



Global review of phytosanitary surveillance in the context of the IPPC Standard (ISPM6) – identification of best practices

Regional Workshop for the review of ISPM 6

6-8 February, 2012

Accra, Ghana.

The workshop for “Global review of phytosanitary surveillance in the context of the IPPC (International Plant Protection Convention) International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM6) – identification of best practice” was held at Alisa Hotel from the 6-9 February 2021. This workshop was facilitated by the FAO Regional Office for Africa (RAF) in conjunction with a technical officer from FAO Sub-regional Office for Southern Africa (Ms Joyce Mulila-Mitti). Participants were from 16 Anglophone countries representing Central, Eastern, Southern Africa and Western Africa. The workshop was organized by FAORAF in collaboration with the IPPC Secretariat.

1.0 Opening session

The workshop was brought to order by Ms Hannah Clarendon- the Plant Protection Officer of FAO/RAF followed by introduction of participants and facilitators. The workshop was then opened by the Crop Protection Officer (Ms Hannah Clarendon) sitting in for Madame Maria Helena Semedo, Assistant Director General and Regional Representative for Africa who was unavoidably absent. Ms Clarendon extended greetings from the Director General of the FAO, Dr Graziano Da Silva, and went on to indicate the type of assistance that FAO and the IPPC Secretariat gave to countries; for example training on Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) and emergency plant pest management as well as general capacity development of NPPOs. The workshop on Global review of phytosanitary surveillance in the context of the IPPC Standard (ISPM6) is part of a larger global support intervention under the Implementation Review and Support System” (IRSS) Programme of the IPPC. The major components of IRSS are: the implementation review system (IRS) and the implementation support system (ISS) to be used along with other information collected by the IPPC and other relevant organizations. The expected result of the IRSS is the implementation review response (IRR) which will summarize the situation of the implementation of the IPPC and its standards by contracting parties every 3 years. This will serve to generate pragmatic action plans for the IPPC that would guide development of the work programme.

Ms Clarendon expressed her appreciation for the kind support offered by the European Union who generously provided funds for IRSS activities including the convening of this workshop.

Participants were then called upon to share their experiences with each other on pest identification recognizing that information sharing was a major component of surveillance. The countries were acknowledged for their contributions to the survey in providing responses to the questionnaire. The FAO Regional Office in its continued effort in capacity development of the countries had developed a strategic framework for crop protection in line with the CAADP and acknowledged the role of Inter-Africa Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) and the Regional Economic Communities (RECs) in coordinating the work for Africa.

The representative from Ghana, Mr. Jack Vesper Suglo (Director of Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate) brought greetings from the Ministry of Agriculture.

2.0 Purpose of the workshop

The facilitator explained the purpose of the workshop, which was:

- to provide feedback from contracting parties on ISPM 6, 4 and 8 which are up for review to the reviewers of IPPC standard setting team;
- to make an analysis of the responses provided by contracting parties on the level of implementation of ISPM 6 and identify the main challenges for its implementation; the data to be collected could be provided to IPPC for guidance in developing capacity development in this area.

3.0 IPPC Overview

Ms. Mulila-Mitti presented the overview of the International Plant Protection Convention highlighting implementation of standards and information exchange, the standard setting mechanisms, and the international regulatory framework, administrative framework and the role of the national/regional plant protection organizations in this context.

4.0 Adoption of Agenda

The workshop elected Mr. Vesper Suglo from Ghana as chairperson; while Ms. Doreen Chomba from Zambia and Ms. Alice Ndikontar from Cameroon were elected as rapporteurs. Mr. I. M. Shamie from Sierra Leone was elected to be the general rapporteur. Following the elections, the participants reviewed and adopted the agenda (refer to Annex 2). Participants were provided with handouts on the various presentations for the workshop as well as the responses to the questionnaire for Africa and for the global analysis.

A format of reporting was provided and it was proposed that a synopsis of the previous days' work would be given at the onset of the following day.

