

**REPORT OF THE REGIONAL ASIA-PACIFIC WORKSHOP FOR
THE GLOBAL REVIEW OF PHYTOSANITARY SURVEILLANCE
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE IPPC STANDARD (ISPM6)**

IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES AND BEST PRACTICE

**31 January – 3 February 2012,
Chiang Rai, Thailand**



**REPORT OF THE REGIONAL ASIA-PACIFIC WORKSHOP FOR
THE GLOBAL REVIEW OF PHYTOSANITARY SURVEILLANCE
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE IPPC STANDARD (ISPM6)**

IDENTIFICATION OF CHALLENGES AND BEST PRACTICE

**31 January – 3 February 2012,
Chiang Rai, Thailand**

Summary

The meeting opened with overview of the IPPC and its recent activities. This was followed by a presentation on the standard on surveillance ISPM 6 as well as presentation of the analytical results of the questionnaire on surveillance submitted by 17 countries in the region. It was noted that most countries use surveillance in association with trade requirement, that there was a great variation in the use of surveillance and the capabilities of countries in practicing surveillance, and that the greatest problem was the lack of skilled staff.

Each of the 17 countries participating in the meeting then presented an example of their best practice in surveillance. Some countries took the opportunity to describe their national plant quarantine systems. The variation in problems, skill levels and surveillance conducted was apparent. Many countries noted the lack of skilled staff, lack of funds and lack of within country coordination.

The advantages and disadvantages of ISPM 6 were discussed by the group and reported under the headings of administrative, operational and technical matters. The standard was found to provide a sound basis for the establishment of surveillance systems. However, a number of improvements could be considered including guidance on obtaining country commitment to a surveillance programme, the improved coordination of surveillance efforts within countries, guidance on the management of surveillance programmes and the quality (particularly statistical) of such programmes, and means of improving diagnostic support.

The participants then considered future work in the area of surveillance. Firstly, the possible agenda for the surveillance symposium to be conducted was discussed. Proposals for the agenda covering surveillance methodology, diagnostics, surveillance management/planning/audit/coordination, record keeping/reporting relating to ISPM 6, and surveillance administration (policy and finance) were put forward by participants. Secondly, the meeting considered what type of training could more strongly support the implementation of ISPM 6. Most of the proposals concerned training relating to the identification of pests and survey methodology.

The meeting looked briefly at two other standards – ISPM 4 on pest free areas and ISPM 8 on pest status.

1. Opening session

Delegates from 17 countries participated the workshop (Appendix 2), and the workshop participants introduced themselves to each other.

Dr Piao welcomed the participants to the first APPPC meeting of the year. Seventeen countries are represented. He noted that an implementation programme for standards was established as the last APPPC session. The IPPC IRSS has also established such a programme. These programmes have been amalgamated to form the present surveillance review programme.

Dr Piao hoped that the discussions would be helped by the pleasant environment of Chiang Rai.

Purpose of the meeting

ISPM 6 is on the standard setting programme for review. The IRSS has included the review of this standard in its programme. The seven regional workshops are to:

- Identify the challenges faced by NPPOs in the implementation of the standard;
- Provide recommendations to the review panel on ways to improve the standard;
- Gather examples of best practise for preparation of training materials and manuals;

This work will be linked to the implementation programme and the development of training materials in the APPPC programme.

2. IPPC overview

This was presented by Dr. J. Hedley using the Powerpoint display from the IPPC Secretariat. Further updated material was supplied by Dr Hedley.

Dr Piao provided an update on APPPC activities. He noted that some funds have been deposited by APPPC members.

3. Adoption of agenda

New Zealand was nominated as Chair (Australia nominated with Vietnam seconding) with Mr Stevens offering to be rapporteur.

The agenda was adopted unanimously (Appendix 1).

4.1 Overview of ISPM 6

See presentation in Appendix 3.

4.2 Summary of results of questionnaire

Dr Paio presented the analytical summary of the results on the survey submitted by 17 countries (Appendix 4). Most countries had filled in the forms as requested.

The majority of respondents indicated policies on free trade agreements, particularly pertaining to agricultural trade agreements, trade policy and free trade agreements (i.e. ASEAN) in general and national quarantine and plant protection laws constitute the most important issues that shape surveillance programmes of their countries. The primary pest surveillance responsibility was with the NPPOs. Most NPPOs perform pest surveillance in a coordinated manner with public or private organizations,

Regarding section B – on average more than 10 organisations are involved in surveillance. The NPPO maintains linkages with these organisations.

