
REPORT

**Entebbe,
Uganda
30 November - 3
December
2009**

**Twenty-first Technical Consultation among Regional Plant
Protection Organizations**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

**REPORT OF THE
TWENTY-FIRST TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG
REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS**

Entebbe, Uganda 30 November - 3 December 2009

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner. Applications for such permission, with a statement of the purpose and extent of the reproduction, should be addressed to the Director, Information Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report of the Twenty-first Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

List of Appendices

- I Agenda
- II Status of the work programme of the Technical Consultation among RPPOs for 2008 – 2009
- III. TC-RPPOs work programme 2010 – 2012
- III Tentative Agenda for the 22nd Technical Consultation amongst RPPOs
- IV List of Participants and Observers

Note: The papers and power point presentations presented at the 21st Technical Consultation among RPPOs are available at https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=213072&no_cache=1&L=0

**Report of the Twenty-first Technical Consultation
among Regional Plant Protection Organizations**

Entebbe, Uganda

30 November – 3 December, 2009

**1. OPENING OF THE TWENTY-FIRST TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG
REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS**

Mr. Komayombi Bulegeya (Commissioner of Department of Crop Protection, Uganda) opened the meeting and welcomed delegates to Uganda. He noted the increasing trade and movement of plants and plant products between various countries places SPS issues into sharp focus. He argued that consultative meetings such as the TC among RPPOs are therefore extremely important to discuss pertinent and emerging SPS issues and to build consensus on how best to support each other to address SPS in a coherent manner to enable global trade while minimizing the risks of spreading pests and diseases. He called attention to some key issues that are particularly important to Africa, including the need for improvements to infrastructure and increased technical capacity to interpret and implement standards. He also called attention to pests affecting key crops such as tropical fruits and cassava and the spread of invasive plant species. He noted the challenges that many countries face in managing GMOs and adopting E-certification systems. He highlighted two positive initiatives – the East African Phytosanitary Information Committee (EAPIC) and the East African Centre for Phytosanitary Excellence (COPE), and he suggested that support is needed expand these networks. Finally, he thanked the participants for attending the meeting and wished the group fruitful deliberations.

Appendix VI provides the attendance list for this meeting.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEUR

The meeting elected Mr. Komayombi Bulegeya as chairperson, and Mr. Mezui M’Ella (IAPSC – Interafrican Phytosanitary Council) as vice chair. Ms. Bateman (IPPC Secretariat) was elected rapporteur.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

It was requested that the Secretariat update include details on Secretariat staffing. Mr. van Opstal requested that a discussion regarding the situation with *Bactrocera invadens* be added to the agenda under “Other business”. Likewise, Mr. McDonnell requested the addition of a point regarding the hosting of the online discussion group of the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG). The agenda was adopted with these additions as per Appendix I.

4. ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE NINETEENTH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION

Issues arising from the 20th TC were considered under other agenda points.

5. REVIEW OF RPPO ACTIVITIES

Each RPPO presented on their activities over the past year. Summaries of their presentations are given in Appendix II.

7. RECOGNITION OF RPPOS AND THE STATUS OF NEPPO

Ms Bateman noted that pursuant to Article XIX.4, the Agreement for the Establishment of the Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO) entered into force with respect to all States that have ratified it, or acceded to it, on 8 January 2009, the date when the tenth required instrument was deposited with the Director-General of FAO. The following Parties have deposited the required instrument: Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Pakistan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, and Yemen. She also remarked that as NEPPO is not an FAO Commission, there will be no FAO resources allocated to its operation. She remarked that it is anticipated that the first meeting of the NEPPO commission will be held in the first quarter of 2010 in Morocco. Once the NEPPO Governing Council and Secretariat have been established, the IPPC Secretariat can contact them to suggest that NEPPO consider applying for recognition. Upon receipt of NEPPO's application for recognition, the process to verify whether it can be recognized as an RPPO will follow Appendix XV the report of ICPM-02: Procedure for the Recognition of New RPPOs. RPPOs need to be included in this recognition process. The TC follows with great interest the establishment of NEPPO and awaits their application for recognition. The TC will review with great interest their application for recognition as an RPPO. The TC would happy to provide information/guidance in establishing and running RPPOs.