5.0 Remarks on surveillance

With a view to assisting participants appreciate the importance of surveillance; Ms. Clarendon made remarks to illustrate in a practical manner what is surveillance in simple terms. Surveillance in the context of ISPM 6 can be summarized as

I see, I say and I tell (communicate)

The participants identified the main components of surveillance including the following:

Searching for pests

Collecting and recording data

- Systematic collecting
- Monitoring

- see; (anyone can see) Detect, or find

1. Say - Report- (any one can report)

2. Identify /verify
3. Document
4. Reporting pest list officially- only the NPPO is mandated to do so.
5. Managing pest outbreaks (NPPO plus the private sector and other institutions)

Feedback on the above session: a question was raised as to who can report. The response was that everyone can report the presence of a pest. The representative from Ghana advised that in the legislation for his country, everyone is obliged by law to report the presence of a pest. The participants raised concerns about the fact that everyone can report. However, it was mentioned that it was the duty of the NPPO to put in place a system through which the information on pest reports can be channeled properly and also observed that the NPPO must be far ahead in knowing the pests present in each of the countries.

Some problems ensue because of the ability of some individuals to report to the highest level in the country and this is particularly so for those pests considered as “political pests” which receive much attention from the Ministers.

Discussions ensued to the main compelling reasons for conducting surveillance;

which are protection of:

- food security
- biodiversity
- trade

5.0 ISPM 6- Guidelines for Surveillance

The presentation on ISPM 6 Guidelines for Surveillance was made by Ms. Awususi Olufunke; representative from Nigeria, member of the Standards Committee.

The presentation covered the following aspects; definition of surveillance, general and specific surveillance, good surveillance practices, technical requirements for diagnostic services, record keeping transparency and requirements for implementation.

In the discussions that followed, it was observed that some countries did not have legislation/or had outdated acts and needed assistance in the compilation/review. In Nigeria for example, the legislation exists but the NPPO had not been implementing given the problem of inadequate funding.

Other reasons given for non-implementation of surveillance included

- the protracted process of enacting bills
- the bureaucracy entailed in the process of preparing for the enactment of bills.
- Another impediment is the absence of administrative structures for effective implementation as well as the regulations for enforcement of the law.
- Insufficient diagnostic capabilities at national level as well as referral laboratories in the region were also identified as key challenges.

FAO was called upon to give assistance in the review and design of legislation as well as technical guidance in developing manuals and standard operating procedures for surveillance.

7.0 Summary of the results of the questionnaire

The presentation of the results of the questionnaire was made by Ms. Clarendon. The major observations included the fact that generally most countries have a limited system in place but needed improvement in legislation/policy which was seen as a very weak area. It was also observed that most NPPOs did not have operational manuals in place. The review of the questionnaire also highlighted some positive experiences of some countries that can be referred to for assistance to others.

Some of the major comments were as follows:

- the need for a legal framework to give authorization for the system/administration for surveillance
- need for a strategic plan
- an information management system that allows for ease of data retrieval
- organizations that can assist in pest identification include: IITA, ICIPE,CABI etc.
- for effective surveillance, alternate hosts, weather preference and life cycle of the pest must be known for control of spread of the pests.
- Need to have a verifier of the pest
- Need to have a GIS system in place
- physical collections of those pests must be there to support the diagnosis
- Need to have an agreement with the private sector to support the surveillance
- Laboratories must be certified for credibility, for international compliance and for effective identification, this will require that calibration of equipment and standardization of procedures are in line with international standards
- Need to access the different professions/expertise
- Traceability of samples and need to manage them according to procedures

Following the presentation and in order to comprehensively identify what Africa needs to put in place to improve their surveillance systems in the various countries, a small team was selected to review the summaries of responses from Africa and the comparative responses for all the regions. The team was to identify strong points for Africa as well as areas needing interventions and in addition to identify countries that would serve as good examples of effective surveillance systems, not only in Africa, but globally.

The participants indicated problems that they experienced in providing responses to the questionnaires which included failure to access the questionnaire on line/or even submit by e-mail separately.

The following recommendations were made after general discussions.

1. The need to have accredited laboratories
2. To have access to on-line diagnostic services
3. Preparation of pictorial manuals on already existing pests in Africa

8.0 Country Presentations

Countries made presentations on general status of surveillance systems. Excerpts of the presentations are as follows:

Cameroon: on-going TCP on pest surveillance with preparation of base line data.

Eritrea: with FAO support a national pest surveillance was conducted with local consultants in 2003. They would like to update the survey and complete the pest list.

Ethiopia: They have plant protection decrees, with a number of cadre of trained staff. NPPO is responsible for pest surveillance.