Section C – most NPPOs use a computerised system.

Section D – Plant pest records are compiled

Section E - 70% countries have a person in charge of surveillance

Rice is the most often surveyed crop

Section F – costs go from \$600 to \$10 million

In most countries only 25% of the surveillance staff have had training.

The factors limiting the conducting of surveillance

- lack of skilled personnel (17)
- lack of funding (12)
- lack of infrastructure (11)
- lack of cooperation and participation (8)

Things to improve in ISPM 6

- more detailed procedures
- case studies/examples
- report format/standard phrases

Technical resources

- many technical resources listed by one country may also be of use to other countries

Best Practices - see reports in Appendix.

Conclusions

- The responses provide a representative view of ISPM 6 in the region
- There are huge differences between countries in terms of available human, financial and material resources
- The list of technical resources provides an excellent source
- The best practice documents provide some excellent examples

Limitations

The format of the survey (e.g. Yes/No questions) did not provide enough differentiation in many cases and so country differences were not picked up with the survey e.g. New Zealand and Australia had 83% of the same answers while New Zealand and Lao had 70% of the same answers.

Issues

- NPPO's have wide responsibilities and may include other organisations.
- The definition of pest surveillance is limited compared with actual practice and this creates confusion.
- It would be useful to know more detailed information and this could be included in future surveys:
 - number of pest records collected
 - number of declarations of pest freedom issued
 - number of new pests detected
 - number of IPPC/NPPO pest lists produced
 - number of pest risk analyses performed

5. Review of best practices for phytosanitary pest surveillance

Each country presented the report of the current status (Appendix 5).

Australia

Dr Rossel noted the purpose of surveillance. Some 100 commodities have had surveillance applied.

The systems include country freedom, area freedom, the monitoring of the Torres Strait/Northern Australia.

National plant pest surveillance – delivered by grants from the NPPO to states and territories. Data is recorded on the national Biosecurity, surveillance, incident.

Issues include funding, staffing, the number of plant pests and the fact that Australia is a huge country with a diverse range of climate regions and crops, and is a federation

Bangladesh

The representative discussed the surveillance systems including the elements of a perfect system. There are some 64 plant protection specialists in the service.

Surveillance in rice was discussed. The actual procedures of the rice surveillance system were noted. The work distribution and responsibilities of staff were described. A rice survey involves 20 hills of rice and the insects and diseases observed.

The diseases were noted: bakanae disease, tungro,

China

China has three levels of quarantine pests. There are four levels of institutions –

The National Agro-Technology Extension and Service Center.

Provincial plant protection and phytosanitary service

City and country level plant protection service.

Surveillance standards and plans include 47 special standards. There are personnel training, field surveys (including regular surveillance and emergency surveillance). This may be followed by laboratory identification.

The development of a survey was described for the case of the red fire ant. Twenty courses were held and 1800 specialists trained followed by surveillance practices in 24 provinces and collection of 390 samples.

Fiji Islands

An outline of Fiji Islands was presented. 285 ha of agricultural land are available.

Pest surveillance is conducted by many agencies include government agencies, institutes and NGOs. The general methods used were described including nets, host removal, field collections, isolations from infected plants etc.

Specific surveys are conducted primarily concerned with export products. The department works with the department of forestry particularly at the ports.

Surveillance is conducted on other islands particularly to avoid the introduction of pest from yacht owners.

Challenges include the lack of essential equipment, the latest technology, diagnostic facilities, adequate budget for more specific surveys annually, and the lack of training.

India

Surveillance began with locust work. The NPPO of India was started in 1946. Surveillance is undertaken under the Directorate of plant protection. Other agencies are involved – State depts of agriculture etc.

Surveillance is undertaken to monitor pests, for the early detection of pests, for managing pest emergencies and checking the spread of pests.

General pest surveillance is crop specific and specific surveillance is pest specific. The programmes include those for fruit flies, potato ring rot etc. There is a three tier system – national, state and district.

Surveillance systems use a hand-held device to transfer information from the field to the office. There are Awareness cum surveillance programmes used for certain pests. The situation in the country is discussed on a weekly basis via a video system. The technical resources and training materials (including videos and manuals) available for pest surveillance was described.

Indonesia

The programme for early detection of exotic fruit flies was discussed. The programme is supported by regulations. Diagnostic support is provided by the government laboratory.

