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Overview

• **The Mycotoxin/aflatoxin challenge in COMESA**
  – Challenges in regional and international trade

• **Role of COMESA (coordination, setting priorities)**
  – The MTSP and the SPS Logical Framework
  – The SPS Unit (Secretariat)
  – The SPS sub Committee (Member States)
  – The Tripartite SPS /TBT capacity building programme
  – Success stories

• **Linkages with PACA**
  – The PACA strategic Plan
  – The COMESA Aflatoxin Meeting (2014) ; sharing experiences with governments, industry and partners (Nacala corridor)

• **Conclusions**
Mycotoxins/aflatoxins challenge in COMESA

• Capacity challenges in the public and private sector, particularly SMEs
• Inadequate legislation & institutional framework
• Varied sampling and testing protocols (scientific data for establishing FSO and negotiating equivalence)
• Varied laboratory competencies, rejection of certificates of analysis
• The result in mistrust and restrictions on trade in aflatoxin sensitive foods
• Maize, peanuts, cassava, and value added products e.g. peanut butter, cassava flour etc
Challenges in international trade

EU 178/2002 – (a) places legal obligations on food operators (producers, food & feed processors) to ensure food safety, to review and control critical control points for mycotoxin contamination (systems), supplemented by;

(b) maximum limits for mycotoxins in food stuffs Reg 165/2010, total aflatoxin from 4 to 8 ppb for ready to eat, 10-12 ppb for further processing, aflatoxin M1/ 0.05 ppb, (c) OC methods for sampling and analysis of mycotoxins Reg 178/2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Total Aflatoxins</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
<td>10 - 15 ppb</td>
<td>Cereals, peanuts, other nuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>10 ppb</td>
<td>Cereals, peanuts, other nuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>5 ppb</td>
<td>Cereals, peanuts, other nuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>5 ppb</td>
<td>Cereals, peanuts, other nuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>10 ppb</td>
<td>Cereals, peanuts, other nuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>10 ppb</td>
<td>Cereals, peanuts, other nuts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Background – MTSP & SPS LF

**MTSP priorities:** (a) removing barriers to trade to consolidate the internal market/FTA (b) building productive capacity to enhance global competitiveness and build regional capacity

The MTSP guides the outcomes,
The SPS LF guides intervention logic (what & how)

The SPS Legal Framework
• SPS Unit
• SPS sub committee - for coordination, decision making/setting priorities

ECOWAS Aflatoxin Meeting - 18-20 Nov 2013
The SPS Logical Framework Result Areas

1. Regional leadership, coordination and collaboration
   1. Reinforce partnerships: AU, USAID, USDA, STDF, CABI/Africa, JIFSAN, IITA, AATF, TMSA/DFID, AFDB, partner RECs
      1.1 NTB reporting system
      1.2 Technical Meetings of the SPS sub committee (annual)

2. Private-sector-driven common certification schemes/protocols and standards in use
   2.1 SPS trade facilitation research, pilots, bilateral agreements on import protocols

3. Monitoring, surveillance, diagnostic and emergency response systems for priority SPS risks
   3.1 Fruit fly surveillance, plant pests/diseases
   3.2 aflatoxin sampling and testing protocols – MR mechanism
   3.3 Pest Risk Analysis
      3.1 MCDA in Uganda, Ethiopia, Malawi, Zambia and Rwanda Kenya, Zimbabwe are next
      4.2 MCDA at regional level

4. Improved decision making using accurate and up-to-date SPS information
CAADP Pillar 2 (Market access & trade capacities)

**Objective** – framework to prioritize Market access and trade related Investments in the Agric sector

**Principle** – All inclusive, Includes non state actors, PS

**Process steps**
(i) Stocktaking, review of sector to establish status with respect to CAADP targets, investment gaps

(ii) **Analysis** - prioritizing and costing the growth options focusing on the best returns.

(iii) **Investment Plan** - integrated investment / operational plan

MCDA (Market access)

**Objective** – framework to prioritize SPS capacity building options with a trade outcome

**Principle** - must engage private sector and key stakeholder

**Process steps**
(i) Gathering information, preparing information dossier based on which to establish capacity building options to be considered in the priority setting process.

(ii) **Analysis** – costing and ranking the prioritized capacity building options

(iii) **SPS capacity building options integrated in the CAADP Investment Plan**
The Tripartite SPS work programme (EAC-COMESA-SADC)

Quote: “The tripartite arrangement is the most exciting trade and infrastructure development in Africa at the moment, it provides the foundation of the Continental Free Trade Area promoted by the AUC and its partners “

- Market integration pillar – (i) a functional FTA free from NTBs, SPS measures inclusive.
- Article 25 of the Tripartite FTA Agreement and Annex 10 on SPS; Key provisions/policy instruments and an implementation structure
- Joint EAC-COMESA-SADC capacity building programme to pilot best practices and approaches along key trade is ongoing to inform interventions
- STDF/DFID/COMESA research on SPS and trade facilitation
Success Story – public/private partnership for harmonizing phytosanitary import requirements

Key activities

PRA
Industry mitigation through GAPs and Food Safety Measures

Dairy, fisheries Identified for action
Factories that are HACCP Compliant
Success story: the pelagic fish industry (Dagaa/Kenya, Kapenta/Zambia, Mukene/Uganda)

10 Years ago

Poor harvesting methods

Inadequate food safety standards

Poor handling practices
Today:

Modern harvesting technology

Improved handling and drying

Improved food safety standards
Success story: Domestic and Regional Markets expanding thru food safety/quality management and Value addition
Conclusions

- Effective coordination mechanism at tripartite level (EAC-COMESA-SADC)
- Legally binding decisions
- Tripartite structure to enable harmonization, equivalence and mutual recognition
- Tripartite structure to enable effective capacity building including regulatory reforms
- Partners on board include DFID, AFDB, STDF and partners

- Challenge is aligning partners with regional/tripartite integration priorities
- How does PACA or GFSI support the tripartite agenda?
- Are there lessons for ECOWAS and other RECs?