A question was raised whether there was a process established for addressing non-functioning RPPOs. The TC noted that it would like to have the participation of the RPPOs that have not been active in the TC for a number of years. The TC made the recommendation that the Secretariat contact the Caribbean Community Secretariat regarding progress in the establishment of an RPPO in that region and encourage the Comunidad Andina to be more active as an RPPO.

8. IPPC SECRETARIAT UPDATE

Ms Bateman provided updates for each of the core activities of the IPPC Secretariat.

8.1 Standard setting

A summary of standards setting activities since CPM and the outcomes of November SC meeting were presented. Ms Bateman listed the draft ISPMs reviewed by the SC, the draft specifications that would be going forward for member consultation, the recommendations for adjustments to work programme, and upcoming calls for experts for EWGs and Technical Panels.

8.1.2 Update regarding planning of Expert Working Groups

The TC reviewed the draft calendar for 2010 – 2011. It was noted that few EWGs were listed in the draft calendar. The Secretariat indicated that several EWGs not listed on the calendar are tentatively planned and the calendar would be updated as these events were confirmed.

8.1.3 Status of the draft ISPM on plants for planting

The TC noted that this is an important standard and recommended that it move forward quickly for member consultation. Preferably it should go to the SC next May and for member consultation next June.

8.1.4 Compilation of member comments on draft ISPMs

Each year, the IPPC Secretariat has had a tremendous task to compile comments submitted on draft ISPMs in time for stewards to be able to revise the drafts in advance of the SC. At CPM-4, NPPOs and COSAVE volunteered to compile comments on draft standards. Each volunteer compiled comments on a particular draft.

Ms Castro described COSAVE's experience with the compilation of comments on the draft ISPM on post-entry quarantine. A total of 546 unique comments were received. Compilation of these comments took 20-25 working hours. The main problems that COSAVE encountered was with cases in which suggested modifications were not clearly formatted, e.g. erased text that was not crossed out or items that were not clearly identified. No operational difficulties were detected.

Based on their experience, COSAVE recommends the following:

- The person in charge of compiling comments must know English and other languages.
- More training to countries is needed on how to perform the comments.
- More coordination is desirable to communicate to the Secretariat that comments of some member countries are the same.

She noted that this is a very concrete and positive way to help the Secretariat to deal with a rush before the SC, and she suggested that may be other RPPOs could get involved in compiling comments, due to their training and expertise in dealing with templates.

Ms Bateman observed that from the perspective of the IPPC this was a huge success and she expressed the Secretariat's appreciation for the work of COSAVE and the other countries.

In 2010, the Secretariat anticipates that an online system for submitting comments on draft ISPMs will be made available. In October 2009, a tender was issued for the development of this online comment system.

With regard to the online comment system, the TC felt strongly that the new system should take into account the following:

- Should not necessitate that work has to be done twice
- Guidance regarding use of the new system should be prepared and released well in advance. Likewise, training material should be made available.
- Countries with limited internet access must be taken into account.

It was suggested that a small group meet at CPM-5 to discuss the proposed online comment system.

8.2 Update regarding phytosanitary capacity building

The Secretariat reported that a new PCE prototype was developed and tested. An informal working group was held in March of 2009 to review the feedback from the testing and to decide on the way forward. Work is underway to implement the specifications developed by the informal working group.

The Secretariat also called the attention of the TC to the operational plan for building national phytosanitary capacity provisionally approved at CPM-4 and noted that an open-ended working group to be held in December of 2009 would further develop the operational plan. The TC noted that RPPOs figured prominently in the operational plan and awaits the outcome of the OEWG. It is hoped that the CPM/IPPC will recognize that capacity building is a priority and that there would not be an expectation for RPPOs to do carry out the bulk of the work.

8.3 Dispute settlement update

The Secretariat reported that there had been no developments since CPM-4. There had been enquiries from various countries about trade issues and in all cases the Secretariat defused the situation before the countries involved decided to initiate a formal dispute settlement process.

8.4 Information exchange

Ms Bateman noted that information exchange activities in 2009 included capacity building in several countries and emphasized that the main achievement was the development of the new IPPC website.