Two main techniques are used to collect fruit flies – trapping and host rearing. The trapping methodology and host rearing techniques were noted.

Japan

General surveillance is conducted by the usual variety of sources. The information is used to compile pest lists. With specific surveys, the target areas are ports, post offices and production sites.

An example of a specific survey, plum pox virus, was described. A nationwide survey was undertaken . 290,000 stone fruit trees were surveyed. PPV infected trees were found in two botanical gardens. With Ome, regulated areas were established after a delimiting survey was undertaken. There will be a verification programme put in place for three years.

Good surveillance practice includes training workshops, diagnostic support, record keeping, transparency.

Two implications for ISPM 6 – to strengthen the reporting network among related agencies and to support the public awareness campaign.

Laos

Pest surveillance is conducted for maize, rice corn, mango cabbage, orange banana coconut and sugarcane. PPC has not yet established a network with other organisations for diagnosis. Work with Australia and New Zealand aid is continuing.

Major capacity gaps include insufficient cooperation to establish networks, insufficient funding, too few skilled diagnosticians, inadequate facilities.

Malaysia

The administrative structure of the Malaysian NPPO was described.

The best practices concerning Papaya dieback and red palm weevil were discussed. Papaya dieback was gazetted by 2009. Training the trainers, contact with the public, the removal of affected material was illustrated.

The programmes for both pests were described. The challenges were noted.

Myanmar

41.7% of land is involved in agriculture. 70% of the population is involved with the farming sector. A pest surveillance programme for a new rice cultivar was described. The common pests of rice were noted. A new disease has been found *Erwinia chrysanthemi*.

Challenges include the lack of financial support , the limitation of labour, and the lack of specialists for diagnosis. Future risks include Golden apple snail, Brown plan hopper and fruitflies.

Nepal

The various organisations involved in surveillance were listed. The usual sources of information for general surveillance are used in Nepal. Very few specific surveys are conducted.

Nepal's priority list for pest listing was presented headed by lentils.

The best practices for pest surveillance were discussed.

New Zealand

The implementation for ISPM 6 commitment at policy level is needed, funds are required and techniques necessary.

12-15,000 calls are taken from the public during a year. The best practice includes the NPPO acting as a national repository, a record keeping system, data verification procedures, communication channels and incentive to report pests such as the legislative requirements.

To deal with pests – both major known ones and unknown potential pests, pathways are surveyed by air, shipping and international mail. The sampling procedures were described.

Challenges include integration between central and regional government, financial commitment and limitation of methodologies for measuring quality and the recognition of new techniques.

Philippines

The Crop protection division conducts surveillance through its Regional crop protection Centres in Philippines.

Regarding specific surveillance, detection and low monitoring surveys have been conducted for Mango Pulp Weevil and Mango seed weevil. Fruit fly surveys are also conducted.

Republic of Korea

It was noted that it was difficult to understand the questions in the questionnaire. The plant quarantine service does not undertake surveillance activities. There is no centralised system for Korea.

Korea is 100,000 sq kms approx. 65% is forested. Coniferous forest is 40% and pine is the main genus. Pine wilt was introduced in 1988. The nematode is transmitted by a beetle. Now is spread over 43 counties and cities. The eradication programme has succeeded in 24 counties. The survey and control programme was described. The programme costs some \$22 million.

Sri Lanka

6.5 mill h. The general structure and administration of the national plant protection service was described.

Major pest outbreaks were listed – Coconut mite, papaya mealy bug, coconut leaf rot disease, *Salvinia molesta*, control of water hyacinth.

Current activities relating to surveillance include pest surveys the development of pest detection methods, quarantine significant weevil identification methods, control of invasive weeds in agricultural habitats, pest outbreaks and control.

Best practices include – preparedness and communication, surveillance and detection, response and containment. A case study of *Parthenium hysterophorus* was presented.

Thailand

The programme for Giant salvinia was discussed. This was found in 2001 and 2006 in a pond. This was eradicated. A further survey was conducted in the whole country. It has been found frequently in water pots for ornamental purposes. The surveillance programme is continuing.

Viet Nam

The functions of the Plant protection service were outlined – plant protection, plant quarantine, pesticide management, food safety.

The recent surveillance programmes were listed. The mango seed weevil programme was described. The pest does not occur in Viet Nam. The mango fruit weevil does occur.