Guinea Bissau: Surveillance is under Plant Protection and a list of general pests exists, they only provide surveillance for "political pests" (fruit-fly and locusts)

Gambia: New Plant Protection Services emerged in 2009 following cabinet decision. Plant Protection bill enacted in 2010. There is a need for clarification in terms of the views of the SPS committee in having regulations as part of the law.

Liberia: No surveillance system. Recommendations made from the recent visit of FAO: January 2012: To build capacity of the MOA to carry out early warning

Malawi: Have laws in place to govern surveillance, do surveillance of storage, field pests and have a special survey for the coffee stem borer.

Mozambique: Very good information system in place for collecting, disseminating information. They have used this for delimiting the occurrence of Coconut Lethal Yellowing Disease (CLYD).

Namibia: Have PFA (Pest Free Area) supported by agro-ecological and climatic conditions which makes it difficult for the fruit-fly to flourish. Have a strong fruit-fly surveillance programme.

Nigeria: National Plant Quarantine Service responsible for surveillance exists, pest list available but not supported by names of collectors and verifiers. General pest surveillance done in 2009 on nine crops.

Kenya: KEPHIS- several pieces of legislation exist but no comprehensive policy linking surveillance to other quarantine work done in the country. Good system in place for capacity building.

South Sudan: Have no system in place; hence no vigilance in procurement of seed, food items that needs to be cleared.

Sudan: Central government responsible for surveillance; have a system in place with surveillance team with a strong cadre of trained people in place for forecast and control

Sierra Leone: Have plant health clinics; the NPPO has established the system in collaboration with CABI, IITA and other local institutions to have a country wide system of collecting information from farmers.

Zambia: have laws in place and a structure; surveillance is a mandate of the NPPO and both general and specific surveillance in place. They do various inspections both within the country and at border posts.

Day two of workshop

The second day started with feedback on the proceedings of the previous day presented by the rapporteurs.

9.0 Feedback on the questionnaire responses for Africa and other regions

The team that was assigned the task of analyzing the responses to the questionnaire from Africa and other regions made the following observations that were presented in the workshop. Generally, they observed that for most countries in Africa, the organizational structure for NPPOs was weak; while at the same time most countries did not have policy legislation and the data management systems were also at various levels of development across the region. In addition, there were no surveillance systems in place in most of the countries.

On the other hand, the team also observed some elements of strong points from a few countries in Africa. It was observed that South Africa and Burkina Faso offered good examples of countries in Africa with well established surveillance systems in place.

From the analysis of responses from other countries the team observed several countries with good surveillance systems. Those mentioned included: Mexico, Korea, New Zealand, Bosnia, Canada, Papua new Guinea, Costa Rica, Thailand, Australia, Hungary, Slovenia, China, Greece, Japan, Kyrgystan, France, Syria, Cook Island, and Montenegro.

10.0 The use of ISPM 6 in Africa (Group work)

Four groups deliberated on use of ISPM by addressing the following three issues:

- ✓ Advantages, opportunities and synergies from use of ISPM 6.
- ✓ Difficulties in implementation of the standard
- ✓ What the NPPOs can do to address the difficulties.

1. Advantages, opportunities and synergies in the use of ISPM6

Provides a uniform surveillance framework for all countries to follow;

Provides mechanism for an early warning system that leads to protection of a country from introduction of exotic pests and to detect new pests of economic importance;

Affirm existence and diversity in fauna and flora;

Helps in bringing the information about pests together and in the development of country pest lists;

Early Detection of pests and take actions immediately and minimize the losses and ease of development of pest management strategies and interventions; as well as best practices for control of specific pests;

Provides information to conduct Pest Risk Analysis;

Boost management strategies among regions (Indigenous knowledge extension);

Give information on the location or distribution of the crops affected by pests as well as provide information on control measures and costs and helps diversify crop production;

Provides for creation of data base for dissemination to stakeholders and ease of execution of outreach and awareness programmes as well as sharing of information between trading partners (trade facilitation);

Help establish and maintain Pest Free Areas (PFA), and Areas of Low Pest Prevalence (ALPP);

Provides assistance in the development of plant protection policies and legislations providing a mechanism in place where both the public and private sectors report pest occurrence;

Encouragement of investment and subsequent growth of agricultural sector if systems are in place; providing a mechanism for private sector in funding surveillance programmes;

Opportunities to penetrate new international markets by credible national phytosanitary systems;

Facilitates detection of pest pathways which inform quarantine decisions;

Give opportunity to report to NPPO, FAO, RPPO and IPPC.

