division provides access to specialists where the PQPS does not have. There was some new equipment recently procured that included PCR, ELISA reader, HPLC etc. However there was some equipment which needed repairs and some that obsolete. The lack of identifiers/taxonomists was emphasized more especially in the Entomology section.

3.2.4 PRA and Surveillance

Zambia has the capacity to conduct PRA and does occasionally conduct surveillances to support the PRA exercises. These are conducted jointly with the Research Plant Protection Unit. The PRA are conducted to provide conditions for export as need arises. Limited surveillance programmes have been implemented in the recent past due to limited financial resources. These included BBTV, LGB, BI, Golden cyst nematode etc.

3.2.5 Exotic Pest Responses

Pest response preparedness was dependant on available financial resources. There is no special fund set aside for emergency pest response; however there is usually quick response to incidences depending on the anticipated economic impact. In general funding to the NPPO is very low to effectively cater for the effective running of the phytosanitary.

3.2.6 Border Capabilities

The NPPO has 108 Plant Health Inspectors who are guided by 7 professional staff. It also sources unavailable specialist’s services from the core plant protection research team which is based at Mount Makulu Research Institute. Over 90% of staff has had effective training in inspections, front line diagnostics and the function of an NPPO and in the use of the IPPC’s ISPMs. The training program covered surveillance and the use and application of PRA. Most of the borders have provision for basic front line inspection and testing equipment. An incinerator facility is available at Chirundu, though not yet commissioned. Discussions with Plant Health Inspectors at the border and at the newly constructed point of exit inspection facility showed a good knowledge by the inspectors in understanding their roles and functions.
3.2.7 Summary

A summary of ratings of the phytosanitary capacity based on the above selected elements for Zambia are tabulated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>The Plant Pest Control Act has just gone through a revision to be in conformity with the IPPC and WTO – SPS Agreement. The Regulations are being timely reviewed</td>
<td>Need to continue with the review so that Regulations are also effectively reviewed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional issues</td>
<td>Currently the NPPO is still under the Research Department, therefore has binding allocation to receive every month.</td>
<td>Requires more autonomy so that it can plan and implement activities independently</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPO set up</td>
<td>The NPPO is part of ZARI and therefore operates within the administrative and financial status of the institution, with its operations being at the mercy of the Director of Research</td>
<td>Independence would further strengthen its potential and effectiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interaction with other players</td>
<td>Good interaction with the private sector and Seed Services Unit. Interaction with other service providers like the university not very evident</td>
<td>Require more awareness campaigns</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visibility</td>
<td>The private sector especially sectors involved in export crop is very much aware of the presence and activities of the NPPO.</td>
<td>More awareness campaigns</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct allocation of funds for core NPPO activities and provide for revolving of funds.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial</td>
<td>There is no allocation specifically for NPPO activities. The allocation is embedded in the Plant Protection Research allocation every month. Priority given to research activities. The border post allocation not stable and also very small. No special provision for overtime. The severance allowance given to some is insignificant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Technical</td>
<td>Number of technical staff is sufficient but there is staff which joined later after the training programs were concluded. They require formal induction to further enhance their skills.</td>
<td>Will require training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Professional</td>
<td>There is professional staff within the NPPO though there are still some deficiencies in some disciplines. This is however taken care of by the collaboration with the university.</td>
<td>There is need to recruit and train in areas like taxonomy, mycology, biotechnology.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic capabilities</td>
<td>Has all relevant laboratory structures but the closed quarantine facilities are in very poor shape.</td>
<td>Need to continue with the renovations of the facilities but to also take to consideration of the fact that the climatic change is real</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Equipment</td>
<td>Some good equipment available in the research labs though some of it is very old and non-functional. Basic</td>
<td>Review and indentify those to be procured</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Required Action</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosticians</td>
<td>Specialists are also limited, but the unit boosts a lot of support from the core research team.</td>
<td>Recruit of re-allocation of staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarder/inspection capacity</td>
<td>Some entry points are properly equipped and have enough staff to effectively implement the phytosanitary work.</td>
<td>Recruit of re-allocation of staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Most of the inspectors have adequate skills to carry out phytosanitary work, but the skills need to be reviewed regularly. The entry/exit points also have got important guidelines and SOPs.</td>
<td>Requires training</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Some posts have computers but no internet facility - they instead relay on personal cell phones. No airtime provision.</td>
<td>Provision of modern equipment and internet facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front line diagnosis</td>
<td>Some entry/exit points have the capacity to do frontline diagnosis.</td>
<td>Provision of equipment and training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of inspectors</td>
<td>Almost all border posts are manned therefore available for inspections. There is however need to beef up staff in some posts.</td>
<td>Recruit of re-allocation of staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity with SADC Protocol</td>
<td>The Act and Regulations plus the pest list are being reviewed for conformity to IPPC and WTO – SPS Agreement to which it is a party.</td>
<td>Align aspects to SADC protocols</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1.: Compliant/ nothing in place; 2.: Urgent attention needed; 3.: Improvement required; 4.: Adequate but needs refinement; 5.: Fully compliant
3.3 Zimbabwe

