FCM CHECKLIST FOR ROSE CUTFLOWER FACILITIES - VERSION 2 -NOVEMBER 2018



| FARM DETAILS | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| Farm name and contacts | Contact person | |
| County | Sub-county Sub-county | |
| Ward | Nearest town/market | |
| GPS readings | Farm size (ha) under roses | |
| No. of greenhouse under roses | Quantity (MT) of rose cut exported monthly | |
| Number of rose varieties | Attach complete list | |
| SYSTEM 1: FARM INFRUSTRUC | TURE (Gree | en house) |
| Status | Rate 1-5 (I very poor, 2 poor, 3 moderate, 4 good and 5 very good) | Remarks |
| Entrance control of greenhouse (opening and closing of the greenhouse door) | 8 1 | |
| The status of greenhouse cover material – consider the level of damage | | |
| The status of the door system- consider double door, waterbath and general condition | 110 | 30 |
| General cleanness status of the greenhouse(inside and outside)- | 1117 | -24 |
| Overall score (15 pass mark) | 1 | 1 |
| Recommendation | | |
| 1 | | |

| SYSTEM 2: PEST MONITORING AND SCOUTING | | |
|--|------|--------|
| Number of scout per unit area | | |
| scouting and monitoring operational procedures in place | | |
| Demonstration on Abilities/experience of the scouts on FCM detection, identification | Pa | |
| Status of the scouting tools (Hand lens, knife, tally counter, boots & gloves, sample vial, cooler box, labels, traps, pest cards, reference material, aspirator, scouting knife, notebook) | 16 | 2 |
| record keeping methods in place Status of the Scouting system (pest ID pest count, crop stage, weather, action taken and others) | , | 153 |
| Documented Reporting mechanisms and auctioning | 40 | - [03] |
| Usage of data -early warning/pest forecasting-periodic data summaries; trends on populations and correlation with climatic factors | 26 | 12 |
| The Status of the monitoring traps –consider number of traps, servicing schedule, locations (Provide map for trapping system) | 7 | 3 |
| FCM Pest status on traps and rose crop – consider infestation levels and relate to the records | J.A. | in |
| The monitoring and scouting reports retrievability | | |
| Correlation between scouting and monitoring results | | |
| Overall score (44 pass mark) | | the P |
| Recommendation | | 50 |

| System 3: FCM management |
|--|
| Pest management protocol/or procedures for FCM in |
| place |
| |
| Understanding and implementation of systems |
| approach to FCM management |
| |
| Effectiveness of pest control methods present |
| (biological, chemical physical barriers, cultural IGR and others); If chemical control, provide list of chemicals |
| others), it chemical control, provide list of chemicals |
| Inspection to evaluate overall effectiveness of the FCM |
| management measures (evaluate relationship between |
| monitoring data and inspection outcome |
| |
| |
| Evaluate FCM awareness by Quality control staff at |
| greenhouse |
| |
| |
| |
| Evaluate FCM awareness by harvesting and |
| general staff at greenhouse |
| |
| Overall score (24pass mark) |
| Recommendation |
| |
| |
| 146 |
| Commence of the Commence of th |
| System 4: Pack house |
| Quality management procedures/ protocol in |
| place |
| The state of the s |
| |
| Ability of QC staff to detect pest at produce intake |
| stage |
| The same are a second and the same and the s |
| |
| Ability of QC staff to detect pest at produce |
| process stage |
| |
| |
| |

| Ability of QC staff to detect pest at produce dispatch stage | | |
|--|-----|-------------------|
| Produce handling procedures to ensure integrity and no re-infestation | PA | |
| Quality assurance personnel familiar with post- harvest treatments/challenges | 10 | |
| Qc ability and experience to detect and identify FCM at different life stages and symptoms | | 122 |
| Graders aware of pests and pest signs of FCM | 4 | - 6 |
| Documentation of pest detection incidences and action taken | 7 | A BY |
| Status of reporting channel for pest detection in the packhouse | 4 | m |
| Inspection to evaluation FCM status in the final produce | 8 | |
| Overall score (44 pass mark) | | The second second |
| Recommendation | 115 | 30 |

| SYSTEM 5: TRACEABILITY AND CO | OMMUNICATION |
|--|--------------|
| Protocol on traceability system in place | |
| Effectiveness of the traceability system | |
| WINE | |
| Documented Communication records of detected pest | 10 |
| Overall score (12 pass mark) | 131 |
| Recommendation | 180 |
| | |
| SYSTEM 7: CAPACITY BUILDING | AND TRAINING |
| Farm management familiarity with market requirements (EU directive 2000/29 EC &EU directive 2017/1279) | 15 / cv |
| Policy on training and its implementation | 12 |
| Competence of technical staff on FCM detection, identification and management | 10 |
| FCM awareness by general staff | m |
| | |
| Pest cards and other training materials placement at strategic points in the farm for use by staff | |
| Quality assurance personnel familiarity with post- harvest treatments/challenges | |
| Overall score (12 pass mark) | 1 % A |
| Recommendation | 1000 |
| | |
| | |

| FINAL RECOMMENDATION | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Farm May be allowed to export | Farm not allowed to Export | |
| | · | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| . 1 114 | 6 | |
| | 3.6 | |
| (43) | Co. W | |
| 100///3 | 10,4 | |
| 1057 | 10.71 | |
| | 100 | |
| | 100 | |
| | | |
| | | |

| Name of the inspector | Date | <mark> Time</mark> |
|--|------|--------------------|
| Signature of the inspector | | |
| Name of the Farm manager | Date | Time |
| Sign <mark>ature of</mark> the manager | | |
| Sc <mark>oring cr</mark> iteria | | |

Scoring criteria

| Rating | Score |
|-------------------------|---------------|
| Absence of an item | Very poor (1) |
| Present but ineffective | Poor (2) |
| Partly effective | Moderate (3) |
| Effective | Good (4) |
| Highly effective | Very good (5) |