2. Difficulties in implementation of ISPM6

Inadequate policies and legislative framework including weak organizational structure and ineffective institutional framework;

No strategic plan/programmes for surveillance;

Limited resources (e.g. materials including surveillance manuals; finances; logistical; equipment including inadequate laboratory facilities; infrastructure including inadequate access to efficient communication system i.e. computers and internet access; lack of developed pest databases/consolidated data);

Limited human capacity development (limited expertise; insufficient diagnostic capacities as well as high staff turnover rate);

limited public awareness in major crop pests;

Inadequate collaboration between public and private sectors and insufficient contribution from private sector;

Lack of formal agreements between NPPOs and Institutions on information sharing;

Inadequate coordination in implementing the conventions;

Changing environmental factors.

3. How can NPPO address implementation difficulties?

NPPOs should initiate development and implementation of policies and legislation;

Solicit funds from public, private and other development partners by developing comprehensive proposals;

Promote specialised training for both middle and advance level personnel;

Request technical assistance in development of surveillances programmes and implementation manuals;

Create public awareness for major crop pests (radio, TV and print media);

Promote establishment of plant protection clinics;

Develop surveillances programmes;

Request FAO technical assistance for draft legislation for ratification;

Develop strategic plans for pest surveillance with FAO assistance;

Establish information linkage with other institutions and NPPOs through the IPPC contact point, FAO regional office and RPPOs;

Lobbying for support in capacity building-(equipments, diagnostics laboratories);

Lobbying for support in government budget;

Domestication of surveillance standards;

Set up of communication network-information sharing mechanism at national and international levels;

Collect information and create databases;

Lobby government to review institutional framework to facilitate implementation;

Learn from success stories from other countries;

Collaboration with private sector and other stakeholders (some % of all exportation of agriculture products should be given to agriculture sector);

Establish culture of discipline; particularly adherence to deadlines.

11.0 How to review a standard

Ms. Hannah Clendon made a presentation on key elements that need to be considered when reviewing a standard. This was done in order to distinguish between the assessment of the requirements in improving the implementation (conditions necessary to administer) of a standard and the review (critique), of the standard with the objective of improving the standard in terms of the various aspects of the standard. She advised that the review process should include looking at the following:

- ✓ The scope – is the scope appropriate and applicable

- ✓ Definitions - clarity
- ✓ Feasibility of implementation-
- ✓ Technical content and soundness of the standard

Immediately following this clarification regarding the review of standards, she also made another brief presentation on how culture may affect the way we work and the perception others may have about us relating to the effect of culture on surveillance work. This presentation was made to bring to the attention of participants the responsibility that they all have in ensuring that they play their role in creating awareness and influencing those who are within their sphere of influence regarding surveillance.

The presentation highlighted the following. After the workshop participants are encouraged to share their observations and reports; it is important that these actions are followed up in order to:

- raise awareness to influence colleagues.
- Identify issues that block implementation with a view to minimizing their impact.

Surveillance is 'see' and 'say' as a fundamental principle. From the workshop each participant is encouraged to build on what is existing in their countries to strengthen surveillance systems. She added that observations/feedback/reporting can be transformed into decisions based on influencing of decision makers.

Day 3 of workshop

The day started with the recap of the proceedings of day 2.

Requirements for improving national pest surveillance (group work)

The group work comprised deliberations on the following:

- ✓ Identification of the tools and technical resources needed to implement ISPM 6
- ✓ Recommendations for improving ISPM 6 (review of the standard)
- ✓ Identification priority areas for Africa as a region to be addressed in the project