The mission in Zimbabwe was from 15th to 17th August 2011 and stakeholders interviewed were from seed companies, the NPPO, Research Service Division and Mutale boarder post and these are listed below:

Dr. C. Nguni  
Dr. G. P. Chikwenhere  
C. Mujaju  
Mr. W. Chigodora  
Mr. E. Nyamusa  
S. Nyamutukwa  
T. Nwata  
I. Duri  
Y. Chisanhu  
Norman Chabota  

Research Service Division  
Research Service Division  
Seed Services  
Agriseed (Pvt) Ltd  
Agriseed (Pvt) Ltd  
Plant Quarantine Service  
Plant health Inspectorate  
Plant health Inspectorate  
Plant health Inspectorate

3.3.1 Policy

Zimbabwe is a member of WTO, CODEX, OIE, and at regional level, it belongs to SADC and COMESA. Zimbabwe Government had reviewed the Plant Protection Act (1981) and will be replacing its regulations. The new regulations to come into place are currently under review and awaiting enactment. In the new regulations, the component of SADC harmonization is high-lighted.

3.3.2 Institutional Issues

The Plant Phytosanitary and Quarantine Unit, which operates as the NPPO, is under the Plant Protection Division within the Research Services Division. The current situation was that due to lack of resources and insufficient incentives, the NPPO has lost experienced staff to private sector. There was a clear knowledge gap between those who know and are in high positions and relatively young new staff.

The NPPO charges for the services it lends but does not revolve whatever funds it generates. This means that it solely relies on the central government funding which is apportioned to it by the Plant Protection Division whose central role is to conduct research.

3.3.3 Diagnostic Capabilities

The Quarantine station at Mazoe has two laboratories; one for pathology and another for entomology. The station has also very elaborate quarantine glass houses which are going to waste because of lack of utilization. The laboratories
have the potential of carrying out basic diagnostic work. Specialized personnel, however is the biggest challenge. However as an institution within the Research division it still is able to tap on the resources within the division. In general the status of the diagnostic capabilities is low with a shortfall in laboratory equipment and reagents.

3.3.4 PRA and Surveillance

The NPPO conducts PRAs in deriving the conditions for commodities entering their territory. Despite the capacity being low there is an effort to fulfill this noble cause. For a number of commodities the old regulations still apply and are still being used selectively with modifications. The PRAs were done and conducted for specific new threats and commodities. Sponsored surveillance programs were being carried out especially on *Bactrocera invadens*, sugarcane borer, sugarcane smut and LGB.

3.3.5 Exotic Pest Responses

Due to the above mentioned limited resources within the division, response programs are only done for BI and LGB. It was clear that dealing with any incursions into the country would be a serious challenge because as is with most if not all pilot countries, there is no provision for special fund to cater for emergency pest response.

3.3.6 Border Capabilities

Most border posts have got inspectors, though indications are that they are not well equipped. Staff in some posts has had some training in inspection procedures, though frontline diagnosis is almost in all cases visual. There is no functional border post laboratory to carry out initial diagnosis. Just as is the case with Zambia, inspectors at the border post are also directly involved in field inspections.