6. The use of ISPM 6 in the region

Participants divided into two groups discussed the standard after the presentation of the Powerpoint on the standard. To facilitate the understanding of the issues discussed within this report in this and the following section, the points made are summarised under the broad headings below:

The advantages to countries in the standard being available:

Administrative:

- the standard provides an initial basis for convincing and informing policy makers of the needs and requirements of an acceptable surveillance system
This is necessary to obtain commitment for the required funding support.
- likewise, it provides the basic argument for legislation to establish and enforce an effective surveillance system
- it explains and provides credibility for surveillance systems when communicating the need for surveillance and associated funding with stakeholders

Operational:

- the standard enhances the function of NPPOs in all their operations regarding:
 - o food security by promoting more effective pest management
 - o the facilitation of trade by providing essential support for producing pest lists and pest free areas
 - o the protection of the environment by detecting invasive species

- it provides IPPC members with a harmonised framework for a surveillance system. It describes most of the aspects of a system so that countries know what to use themselves and what to expect from trade partner countries
- the harmonised system with described components allows countries to operate credible surveillance systems which trade partners can have confidence in
- it provides internationally recognised systems to provide information for the resolution of disputes regarding pest absence or presence

Technical:

- the standard provides the basic tool for surveillance systems
- it promotes the development of diagnostic protocols
- surveillance systems provide information that allows countries to take proactive preparation for potential or emerging pests.

The difficulties associated with the implementation of the standard include:

Administrative:

- the standard does not provide any assistance, other than its existence, in the promotion of financial support for funding survey programmes, diagnostic stations, record keeping and awareness programmes
- the standard does not help with guidance for coordination between different agencies that may be involved in the different aspects of surveillance work
- likewise, it does not assist with guidance on relating to and communicating with all the stakeholders that may be involved in a surveillance programme on many aspects of surveillance programmes
- the lack of guidance on an auditing system to show the effectiveness (or lack of it) of surveillance systems has not aided the implementation of surveillance programmes
- the understanding between trade partners of surveillance systems could have been increased with more guidance on the interpretation of the standard
- also, there has been a lack of understanding on the part of the general public and teaching and research institutions on the pest reporting role of the NPPO and their links to it.

Operational:

- members have found it difficult to move from the concepts of the standard to the actual procedures and methodology of surveillance programmes.
- there is no support to assist with the setting of priorities in a surveillance programme. The setting of priorities is an essential part of all surveillance systems as there is always more surveillance required than there are funds to accomplish the potential programmes
- the lack of guidance on surveillance system planning regarding training, resources, methodologies has caused difficulties with implementation for some members
- the standard does not provide guidance on information and data exchange between the parts of a surveillance system particularly when different agencies are involved

- the lack of guidance on management systems for the different types of surveillance project has caused difficulties with some members
- there is a lack of information on the types of surveillance associated with pest management and that facilitating market access
- whereas it is recognised that the standard cannot go into too much detail, more information on training and the elements involved would have strengthened its effect.

Technical:

- the lack of guidance on how to remedy the lack of recourse to diagnostic expertise has limited the usefulness of the standard. The lack of diagnostic expertise is a major problem for many countries
- the lack of strong linkages with the related standards is a limiting feature of the standard. Strong links are needed to emergency response programmes.
- the lack of details on many aspects of the standard has caused problems with some members, for example:
 - the insufficient information on surveillance sampling
 - the lack of guidelines for record keeping regarding software
 - the lack of detail in the description of good surveillance practice
 - insufficient diagnostic guidance
 - the lack of guidelines for ongoing pest monitoring (eg the time required to produce acceptable results)
 - insufficient information on the collection and preservation of material
- the lack of information of quality levels including targets for statistical validity has limited the effectiveness of the standard.

7. Requirements for improving national pest surveillance

The meeting discussed the tools and resources required to implement ISPM 6 and proposed some recommendations for improving the standard. The points are listed below.

The identification of tools and technical resources needed to fully implement ISPM 6:

Administrative:

- regarding general surveillance this should be supported by:
 - public awareness campaigns
 - publicity/communications staff training
 - contact and communication with
 - professional bodies (teaching and research organisations, NGOs)
 - the public
 - private agencies (eg pest exterminating firms)
 - industry and industry representative bodies.