1. Identification of tools and technical resources needed to implement ISPM6

- Organization and institutional structure and Legislative framework;
- Appropriate expert human resources;
- Verification centers;
- Pest lists ;
- Access to reference materials such as journals, books, websites, scientific papers, manuals;
- Tools for training: posters, fact sheets, manuals, identification keys, virtual diagnostic facilities, e-learning material, leaflets, handbills projectors, pictorials;
- Specialists/consultants in- legislation drafting, surveillance manual preparation, development of regional standards, diagnostic laboratory accreditation, database management/ICT, survey methodology, pest diagnostics, surveillance audits, pest verification);
- Reference collection and material and equipments for pest reference collections/ national repository systems, diagnosis (rapid diagnostic kits), pest databases, surveys (GPS, appropriate chemicals/attractants, traps, sweep nets, preservation sets, survey forms: communication systems - internet access, mobile phones);
- Equipments (D-cameras, m-scopes, dissecting kits, ELISA kits, PCRs, plant protection compendium);
- E-learning (internet, CABI, Google search);
- Inspection Kits (material and equipment);

- Computer and software (documentation for database) and database management;
- Tools for awareness creation/ information dissemination (mass media, video, film ,audio visual aids,);
- Standard operating procedures/pest surveillance manual/ Assistance in development of strategic action plan and standard operating procedure;
- Strategic plan/action and manual;

2. Recommendations for improvement of ISPM 6:

- It was observed that the scope adequately covered PRA while the PFAs pest lists answer to trade issues and aspects of food security are also well addressed while the PFA aspect also favours increased productivity while biodiversity is preserved;
- The group ascertained that the standard is feasible but the competence of most countries needs to be improved to implement the standard;
- It was recommended that the standard should include standard operating procedures ;
- It was also recommended that the impact of pest surveillance on biodiversity be included in the standard;

2.1 factors for improving the ability of countries to implement ISPM6

- Put in place national legislation;
- Technical assistance;
- Capacity building among the member countries in phytosanitary and plant protection activities; and survey of pests ;

3. Priority areas for Africa

- Capacity development for specialized expertise in the various relevant disciplines e.g.; Taxonomists, Pathologists, Nematologists, Virologists, Bacteriologists and mycologists and facilitating access to technical expertise through networking within Africa and outside.
- Technical assistance support for legislation to include establishment where none exist, reviewing, updating as well as harmonization of existing legislation.
- Establishment of centers of excellence and support for accreditation of diagnostic laboratories.
- Strengthening the management of porous borders by facilitating information sharing, development of SOP on how to prevent pest movement across borders.
- Development of information retrieval systems
- Support for the collection and maintenance of specimens

12.0 Review of ISPM 4 and ISPM 8

Mr. Suglo made presentations of the ISPM 4 and 8 which are due for review. After the presentations, the participants worked on recommendations to be considered by the standard review team. The following observations were made:

1.0 ISPM 4: Requirement for the Establishment of Pest Free Area:

-Scope

- ✓ It was observed that the scope is comprehensive and addresses the three pillars of IPPC, food security, trade and bio-diversity

-Feasibility

- ✓ It gives leeway for a bilateral agreement when a PFA requires complex measures for establishment and maintenance.

-Recommendations on general requirements

- ✓ Provide for Legal obligation to prevent or monitor movement of commodity into the PFA;
- ✓ Include public awareness programmes
- ✓ The methods for establishment under survey; it is recommended that the components of survey process are outlined in a systematic order thus: **Surveys (detection, delimiting, monitoring)**
- ✓ Recommend that important modifiers should include **management systems**

-Technical recommendations:

- ✓ On pest free area definition: **Include place of production.**
- ✓ PFA biological modifiers: **Include presence of natural enemies**
- ✓ On establishment of systems to establish pest freedom: **Include pest eradication programs.**
- ✓ Extension advice to producer: **Include all stakeholders in the value chain, i.e. the public, shippers/merchants/local administration etc.**
- ✓ Checks to verify pest freedom: **Include general public** on notifying the NPPO, besides researchers, advisers and inspectors.

2.0 ISPM 8: Pest Status of an area

-Scope

- ✓ to be refined to make it clear

-Definitions

- ✓ The definition of pest status on of area is not clear, should be simplified for easy understanding ;
- ✓ The terminology of transience pest status in an area needs further clarification to explain the 3 types.

-Recommendation on general observation

- ✓ The factors that determine that pest records are valid should be given just as those that determine reliability have been given.