3.3.7 Summary

A summary of ratings of the phytosanitary capacity based on the above selected elements for Zimbabwe are tabulated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>The Plant Pest and Disease Act of Zimbabwe is currently under review to be in conformity with the IPPC and the WTO-SPS Agreement.</td>
<td>This is an opportunity to include issues related to operation of the NPPO.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional issues</td>
<td>The Plant Protection Division is under the Research Services Division of which one of the unit is the Plant Quarantine section that operates as the NPPO. The Director is the IPPC contact point.</td>
<td>The structure Make the structure more visible.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPO set up</td>
<td>The NPPO is part and parcel of the Research Institute; therefore all staff in the Plant Protection Unit comprises the NPPO.</td>
<td>There is need to have a separate unit with a clear mandate in order to provide professional advice and also be visible.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interaction with other players</td>
<td>Staff in this section is specifically assigned to Quarantine work. It was however noted that interaction with the Seeds unit is a bit limited, this puts the phytosanitary activities fully reliant on government funding, since whatever monies are realized from the services they render goes to the government coffers as opposed to Seeds unit which is given a provision to revolve whatever they realize.</td>
<td>The review of the Act should make provision for this in order to enhance the operational capabilities of both sectors and provide a level ground for effective interaction. The private sector</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visibility</td>
<td>The NPPO is visible, but this visibility must be augmented with quality and timely service provision.</td>
<td>There is need however to beef up staff so that there is adequate and detailed concentration on specific concerns.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial</td>
<td>The NPPO gets its allocation through the Plant protection unit of the Research Department.</td>
<td>There is need for direct allocation of funds to the NPPO. With its location it requires a little bit more resources to cater for sub-item like communication facilities.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human resources</td>
<td>Staff is specifically allocated to Quarantine activities though not sufficient.</td>
<td>There is need to beef up staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technical</td>
<td>All key border posts are manned but there is limited resource allocation.</td>
<td>Requires recruitment and training. Where there is a serious shortfall involvement of other partners like customs and immigration would</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Professional</td>
<td>This category of staff is limited, with only three stationed at the quarantine facility due to high level of attrition.</td>
<td>Recruit or re-allocation of staff and training</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic capabilities</td>
<td>Technical human resource is available in the country</td>
<td>Needs develop to mobilized specialists</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
though outside the NPPO services through effective interaction with other institutions

- **Equipment**
  The NPPO has two labs within its structures, which has some good basic equipment. It also has some equipment which is old more especially in the main stream labs at the research institute. This where most of the diagnosis at present is done. The lab at the quarantine station is not intensively used due to lack of staff. It also has very elaborate closed quarantine structures which are going to waste.

  **Procure new equipment**

- **Diagnosticians**
  The NPPO as an entity has limited number of specialists, but the main Plant Protection section has some specialists who work directly with the quarantine unit. The university also rich in specialist and are available for backup work. The assumption though is that it has the necessary facilities.

  **If recruitment is not possible strengthening collaboration with the University and Food and Nutrition Unit would assist in achieving the diagnosis of pests for which the department does not have specialist.**

  **Boarder/inspection capacity**

- **Skills**
  Most staff have just had on-the job training and formal training in the basics of phytosanitary and quarantine.

  **Requires training**

- **Communication**
  Only means of communication is cell phone. No internet connectivity.

  **Connectivity is very crucial and there is need to source and make available ITC equipment.**

- **Front line diagnosis**
  Most boarders have some offices with relatively poor basic frontline diagnostic equipment. However this was also appreciated by the dedicated inspectors, who were lamenting over poor equipment. It was observed that some borders were connected with a land line and were allocated some airtime on a monthly basis.

  **Procurement of new equipment and training them in its usage, and also on diagnostic techniques.**

  **Availability of inspectors**
  Adequate

  **Requires capacity building in inspection process and diagnosis**

  **Conformity with SADC Protocol**
  The NPPO uses the standard documents in its transactions, but does not have a transparent pest list. It has not yet started harmonizing its pest list with the SADC list. It however has drawn a list of pests is not yet published. They also National Enquiry Point and the National notification Authority.