8.4.1 Presentation of the new IPPC website and discussion regarding RPPO requirements

On 1 December, a new IPPC website was released. Ms Bateman gave a presentation outlining the issues which the new site sought to address, how the new website was developed, the organization and basic elements of the new site, and key features that may be of interest to RPPOs. She demonstrated the new site, and the group provided comment on ways in which information with respect to RPPOs could be better presented. In particular, it was suggested that the main navigation bar could list tabs for countries, regions and international. Overall, the TC was pleased and considered the site a great improvement over the previous IPPC website.

8.4.2 Reporting to the IPPC through RPPOs

At the 20th TC, the FAO Legal Office advised that NPPOs could report through their RPPO as long as they clearly indicate that this is how they will carry out their reporting. In consultation with FAO Legal Office, the Secretariat developed a form for countries to notify the Secretariat that this was how they would meet their reporting obligations. This form has been made available on the IPPC website. In 2010, the Secretariat will establish a mechanism for receiving information from RPPO websites.

9. Electronic certification update

Following up on a decision from TC-20, there was a detailed discussion regarding E-certification. McDonnell made a presentation summarizing the Electronic Certification Workshop organized by NAPPO and held in Ottawa, Canada in May 2009. Sixty participants from fifteen countries attended the workshop.

The following nine points summarize the key workshops agreements and recommendations resulting from the plenary session on day three of the workshop.

1. Agreement on definition of Electronic Phytosanitary Certification;
2. All elements for electronic phytosanitary certification exchange mechanism will be derived from ISPM-12;
3. Universally accepted standards for secure certificate exchange, message format, and implementation of procedures for exchange will be used;
4. UN/CEFACT Schema (data elements, core components) must be reviewed to ensure consistency with ISPM-12 requirements and a user guide developed to include an 'ISPM-12 Overlay for the UN/CEFACT Schema' (an ISPM-12 specific schema imposing business restrictions on the UN/CEFACT Schema);
5. During transition periods in implementation, current hard-copy practices would still apply;
6. Rely on IT experts to provide advice on methods for flexible and secure electronic transfer;
7. Initiate a multilateral standardization approach rather than a bilateral approach with respect to country-to-country negotiations for exchange;
8. Engage developing countries through regional cooperation and pilot projects and use IPPC for outreach activities; and
9. Develop simple-to-understand communication pieces such as a background paper and “myth-busting” Questions and Answers.

A follow-up to the E-certification workshop is planned for 2010.

Mr. Van Opstal provided information regarding E-certification in the EPPO region, and he observed that the E-certification workshop in Canada was very useful to EPPO member countries as there is

relatively little experience with E-certification in the region. He noted that per the definition of E-certification that was agreed upon in the workshop, no country is fully implementing electronic certification at this stage, and he stressed that it will be important that the means of data transmission be harmonized. It was emphasized that E-certification will be by bilateral agreement and that there is no obligation to implement it. Certain technological challenges were highlighted, e.g. protection of the data and authentication of the data. It was suggested that E-certification would involve a lot of benefits in that it should help avoid issues of fraud because NPPOs are communicating directly. Likewise, the quality of data will probably improve. There was a recommendation that pilots would be important way to gain experience between NPPOs, and that one EPPO member is keen on setting up pilots. It was observed that there is the tendency that it is IT driven, but the NPPO should take the lead as there will be issues such as what to do about re-export which will require that NPPOs are involved in discussions. For E-certification to succeed, NPPOs need to ensure that messages are transmitted in a standardized way, thus all of the different regions should be involved in the discussion.

The presentations on E-certification generated considerable discussion. It was observed that work in this regard is still at an early stage. In response to a question regarding the cost of implementing E-certification, it was suggested that there would be little initial increase in cost and that ultimately once it is fully implemented there will be savings. There was also a question regarding how languages would be addressed by the new system. It was noted that UN-CEFACT should be able to accommodate multiple languages.

It was noted that one important area of work for the follow-up meeting is to ensure that the UN-CEFACT SPS certificate can be adapted to meet all of the requirements in ISPM No. 12. Likewise, it was recommended that explanatory material should be developed and circulated to increase understanding of E-certification.

To encourage other regions and countries to get involved a suggestion was made to form a steering committee to address electronic certification with a rotating chair. More leadership from the IPPC was also urged, noting that IPPC involvement will increase awareness and facilitate international consensus. It was suggested that a presentation on E-certification be given at CPM-5. Likewise, the steering committee could be charged with moving the initiative forward and at some stage the CPM could recognize the work of the steering committee, much as the PRA steering committee worked.