Operational:

- greatly improved training arrangements need to be made available including:

- guidelines for different surveillance systems
- SOPs for major pests with technical manuals
- best practice examples
- for the training of public/grower volunteers (cf farmers field school)
- more information needs to be made available on the use of databases in surveillance (guidelines, requirements, hardware recommendations)

Technical:

- a major resource required by many countries is diagnostic services. Various resources and tools were suggested that could assist in solving this problem including:
 - the use of readily available databases (e.g. PaDIL)
 - virtual techniques (remote microscopy for diagnosis)
 - the use of a Help desk
 - identification keys (e.g. LUCID)
 - the availability of lists of experts
 - training programmes
 - the development of more skilled lab staff and diagnosticians eg morphological taxonomists
 - the development of more diagnostic protocols and reference material
 - improved diagnostic facilities and the improved sharing of such facilities.
 - manuals and guidelines to assist with the interpretation of the standard.
- associated skilled manpower should be available – management staff, technical programme designers, field personnel, auditors, diagnosticians)
- Other tools that should be available, perhaps with the necessary assistance, could include:
 - GIS systems
 - data logger systems plus GPS (e.g. ePEST surveillance)
 - rapid test kits (e.g. bar code, protein techniques)
 - pheromones for field traps
 - field identification materials (eg manuals, photos, pamphlets)
 - information needed to use the tools and guidelines on when their use is appropriate.

Recommendations for improving ISPM 6:

Administrative:

- a section could be added to stress the importance of surveillance by noting:
 - that surveillance provides the basis for other standards (PFA, pest reporting, pest lists, eradication)
 - the links with food security
 - the links with market access and trade facilitation
 - the links with the protection of the environment
- advice on the content of surveillance legislation could be considered
- a section should be added on auditing

- further information could be added on the requirement for the coordination of the agencies involved in surveillance programmes
- a recommended system, including a range of elements, could be proposed to assist with priority setting that considers aspects of food security, trade facilitation, environmental protection, financial support and cost benefits
- guidance on surveillance management systems could be included
- the review of ISPM 6 could include a recommendation on how regularly countries should review their surveillance systems.

Operational:

- more information could be included on training requirements and guidelines including the level of diagnostic and surveillance expertise
- links to relevant ISPMs should be added.

Technical:

- more information on the statistical basis of specific surveys is required
- there could be a section on pest monitoring that includes advice on time intervals

8. Future work

Contribution to this project

Pest Surveillance Symposium

Dr Hedley introduced this subject. He stated that the surveillance implementation programme was initiated by the APPPC and agreed to at the 27th session of the APPPC in August 2011 in Manila. The IRSS has subsequently also began a programme to assist the implementation of ISPM 6. The two programmes have been coordinated. After the holding of the regional workshops, the IRSS will evaluate the results of the discussions and prepare an assessment. This will be presented at a Pest Surveillance Symposium to be held in Korea 29 October - 2 November 2012. This meeting will be organised by the APPPC and the NPPO of the Republic of Korea. Dr Hedley requested that participants propose items to be discussed at the symposium.

A number of suggestions for the meeting programme were forthcoming regarding:

- Surveillance
 - a session on pest monitoring. This could include the timeframes for objective completion (PFA establishment, pest eradication)
 - the publication of lists of diagnostic experts
 - the consideration of sampling methods.
 - statistical basis of surveillance for different purposes
 - SOP for specific pests,
- Diagnostics
 - guidelines on the use of remote diagnosis
 - the use of different taxonomic identification networks eg PestNet
- Surveillance management/planning/audit/coordination

- guidelines for interpretation of the standard
 - more guidelines on general versus specific surveillance
 - guidelines on different types of surveillance
 - guidelines on the development of surveillance coordination systems within countries
 - guidelines on the economic analysis of pest surveillance
- Record keeping/reporting relating to ISPM 6
It was suggested that there needs to be guidance on how more information can be made available on the:
- recording of information
 - preservation of specimens
 - communication of pest information
- Surveillance administration (policy and finance)
- assistance needs to be developed that outlines the benefits of surveillance to countries so as to secure funds for ongoing surveillance work within their countries. Policy development and financial expertise would need to be available for this. Examples of successful and unsuccessful surveillance could be used in the development of supporting documentation
 - it was suggested that this be supported by guidance on creating public awareness of the importance of surveillance as the basis of a national plant health system
 - the development of technical information exchange must be supported. Much information is available. For example, many countries have undertaken surveillance exercises, information on techniques

It was suggested that there be a Poster session at the symposium the surveillance activities of different countries. Such a session would show the different work that is done in countries and could also provide details and contacts.