  **Review to align with SADC protocols**

---

Scale: 1. : Compliant/ nothing in place; 2.: Urgent attention needed ; 3.: Improvement required; 4.: Adequate but needs refinement; 5.: Fully compliant
3.4 Swaziland

The Swaziland survey took place from 29th August to 1st September 2011. Audiences were held with personnel from the industry, Seed Services Unit, NPPO and a grower. We also had an opportunity to meet the Principal Secretary for Agriculture. A full list is shown below.

Dr. Robert S. Thwala  Ministry of Agriculture – Principle Secretary
Mr. Similo Mabvimbela  Malkerns Research Station
Mr. Sipho Simelane  Malkerns Research Station,
Mr. R. Mkhombe  Lower Usutu Smallholder Irrigation Project (LUSIP),
Ronnie V. F. Mkhombe  Swaziland Water and Agriculture Development Enterprise (SWADE)
Robert Mabundza  Swaziland Water and Agriculture Development Enterprise (SWADE)
Sidney Mhango  African Christian College

3.4.1 Policy

Swaziland is a member of WTO, CODEX, IPPC, OIE, and at regional level, it belongs to both SADC COMESA economic groupings. At the time of the survey, Swaziland was in the process of presenting the revised Plant Protection Bill for stakeholder consultation. The draft revised bill incorporated element of a revolving fund in order to improve efficiency of delivery of services and also harmonization with the SADC protocol.

3.4.2 Institutional Issues

The NPPO of Swaziland is housed within the Plant Protection Service of the Research Department. The system suffers from the intrinsic problem of not delivering efficiently in the NPPO assignments due to its setup. Delivery in phytosanitary area is seriously challenged by limited human resource in the Plant Protection section which is also expected to perform NPPO activities.

The Agriculture Extension Department has a section which deals with farmers’ crop protection issues with a bias towards preparedness for migratory pests; this section is being deployed sometimes to assist in provincial plant health inspectorate activities.

3.4.3 Diagnostic Capabilities

The NPPO as indicated above has a very serious shortage of staff at both professional and technician level. The newly built post entry quarantine facility has modern facilities with new diagnostic equipment but lack the necessary trained human resource to effectively put them to use. The only two professional staff that is also responsible for plant protection research run the NPPO. One is not yet specialized and is going on a two year study leave. There
is also no technical staff at the NPPO, and no designated inspectors at border post. There are also no structures to house the very modern inspection kit at any of the border post.

3.4.4 PRA and Surveillance

In the same vein, there are insufficient human resource and capacities within the NPPO to conduct surveillances and PRAs. However, a small group exists that meets every so often to deal with critical emergencies and threatening situations. The Plant Protection Division has been given the authority to recruit five (5) new members of staff. Harmonization of pest list has not been initiated but there plans to just adopt the SADC pest list.

3.4.5 Exotic Pest Responses

NPPO in Swaziland does not show potential capabilities to deal with any pest introductions due to poor human and financial resources. However, possibilities may lie in the joint efforts with the plant protection unit in the Extension division assuming it has resources for pest emergency preparedness responses. This also assumes that good cooperation and collaboration exists between the two units in dealing with emergency situations.

3.4.6 Border Capabilities

Members of staff dealing with regulatory issues were met at the sampled border. These included the Milk Board, NAMBoard, Department Veterinary Services and phytosanitary services. There are no plant health inspectors at all border posts and NPPO inspections are covered by the other parties on a gentleman’s agreement. As an example a visit to Ngweya border post revealed that the Veterinary services person, who is just a certificate holder, is in-charge of Plant Health Inspections. It was however observed that he had very limited knowledge of what is expected of him when it come inspection of plant and plant products.