10. FOLLOW-UP FROM CPM-4

The Secretariat indicated that most points from CPM-4 requiring follow-up have now been addressed. For those items that are outstanding, issues that may require particular attention from the RPPOs have been included elsewhere in the agenda. A brief summary was given regarding the current status of the staffing situation in the Secretariat.

11. CPM-5: TOPICS FOR AN EXTERNAL PRESENTATION

Speakers giving the external presentations at CPM-5 would tie in to the 2010 year of biodiversity. One potential speaker who can address the impact of international standards on forest pests has already been identified. The Secretariat will seek to identify another speaker during the Joint Secretariat meeting of the IPPC and the CBD in December, 2009. The TC noted that aquatic plants represent a high risk and suggested that the CBD speaker could provide some focus on aquatic invasive plant species.

12. CPM BUSINESS PLAN – ROLE/ACTIVITIES OF RPPOS

The Secretariat noted that a small group has begun to draft the 2012-2017 CPM Business Plan. The TC considered the current Business Plan with regard to RPPO activities and saw no need for revision relative to the role of RPPOs. It noted that many activities identified in the Business Plan are cross cutting.

13. IPPC IMPLEMENTATION, REVIEW AND SUPPORT SYSTEM (IRSS)

The TC was reminded that the IRSS work programme was adopted by CPM-3 and noted that work on the IRSS has largely been on hold pending the recruitment of an IRSS officer.

13.1 IPPC Secretariat guidance regarding input from RPPOs on priorities for the Implementation review and support system

The TC discussed the approach outlined in the paper presented by the Secretariat and thought it would be more appropriate for NPPOs to provide the sort of information indicated in the form. The TC felt that the questionnaire was not specific enough, that it would not likely get a high response rate, and that analysis of responses would be difficult. The TC suggested that the questionnaire be clearly focused on a particular priority issues (e.g. the top five ISPMs where there are difficulties). It was noted that countries also need to see the benefit in filling out this sort of questionnaire – example explanatory documents, workshops, etc. The TC suggested that the questionnaire be referred to the Bureau for review.

The TC suggested that pest reporting and systems approach are two areas in which the RPPOs can contribute to addressing issues with implementation. It was decided that presentations on these topics would be prepared for next TC.

13.2 Priorities on workshops aiming at improving the phytosanitary capacity of members

Mr. McDonnell noted that some RPPOs organize workshops for particular topics and put forward the suggestion to pool expertise in the TC to organize a workshop on a priority topic jointly sponsored by regional plant protection organizations.

The group listed key priorities in each region and identified areas where needs overlapped. Examples included strengthening of phytosanitary institutions, treatment and analysis of seeds, sampling, training with regard to the new PCE and the new IPPC website, ISPM 7, an overview of the IPPC and the functions of NPPOs, how to comments on draft ISPMs, particularly given that there will be an online system, E-certification, ISPM 11 and forest pests.

It was agreed that since an E-certification initiative is already in motion, the workshop that follows-up on the workshop in Ottawa could be undertaken as joint RPPO event, with the RPPOs agreeing to act as contact points and helping members from each region for the steering committee. In addition, the TC could request time on the agenda of CPM-5 to bring contracting parties up-to-date on developments.

As other priority areas that the RPPOs are not well positioned to address were raised, the TC recommended that the Secretariat be made aware of these points.

14. PRESENTATIONS FOR THE 2008 – 2009 WORK PROGRAMME

Presentations were given by the RPPOs on certain topics identified by the 20th TC.

14.1 Current and emerging major pests

Each RPPO briefly presented major emerging pests that their member countries are confronting. Examples included *Agilus planipennis*, *Bactrocera invadens*, *Bursaphelencus xylophilus*, *Cactoblastis cactorum*, Cassava brown streak virus, *Chromoleana odorata*, *Conompherella*

cramerella, Lobesia botrana, Lymantria dispar, Parthenium sp, Phenococcus manihoti, Quelea quelea, Raiella indica, Sirax noctilio, Solenopsis invicta, Thrips palmi, and Wasmania auropunctata.