13.0 Workshop closure

Before the closure of the workshop, the draft report was presented and discussions ensued particularly on the follow up project ideas for Africa, the report was then adopted. This was followed by closing remarks which were given by Ms. Mulila-Mitti who thanked the participants for having come to the workshop and for the

hard work and encouraged them to make follow up on the recommendations made in the workshop to strengthen pest surveillance work in their countries. Two participants representing Nigeria and South Sudan also made remarks thanking FAO for organising the workshop and indicated that the workshop had provided an opportunity for learning from each other.

The chairman also thanked the participants for their hard work during the workshop and encouraged them to continue to interact after the workshop.

Ms. Clarendon, in closing the workshop, also thanked the participants for the hard work, emphasising the fact that FAO would like to see Africa emerge strong and empowered in making effective contribution to the IPPC. NPPOs were encouraged to invest in what they had within countries promoting their countries for their particular area of excellence, whether it was in having a pest free area, or having a good surveillance programme on the ground.

Annex 1: Participants List for IPPC Meeting for Anglophone countries; Accra, Ghana; 06 - 08 February 2012

| No | Country | Name of Participant | Institution | Title | Address | Tel | Email |
|------------|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| No. | Country | Name of Participant | Institution | Title | Address | Tel | Email |
| 1 | Cameroon | Alice Ndikontar, née Siben Ntoboh | DRCG, MINADER | Plant Protection Officer | P. O. Box 812, Yaounde, Cameroon | 00 23777561240 | ndikontarli@yahoo.fr |
| 2 | Eritrea | Rishan Ghebrekidan Kidanamariam | Ministry of Agriculture | Plant Quarantine Officer | | 00 2917283610 | rishankg@yahoo.com ; rishankg@yahoo.com |
| 3 | Ethiopia | Elias Gebrekristos Sehle Dengel | Ministry of Agriculture | Plant Quarantine Expert | Elias Sehele Dengle, Ministry of Agriculture | 00 251911463388 | eliass41@yahoo.com |
| 4 | Gambia | Landing Sonko | Plant Protection Services | Deputy Director | Deputy Director, Plant Protection Services Department of Agriculture | 00 220 9344003 | sonkokebba@gmail.com |
| 5 | Ghana | Edmund Kojo Jack Vesper Suglo | Plant Protection and Regulatory Services | Director | P. O. Box M 37, Pokuase | 00 233244388275 | jackvesper@yahoo.com |
| 6 | Guinea Bissau | Luis Antonio Tavares | MADR/DSP | Head of Phytosanitary Control, IPPC Focal Person | | | ltavares@yahoo.com ; lusnta2@yahoo.fr |
| 7 | Kenya | George Keere Momanyi | Kenya Plant Protection Inspectorate | Inspector | P. O. Box 49592-00100, Nairobi, Kenya | 00254 203597201-3 | director@kphis.org ; gmomanyi@kphis.org |
| 8 | Liberia | Seklau Elizabeth Wiles | Ministry of Agriculture | National Coordinator, National Livestock Bureau | Libsuco Old LPRC Rd, Somalia Drive, Gardnesville 1000 Monrovia, Liberia | 00 231886126704 | seklauwiles@yahoo.com |
| 9 | Malawi | Stephen Pearson Nyirenda | Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Water Development | | Department of Agricultural Research Services, Lunyangwa Research Station, P. O. Box 59 Mzuzu, Malawi | | spnyirenda@yahoo.co.uk |
| 10 | Mozambi que | Antonia Augusto Sabonete Vas | National Directorate of Agrarian Service | Plant Protection Department (Technician) | FPLM Avenue, Reantodo IIAN | 00 258827137384 | avaz5099@gmail.com |
| 11 | Namibia | Konis Elungi | Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry | Agricultural Extension Officer | P. O. Box 21658, Windhoek, Namibia | 00 264612087496/ 00 264814964738 | konis@web.com.na |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------|--------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| 12 | Nigeria | Olufunke Olusola Awosusi | Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service | Deputy Director, Head, Post Entry Quarantine | Nigeria Agricultural quarantine Service, Post Entry Quarantine, Moor - Plantation, P. M. B. 5672, Ibadan | 00 2348059608494 | awosusifunke@yahoo.co.uk |
| 13 | Sierra Leone | Ibrahim Shamie | Crop Protection Service | Head of Crop Protection | Youyi Building , Freetwon | 00 23278542939 | imo1shamie@yahoo.co.uk |
| 14 | South Sudan | Atem Garang Malual | Ministry of Agriculture | Executive Director for Training | Ministry of Agric. and Forestry, Republic of South Sudan, RSS, Juba | 00 211977109588 | alfredatem1@hotmail.com |
| 15 | Sudan | Khawla Mudawi Ahmed | Ministry of Agriculture | | | 00 249915310511 | khawlamudawi@yahoo.com |
| 16 | Zambia | Doreen Malenkano Chomba | Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service | | Mt. Makulu Research Station P/B 7, Chilanga | 00 260 979672806 | dchomba71@yahoo.com dchomba71@gmail.com |
| 17 | FAO, Zimbabwe | Joyce Mulila Mitti | FAO | Plant Production & Protection Officer | Sub-Regional Office for Southern Africa | +263 772 273188 +263 4 253658; | joyce.mulilaMitti@fao.org |
| 18 | FAO, Ghana | Hannah Clarendon | FAO | Crop Protection Officer | Regional Office for Africa | 233 26 301 76 12 | hannah.clarendon@fao.org |