Training material

The meeting participants discussed training programmes related to surveillance. Comments and suggestions included:

- the APPPC programme will have a training workshop in 2013 within this surveillance programme. There needs to be the development of training materials prior to the workshops. Australia has already provided some material.
- training programmes could include pest identification programmes that deal with country specific pests and take account of within-country pest population differences
- the efforts in the Pacific region where the trainer is trained were noted. The training involves actual use of the techniques – in field detection to response programmes.
- training programmes could have resource people going to each country.
- programmes that are devised should be adaptable to each individual country.
- Dr Piao noted that many donor countries and organisations have provided specific programmes e.g. for diagnostics. Some have been for specific

countries or for a number of countries. Some programmes are highly developed. In order to avoid the duplication of programmes and to effectively use our limited budget we should identify common interest areas and focus on these for the development of training materials for use in the programmes. The APPPC might initially go for broad programmes and specialise later.

- it was proposed that training programmes include training for management of surveillance exercises and the field work involved. There could be training for the system manager or surveillance leader to teach them the overall system development, ISPM 6 budget management, staff control.
- the availability of online training in biosecurity (from Australia) was noted.
- training programmes on the use of GIS in surveillance systems for specific pests could be considered. The development of a data logger for these systems was noted
- the requirement for SOP of surveillance for major pests was noted. This could be done (as for SALB) providing suitable experts were available
- it was suggested that the development of SOPs for documentation of surveillance exercises be examined
- training programmes in the surveillance for major economic pests of concern could be developed
- it was suggested that we have training programmes to learn about the emerging pests that we do not have and how countries can work on preparing for specific pest emergencies
- training in the identification of fruit flies was proposed
- new methods should be brought to the attention of countries and training offered.

9. Other business

9.1 Considerations for the revision of ISPM 4

A number of points on the improvement of the standard were made by the participants including:

- there could be reference to public reporting for new pests as part of the checks for the pests involved in a PFA
- regarding pest monitoring, there need to be guidance on the time schedule for declaring pest freedom
- there is needs to be reference to relevant standards e.g. ISPM 6
- there is needs to be discussion on the minimum measures of quality or statistical confidence
- one member would like ISPM 10 combined with 4 to deal with freedom for all areas
- the usage of terms needs to be updated eg phytosanitary security
- there needs to be more information on the use of buffer zones

9.2 Considerations for the revision of ISPM 8

The terminology of this standard needs to be brought up to date with the present glossary.

No items were brought up by the meeting participants.

10. Closure of the meeting

Dr Piao reminded the participants of the opportunity to comment on the draft ISPMs to be considered at CPM 7.

Dr Piao thanked the participants for their input into the meeting. He felt that all participants had gained from the discussions.

Timetable

Tuesday 31 January 2012

- 08:00-08:30 Registration
- 08:30-09:00 **Agenda 1: Opening Session**
- Welcome address
 - Purpose of the workshop
 - Logistical information
- 09:00-10:00 **Agenda 2: IPPC overview**
- Progress with ISPM development
 - Update on IPPC business (staff, finances, CPM7)
- 10:00-10:30 **Agenda 3: Adoption of agenda**
- Election of Chair
 - Election of rapporteur
- 10:30-10:50 Coffee break
- 10:50- 11:10 **Agenda 4.1: Overview of ISPM6**
- General surveillance
 - Specific surveillance
- 11:10-11:30 **Agenda4.2: Summary of results of questionnaire**
- In the region
- 11:30-13:00 **Agenda 5: Review of best practices for phytosanitary pest surveillance**
- Presentation of country best practices by each country
- 13:00-14:00 Lunch break
- 14:00-15:30 Continuation of country presentations
- 15:30-15:50 Coffee break
- 15:50-17:30 Continuation of country presentations

Wednesday 1 February 2012

- 08:00-10:00 **Agenda 6: The use of ISPM 6 in the region** (open or breakout group discussions)
- Based on presentations, discussions on:
- Advantages in the use of the standard

- Difficulties in implementation of ISPM6

10:00-10:20 Coffee break

10:20-12:30 Continuation of Agenda 6

12:30-13:30 Lunch break

13:30-14:30 Presentation on the output of the discussions (Plenary)

14:30-15:30 **Agenda 7: Requirements for improving national pest surveillance**

- The identification of the tools and technical resources needed to implement ISPM6
- Recommendations for improving ISPM6

15:30-15:50 Coffee break

15:50-16:30 Continuation of Agenda 7

16:30-17:30 Summary of discussions (Plenary)