The TC found the discussion to be very useful and agreed that it would be beneficial if each RPPO provided an unofficial summary report on emerging pests in their region at the 22nd TC.

It was also noted that internet sales are challenging pathway for pest introduction that is worth exploring, and it was suggested that the RPPOs explore this topic with member countries and discuss it at the next TC.

14.2 Emergency response and contingency planning

Ms Castro presented to the group the COSAVE regional standard for phytosanitary measures 3.17 - version 1.1: *Guidelines for Phytosanitary Contingency Plans*. In his presentation, Mr. Van Opstal noted that EPPO has several RSPMS that deal with eradication and described some key ones in detail. Mr. McDonell provided a presentation on emergency response and contingency planning in the NAPPO region for a specific pest, Ug99 (wheat stem rust).

The TC noted that communication is important, particularly with respect to the potential cost of the pest and benefits of eradication. In response to a question regarding emergency funding, it was noted that many countries do not have money set aside for emergencies and that often times governments are reluctant to compensate growers for losses incurred. With regard to compensation, an example was given of one country where there is a growers insurance fund to deal with this sort of situation. When outbreaks happen, they receive compensation from the fund provided that they have followed proper phytosanitary practices.

Mr. Masamdu noted that the PPPO encourages that PPPO members link their emergency response plans to their national disaster plans. Likewise, the PPPO assists members to develop generic contingency plans to cover both plants and animals, but with different technical specifications depending on the species in question.

Ms Castro explained that it is important to that all stakeholders are aware of and understand the importance of contingency plans. There is a perception that when a contingency plan is developed for certain pests that indicates that these are the only pests of concern. Consequently there is a need to prioritize regulated pest lists to identify which are the pests for which contingency plans will be developed. Likewise, developing contingency plans is a lot of work, the information should be shared so that other countries and RPPOs may benefit.

14.3 Purpose and use of regional pest lists

In a round table discussion, each RPPO reported on whether or not they use regional pests lists, and if so, for what purposes and how they are established and maintained. The TC found the presentations very informative and the discussions very useful. It was noted that there are considerable differences among the RPPOs in how these pests lists are established and how they are used. It was decided to maintain this point on the agenda provided there was new information to report.

14.4 Economic impact of plant protection programmes

Mr. Masamdu and Mr. McDonell presented on the economic impact of plant protection programmes in their regions. Mr. Van Opstal noted with great interest the presentations from NAPPO and PPPO with respect to the assessment of economic impact of plant protection programmes at the regional level. With respect to EPPO, the challenge is to quantify the benefits of eradication measures. Mr. Van Opstal indicated that he could report on the findings of the inventory of the costs of eradication programs at next year's TC, and Mr. McDonell indicated his willingness to report on two other studies that are underway as well.

14.5 Movement of Germplasm

Mr. Masamdu presented on the germplasm collection that is maintained by his organization in the Pacific. He indicated that tissue cultures of important staple crops such as taro, bread fruit, and banana are maintained as a reserve for member countries in time of crisis (e.g. following cyclones). He noted that this material, once collected, is cleaned. The quarantine officers in each of the countries have been made aware of the process by which materials are maintained so that they permit the importation of germplasm material in tissue culture. He noted that commercially produced seeds must be dealt with separately.

Mr. Mezui M'Ella observed that IAPSC, in collaboration with IITA and CABI, is in the process of formulating a regional standard to address the movement of cassava germplasm as this is an important issue for African countries. Mr. Van Opstal noted that an upcoming expert working group will be drafting an ISPM which will include guidance on the issue of the movement of germplasm.

15. REVIEW OF WORK PLAN FOR 2008 – 2009 AND PLANNING FOR 2010 – 2012

The TC reviewed the status of the items identified in the 2008 – 2009 work plan. A summary is presented in Appendix III. Based on this review and the items discussed under the other points earlier in the agenda, the TC identified items for inclusion in the 2010 – 2012 work programme. This information, along with responsibilities for preparing papers for the 22nd TC, is given in Appendix IV. A draft agenda for the 2010 TC is given in Appendix V.