3.4.7 Summary

A summary of ratings of the phytosanitary capacity based on the above selected elements for Swaziland is tabulated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal framework</td>
<td>The Plant Control Act (1981) which governs Phytosanitary and Quarantine measures is currently under review to be in conformity with the IPPC and the WTO-SPS Agreement. This will in make it also in conformity with the SADC Trade Protocol SPS Annex.</td>
<td>The process should be completed and they should make sure that it makes the NPPO prominent with necessary statutes that will make it effective and self sustaining.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional issues</td>
<td>The Plant Protection Research unit acts as the NPPO and has no personnel of its own. There is serious human capacity challenge. There are only two scientists, one with MSc and another with BSc at professional level dealing with NPPO issues. These have to sort out pest related problems in the country. There is a freeze of recruitment, which means the situation will remain like this until this is lifted.</td>
<td>There is need to seek for special consideration in order to boost the potential and capacity of the NPPO. The NPPO should be a separate unit with specific mandate and also its own staff so that activities of the NPPO are not diluted. This is important if viewed in the context of South Africa as the main Trading partner and also some Developed countries which may be imposing some very strict measures on their exports.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPO set up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interaction with other players</td>
<td>There is very good interface with Ministry of Trade, the Seed Services unit which is under Extension Department and some horticultural crop producers/exporters. Other institutions involved at the border posts interact well with the NPPO, as demonstrated by their assistance in inspections where there are no or insufficient personnel to conduct phytosanitary inspection.</td>
<td>NPPO setup to be de-centralized</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visibility</td>
<td>Not very visible because of shortage of staff. However efforts are being as demonstrated by the Unit showcasing their activities at an Agricultural fair which was taking place at the time of the assignment.</td>
<td>More awareness campaigns</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td>Not specifically allocated for the NPPO, but gets a share from the Research allocation. Benefits from some projects which complements Government efforts.</td>
<td>Dedicated allocation of funds to NPPO core activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Human resources</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Recruit or re-allocation of staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Technical</td>
<td>Almost unavailable, such that most border posts are not manned. At the NPPO office there is also limited Technical staff</td>
<td>Recruit or re-allocation of staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Professional</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Recruit or re-allocation of staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Equipment</td>
<td>Recently available through the FAO/TCP with minimum</td>
<td>Review equipment and procure the missing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utilization due to limited staff.</td>
<td>ones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diagnosticians</td>
<td>The NPPO has only three professional staff available from the Research Unit. This is limited to Mycology, Entomology (Trainee) and Weed Science</td>
<td>If recruitment is not possible strengthening collaboration with the University and Food and Nutrition Unit would assist in achieving the diagnosis of pests for which the department does not have specialist.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarder/inspection</td>
<td>Available but inadequate</td>
<td>Recruit of re-allocation of staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Skills</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Training program require as a matter of urgency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Provision of dedicated phone and internet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Front line diagnosis</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>Provision of staff and training in front line diagnosis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Recruit or re-allocation of staff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspectors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity with SADC</td>
<td>Review is ongoing but have inadequate staff</td>
<td>May require external support to hasten review</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Discussion

4.1 The harmonization process

In order to effectively apply the harmonization process for quarantine and phytosanitary measures for seeds, some structured (targeted and general) surveillance programs need to be instituted for the countries to positively know what type of pests they have in their territories. The information collected, can be applied into pest risk analysis, and will provide a good basis for regulating seed borne pathogens including contaminants. This information will provide for the ever necessary pest lists relevant to seeds and crops.

It is envisaged that at the SADC level, there should be some advocacy for the NPPOs to appropriate the resources that they generate to sustain these programs. It is also proposed that some good phytosanitary practices be advocated for to ensure that at the SADC wide level, practices are common and agreed upon. This would be, for example, methods of collecting samples in the field or the best sampling methods for commodities on trucks. Such standardized best practices, will increase the level of confidence in the region and will enhance the credibility of the inspection services from the region.

The above should provide for the need of having standard operating procedures (SOP) and guidelines which were not readily available in the pilot countries. However, some SOPs are available at the Centre of Phytosanitary Excellence (COPE) that is based in Nairobi, which can be borrowed for modification to the local relevant conditions.

4.1.1 Proposed areas of intervention

The pilot countries have all gone through the freeze on staff recruitments hence a deficit in the human resource that is critical to the NPPOs. This creates a situation where there is staff attrition but there is no staff recruitment. This has created an imbalance in terms of information flow and capabilities of doing NPPO activities such as surveillances and PRAs.

4.2 Contact points and information exchange
One of the critical areas in WTO SPS Agreement includes establishment of an operational contact/enquiry point that will facilitate information flow from clients to NPPO and from NPPO to the relevant units in the plant protection or other relevant enquiry points. This includes activities like document control and filling documents for trace back purposes.