Thursday 2 February 2012

Field visit

Friday 3 February 2012

08:00-10:00 **Agenda 8: Future work**

- Contributions to this project (symposium, preparation of training material)
- Work in the region

10:00-10:20 Coffee break

10:20-12:30 **Agenda 9: Any other business**

- Consideration of what needs to be revised in ISPM 4
- Consideration of what needs to be revised in ISPM 8

12:30-13:30 Lunch break

13:30-15:30 Continuation of Agenda 8

15:30-15:50 Coffee break

15:50-17:30 Discussion on preferable program of the symposium

Agenda 10: Adoption of report

Online evaluation on the workshop
Closure

List of Participants

Australia

Dr. Jan Bart Rossel
Manager
International Plant Health Programme
Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
GPO Box 858
Canberra City ACT 2601, Australia
Tel: 02-62725056
Fax: 02-62725835
Email: bart.rossel@daff.gov.au

Bangladesh

Mr. Md. Torikul Islam
Plant Pathologist
Plant Protection Wing
Department of Agricultural Extension
Khamarbari, Dhaka-1215
Bangladesh
Tel : +88 01712547547 (Mobile)
Fax: +88 02 8114740
Email: mtitulul@yahoo.com

China

Mr. Feng Xiaodong
Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine Division
NATESC, MOA
No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street
Beijing, P.R.China
Tel: 86-10-59194757; 13911467697
Email: Fengxdong@agri.gov.cn

Fiji

Mr. Ilaisa Dakaica
Manager Standards, Policies & Compliance
Biosecurity Authority Of Fiji
Ground Floor, Takayawa Building, Toorak, Suva
Fiji Islands
P: +679 331 2512
F: +679 330 5043
Email: idakaica@biosecurityfiji.com; iranavuna@gmail.com
Postal address: GPO Box 18360, Suva, Fiji Islands

India

Mr. Ram Asre
Joint Director (Entomology – IPM)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage
NH IV , Faridabad, India
Tel: 00-129-2418508
Mobile: 00-8826175860
Email: ramasre56@gmail.com

Indonesia

Dr. Eliza Suryati Roesli
Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine for Seed Division
Centre for Plant Quarantine and Biosafety
Indonesia Agricultural Quarantine Agency
Ministry of Agriculture
Jl. Harsono RM No. 3, Building E, 5th Floor, Ragunan
Jakarta Selatan 12550
Indonesia
Tel/Fax: +62-21-7816482
Email: eliza_rusli@yahoo.com

Japan

1. Mr. Yutaka Inoue
Senior Officer
Kobe Plant Protection Station
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, The Government of JAPAN
1-1, Hatobacho, Chuou-ku, Kobe, Japan
Tel: +81-78-331-2384
Fax: +81-78-391-1757
Email: inoueyt@pps.maff.go.jp

2. Mr. Yuji Kitahara
Section Chief
Plant Protection Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, The Government of Japan
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo
Japan
Tel: +81-3-3502-5978
Fax: +81-3-3502-3386
Email: yuji_kitahara@nm.maff.go.jp

Lao, PDR

Mrs. Khonesavanh Chittarath
Plant Protection Centre
Vientiane, Lao PDR
Tel/Fax: 856 21 812164
Email: chittarhat_2005@yahoo.com

Malaysia

Ms Rohaina Mat Nawi
Senior Agriculture Officer
Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Branch
Telok Chengai, Kedah
Malaysia
Tel: 604-7711154/7729114
Fax: 604-7729127
Email: ainarahim@yahoo.com

Myanmar

Dr. Khin Thein Nyunt
Research Officer
Department of Agricultural Research
MoAI
Myanmar
Mobile: +95 (0) 949 214 213
Email: ktnyunt@gmail.com; pmmas.moai@mptmail.net.mm

Nepal

Dr. Yubak Dhoj G.C.
Program Director
Plant Protection Directorate & Co-ordinator
National IPM Program
(Joint Secretary)
Directorate of Plant Protection
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Kathmandu, Nepal
Cell: ++ 977 9841 097 986
Tel (Res): ++ 977 1 6638442
Tel (office): ++ 977 1 5521597
Fax: ++ 977 1 5010112
E-mail: yubakgc@yahoo.com
Official Email: director@ppdnepal.gov.np
Web: www.ppdnepal.gov.np