16. OTHER BUSINESS

16.1 Fruit fly situation in Africa

The TC noted that the situation regarding *Bactrocera invadens* is potentially an issue of global concern and the request was made for more information regarding the present status of this pest in Africa. It was noted that *Bactrocera invadens* is a serious pest, particularly in some African countries. Observations and research have indicated that some fruit species are more susceptible than others. Likewise, researchers are exploring options for biological control. It was noted given that the nature of the borders in African countries, it is important that the response to this pest be regional. Ms Bateman remarked on two fruit fly management initiatives that are in development, one funded by the Standards and Trade Development Facility and the other funded by the European Union. Mr. Mezui M'Ella described a meeting to address fruit fly management in Central and Northern Africa that is to be held in Egypt later this year. On encouraging note, Mr. Masamdu remarked on the success of a ten year project to manage fruit flies that was carried out in the Pacific. This project involved fruit fly surveillance and the development of appropriate responses. Several Pacific island countries are now able to treat their fruit and export to New Zealand and Australia.

16.2 Platform for the International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) discussion group

NAPPO raised the issue of whether or not the IPPC website would be able to provide a platform for the IFQRG discussion group. The Secretariat indicated that this should be possible and agreed to contact Eric Allen, Chair of IFQRG, for more information regarding the discussion group's specifications.

17. DATE AND LOCATION OF THE TWENTY-SECOND TC-RPPOs

The TC-RPPOs agreed that the next TC-RPPOs would be held during the week of 23 – 27 August, 2010. EPPO offered the possibility to host the 22nd TC meeting in Portugal. The TC agreed to this proposal and thanked EPPO and Portugal for the offer.

17.1 Establishment of rotation scheme for TCs (2011 – 2014)

The 20th meeting discussed the desirability of some forward-planning so that RPPOs were aware of when it would be their turn to host the meeting. The following rotation was provisionally agreed upon:

- 2011 – APPPC
- 2012 – PPPO
- 2013 – COSAVE
- 2014 – NAPPO

It was also decided that should an RPPO be unable to host the meeting in a given year, the IPPC Secretariat would act as the alternative host.

18. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The meeting adopted the report with the understanding that the Secretariat would circulate the document for RPPOs for final comment. The comment period would be for one week.

19. CLOSURE

The Chairman thanked the participants for their very positive input into all the discussions held during the week.

Appendix I

21st Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations 30 November – 3 December 2009

Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT
1. Opening of the Technical Consultation	–
2. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-chair and Rapporteur	–
3. Adoption of the agenda	TC-RPPO 09/02
4. Matters arising from the 20 th TC-RPPO's	TC-RPPO 09/01
5. Review of RPPO activities (incl. organisation, regional standards, workshops) and this will also include specific feedback on RPPO activities to realize the goals of the CPM Business Plan as listed in: 1.2 Standard implementation; Current activities and standards under development by RPPOs 2.1 Implementation of information exchange as required under the IPPC 3.1 Encouragement of the use of dispute settlement systems 4.2 The work programme of the IPPC is supported by technical cooperation 5.1 The IPPC is supported by an effective and sustainable infrastructure 6.3 Efficient and effective communication between the RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat 7.1 Regular examination of the overall strategic direction and goals of the CPM with the adaptation of programmes to reflect/respond to new and emerging issues Please note - presentations should be limited to 20 min, including time for Q&A and an electronic summary (max one page) should be provided.	–
5.1 APPPC	TC-RPPO 09/19
5.2 CA	–
5.3 COSAVE	TC-RPPO 09/20
5.4 CPPC/CAFHSA	–
5.5 EPPO	TC-RPPO 09/21
5.6 IAPSC	TC-RPPO 09/15
5.7 NAPPO	TC-RPPO 09/22
5.8 OIRSA	–
5.9 PPPO	–
5.10 NEPPO	–
6. Interregional comments on draft regional standards for phytosanitary measures	–