**Regional workshop for the review of phytosanitary surveillance in the
context of the IPPC Standard (ISPM6) – identification of challenges and best
practice Sub- Saharan Africa FAO Region/Anglophone Countries
6 - 8 February 2012, Alisa Hotel, Accra Ghana**

Provisional Agenda

Monday 6 February 2012

| No. | Item | Time |
|-----------|--|-------------------------|
| 1. | Opening of the session | 8.30 – 9.00 |
| | - Remarks – ADG-RR/RAF | 8.30 – 8.45 am |
| | - Logistics | 8.45 – 9.00 am |
| | - introductions | 9.00 – 9.15 am |
| 2. | Purpose of the workshop (Host) | 9.15 – 9.30 am |
| 3. | IPPC overview (RAF Plant Protection Officer) | 9.30 – 10 am |
| | - Progress with ISPM development | |
| 4. | Adoption of agenda | 10.00 – 10.15 am |
| | - election of chair and rapporteur | |
| | - times of the sessions | |
| | - any other business | |
| | Coffee Break | 10.15 – 10.45 am |
| 5. | ISPM6 | 10.45 – 11.45 am |
| | - Overview of ISPM6 | 10.45 – 11.15 am |
| | - General surveillance | |
| | - Specific surveillance | |
| | - Summary of results of questionnaire | 11.15 – 12 noon |
| | - In the region | |
| | - Internationally | |
| | - Discussion on results of questionnaire | 12.00 – 12.45 pm |
| | Lunch Break | 12.45 – 1.45 pm |
| 6. | Review of best practices for phytosanitary pest surveillance | 1.45 – 4.45 pm |
| | - Presentation of country best practices by each delegate (15 minutes per delegate) 15 min x 12 = 3 hours | |
| | End of Day 1 | |

Tuesday 7 February 2012

| No. | Item | Time |
|-----------|--|-------------------------|
| 7. | The use of ISPM 6 in the region (open or breakout group discussions) | 8.30 – 12.30 am |
| | - Based on presentations, discussions on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Advantages in the use of the standard - Difficulties in implementation of ISPM6 | |
| | | |
| | Coffee Break | 10.30 – 11.00 am |
| | | |
| | Lunch | 12.30-1.30 pm |
| | | |
| 8. | Requirements for improving national pest surveillance | 1.30 – 3.30 pm |
| | - The identification of the tools and technical resources needed to implement ISPM6 | |
| | - Recommendations for improving ISPM6 | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 9. | Future work | 3.30 – 4.30 pm |
| | - Contributions to this project (symposium, preparation of training material) | |
| | - Work in the region | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | End of Day 2 | |

Wednesday 8 February 2012

| No. | Item | Time |
|------------|--|-------------------------|
| 10. | Any other business | 8.30 – 10.30 am |
| | 1. Consideration of what needs to be revised in ISPM 4 | |
| | 2. Consideration of what needs to be revised in ISPM 8 | |
| | | |
| | Coffee Break | 10.30 – 11.00 am |
| | | |
| 11. | Preparation and Adoption of Report | 11.00 – 12.45 pm |
| | | |
| | Lunch | 12.45 – 1.45 pm |
| | | |
| 12. | Final Remarks and Close of Workshop | 1.45 – 2.30 pm |
| | End of Workshop | |