New Zealand

1. Dr. John Hedley
Principal Adviser, International Organizations
Policy, Science and Economics Branch
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace
PO Box 2526, Wellington
New Zealand
Tel: 64 4 894 0428
Fax: 64 4 894 4072
Mobile: 64 29 894 0428
Email: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz

2. Mr. Paul Stevens
Senior Adviser
Biosecurity Surveillance Plants and Environment
Investigation & Diagnostic Centres and Response
Compliance and Response
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
231 Morrin Rd, St Johns, Auckland 1072
PO Box 2095, Auckland 1140
New Zealand
Tel: 64-4-894 0194
Fax: 64-9-909 5739
Mobile: 64-29-894 0194
Email: Paul.Stevens@maf.govt.nz

Philippines

Mr. Joselito L. Antioquia
Officer-in-Charge
PQS-Ninoy Aquino International Airport
Manila, Philippines
Mobile: +63 9178695720, +63 29256906
Email: banglen2001@yahoo

Rep. of Korea

1. Mr. Chang-Ho Shin
Director
Plant Pest Control Division
Animal, Plant and Fisheries Quarantine and Inspection Agency
178 Anyang-ro, Manan-gu, Anyang-si, Gyeonggi-do,
Rep. of Korea
Tel: +82-31-420-7630
Email: newwindow@korea.kr

2. Dr. Jong-Ho Lee
Researcher
Risk management division
Animal, Plant and Fisheries Quarantine and Inspection Agency
178 Anyang-ro, Manan-gu, Anyang-si, Gyeonggi-do,
Rep. of Korea
Tel: +82-31-420-7654
Email: acarologist@korea.kr

Sri Lanka

Mr. S.G.R. De Silva
Director
Seed Certification & Plant Protection Centre
Department of Agriculture, P.O. Box 74
Gannoruwa, Sri Lanka
Tel: 0812388044
Email: spreapgtraining@yahoo.com

Thailand

Mr. Sarute Sudhi-Aromna
Senior Entomologist
Plant Protection Research and Development Office (PPRDO)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperative (MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak, Bangkok, 10900
Thailand
Tel: 66 2 579 5583
Fax: 66 2 940 5396
Email: sarutes@yahoo.com

Vietnam

Dr. Duong Minh Tu
Entomologist
Director
Plant Quarantine Diagnostic Centre (PQDC)
Plant Protection Department (PPD)
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD)
149 Ho Duc Di, Dong Da, Hanoi, Vietnam
Tel./Fax : (84) 4 3851 3746
Mobile: 0904 101 090
Email: duongminhtu60@gmail.com or thanhtam1992@yahoo.com
or pqdc_ppd@yahoo.com.vn
Website: <http://www.ppd.gov.vn>

Observers

1. Dr. Pornpimon Athipunyakom
Senior Plant Pathologist
Plant Protection Research and Development Office (PPRDO)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok, 10900 Thailand
Tel: 66 2 579 9582
Fax: 66 2 579 9582
Email: pathipunyakom@gmail.com
2. Ms. Tasanee Pradyabumrung
Senior Standards Officer
Office of Commodity and System Standard
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok, 10900 Thailand
Tel: 66 2 561 2277 #1452
Fax: 02 561 3357
Email: tasanee@acfs.go.th; tassaprat@hotmail.com

3. Dr. Nuttima Kositcharoenkul
Senior Plant Pathologist
Plant Protection Research and Development Office (PPRDO)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok, 10900 Thailand
Tel. 66 2 579 8599
Fax: 66 2 940 6371
Email : n_kosit_t@hotmail.com, nuttima.k@doa.in.th

4. Dr. Siriporn Zungsontiporn
Agricultural Research Officer
Plant Protection Research and Development Office (PPRDO)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok, 10900 Thailand
Tel: 66 2 940 7409
Fax: 66 2 579 5247
Email: siriporn.zung@gmail.com, siriporn.z@doa.in.th

FAO/RAP

1. Mr. Piao Yongfan
Senior Plant Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
39 Maliwan Mansion
Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: 662 697 4268
Fax: 662 697 44445
Email: yongfan.piao@fao.org

2. Ms. Nongyao Ruenglertpanya
Secretary
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
39 Maliwan Mansion
Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: 662 697 4264
Fax: 662 697 44445
Email: N.Ruenglertpanya@fao.org

(Appendix 3-ISPM6, Appendix 4-summary of analysis on surveys and Appendix 5-country reports are in separated pdf and zip files-see attached appendix files)