This will facilitate rapid information flow and information exchange in order to be responsive to the ever changing trading climate worldwide.

4.3 Proposed new areas of intervention

i. Seed pathology training

There was a clear deficit of seed pathologist in the pilot countries. Staff trained in this field would assist in documenting the pests found on seed to assist in the phytosanitary harmonization of the seed movement. One possible avenue is to consider developing a course to be conducted at the Seed Pathology Laboratory based at the Sokoine University in Tanzania. The concept is that the centre would once again become more viable and the field of seed pathology would have an opportunity to have more candidates that would work in this field.

ii. Plant Inspectors Training

The structure and building at the Mazowe Plant Quarantine Station is currently going to waste. At its establishment the intentions were good but the final implementation has not been as earlier anticipated. A possible intervention would be to have this centre resuscitated so that it can provide training programs for the region. These training programs would directly cover SADC wide concerns such as border inspections, sampling, risk mitigation, front line diagnostics, basic knowledge in pest identification, etc.

iii) SADC wide permit management system

A number of countries have singly tried the permit management systems for issuance of permits and documentation. These include Zambia and Zimbabwe.

A number of advantages would accrue if this was done in a harmonized fashion. In other words, if a template was developed that would be used SADC wide, it would hasten the harmonization process and ensure that all countries are entering similar data in the data base. The system would also facilitate
sharing of information and countries would know what commodities are actually moving in the region.

The other advantage would be that the NPPOs would at a click of a button provide information to its seniors on the actual total volumes of commodities that have actually moved as these can, on a daily basis be compiled, collated from the borders and compared with Customs data sheets.

It can be workable in such a way that the system can interface with the Customs ASQUUDA system to facilitate early clearance of commodities, and risk mitigation well before the commodity reaches the importing country’s border.

4.5 Capacity Development

Considerable assistance is being provided in the area of capacity development by a number of donors and partners. It was also noted that this assistance is frequently geared towards gaining access to foreign markets and meeting importing country plant health standards. The current thinking is to ensure that such capacity development programs should also be directed at enhancing the ability of recipient countries to protect their domestic plant health and natural resource for sustainable agricultural development.

Strong phytosanitary capabilities contribute directly to archiving a number of goals established under the United Nations (UN) millennium development goals (MDGs). The ability for a country to protect plant health is vital for increasing agricultural output, reducing hunger and generating incomes towards the resource challenged small scale farmers. It is equally important to protect biological biodiversity on which the agriculture industry sorely depends.

It is important to note that resource allocation towards the NPPOs in the national budgets is relatively low and hence the activities may not be achieved without the necessary capacity development. With this situation, making provision for appropriation of resources generated by the NPPOs, can effectively deal with the national requirements of the core NPPO activities. The concepts and programs of capacity building could be mirrored with those being done at the Centre of Phytosanitary Excellence (COPE) in Nairobi and make reference to the National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy under the IPPC.

4.6 SADC Plant Protection Committee
Within the SADC realm, the position of the Plant Protection Committee as a recognized SADC committee, should provide an avenue for articulating issues directly relating to the importance of the NPPOs. It has been proposed in the past to have a Sub-Regional RPPO covering the SADC region as they possess common pest and regional problems. FANRPAN, FAO and the SADC Secretariat, should articulate the importance of raising the profile of this committee, so that it can serve the common interests, facilitate harmonization SADC wide in programs. This is seen as the vehicle for easy harmonization for the region in the phytosanitary arena as these issues relate to the IPPC and the WTO SPS Committee. It is also envisaged that Governments would readily provide funds to this Committee as it is already recognized under SADC.

4.7 Transparency

There concern over sudden changes to import requirements which has tended to create the un-predictability of doing business. Some companies interviewed mentioned the sudden changes in requirements when consignments were moving or may be at a border.

It is an obligation for countries that are members to the WTO with its SPS agreement and under the IPPC, that they must be transparent. The WTO has put up a number of training sessions providing to countries the best practice to become compliant as a national obligation. The first avenue is the requirement to notify for any upcoming changes to the legislation and for countries to consider placing the national requirements on a ready to read website.

The publication of national requirements provides information in advance to clients and allows for forward planning and predictable scenarios for conducting business with known requirements for plant health.
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