AGENDA ITEM		DOCUMENT
7.	Recognition of RPPOs; status of NEPPO	TC-RPPO 09/08
8.	Secretariat update	
8.1	Standard setting	
8.1.1	Standard setting programme	TC-RPPO 09/05
8.1.2	Update regarding planning of Expert Working Groups	TC-RPPO 09/06
8.1.3	Status of draft ISPM plants for planting	–
8.1.4	Compilation of member comments on draft ISPMs	TC-RPPO 09/23
8.2	Update regarding Phytosanitary Capacity Building	TC-RPPO 09/17, TC-RPPO 09/18
8.3	Dispute settlement update	TC-RPPO 09/09
8.4	Information Exchange update	TC-RPPO 09/12
8.4.1	Presentation of the new IPPC website and RPPO requirements (e.g. bulletin board)	TC-RPPO 09/11
8.4.2	Reporting to IPPC through RPPOs; implementation requirements.	TC-RPPO 09/10
09.	Electronic certification (NAPPO, EPPO)	TC-RPPO 09/04, TC-RPPO 09/28
10.	Follow-up from CPM-4	
11.	CPM-5: Topics for an External presentation	TC-RPPO 09/07
12.	CPM Business Plan – role/activities of RPPOs	TC-RPPO 09/13, TC-RPPO 09/14
13.	IPPC Implementation, Review and Support System (IRSS)	
13.1	IPPC Secretariat guidance regarding input from RPPOs on priorities for IRSS	TC-RPPO 09/16
13.2	Priorities on workshops aiming at improving the phytosanitary capacity of members	–
14.	TC among RPPO's Work plan for 2008/2009, including:	–
14.1.	Current and emerging major pest issues	–
14.2.	Emergency response and contingency planning (EPPO/COSAVE)	TC-RPPO 09/23, TC-RPPO 09/24
14.3.	Purpose and use of regional pest lists (all RPPO's)	TC-RPPO 09/25, TC-RPPO 09/26
14.4.	Economic impact of plant protection programmes (NAPPO/PPPO)	TC-RPPO 09/03, TC-RPPO 09/27
14.5.	Movement of germplasm (PPPO)	–
15.	TC amongst RPPOs; review current workplan and planning for 2009-2012	–
16.	Other Business	–
16.1	Fruit fly situation in Africa	
16.2	IFQRG website	
17.	Date and location of next TC	–
17.1	Establishment of rotation scheme for TCs (2010-2014)	–
18.	Adoption of the Report of the 21 st TC-RPPOs	–
19.	Closure	–

Appendix II

5. REVIEW OF RPPO ACTIVITIES

5.1 Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)

Mr. Yongfan Piao, Executive Secretary of APPPC Secretariat, reviewed the APPPC's main activities since the 20th TC-RPPOs.

The twenty-sixth session of the APPPC was convened in New Delhi from 31 August to 4 September 2009. It was a milestone in the history of the APPPC with three significant outcomes: (1) the revised Agreement of Plant Protection for Asia and the Pacific came into force from 4 September 2009, which enabled the Commission to set up its own financial mechanism after 26 years' effort; (2) the rules of procedure and financial rules were discussed and adopted by the session, which governs the procedural activities and the financial administration of the Commission; and (3) two Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPMs) were adopted, including the RSPM on *Guidelines for Protection against South American Leaf Blight of Rubber*. The adoption of this RSPM represents significant progress made by the Commission in harmonizing phytosanitary measures. It will allow the process for the acceptance of the 2nd part of the 1999 amendments to the agreement to proceed (deletion of the Article IV and Appendix B-“measures to exclude SALB of Hevea from the Region” which has been existed 54 years (It was decided in 1999 that the amended Agreement will only be distributed when the Director-General is notified by the Secretary of the Commission that a satisfactory regional standard on SALB has been adopted by the Commission).

The 10th APPPC/Asia Regional Workshop on the review of draft ISPMs was held in the Republic of Korea with participation of 16 countries. There was considerable discussion on the draft ISPM No.12. The duration of validity of a PC was discussed at length. It was suggested that more information should be supplied on when the actual period of concern was and what lengths of time might be involved with different circumstances, etc.

Updating the plant protection profiles from APPPC member countries with information of new development is an important event for APPPC, which will be the complementary contribution to International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP). The 2nd edition of the profiles was published in Sept. 2009.

Three training workshops on pest risk analysis (PRA) and import regulation as well as phytosanitary inspection and phytosanitary certification were organized by a regional project (GCP/RAS/226/JPN) for 10 countries. In addition a regional training workshop on ISPM No.15 for ASEAN countries was convened in Korea.

There are several projects (from FAO and other sources) about improvement of phytosanitary capacity are implementing in several countries (such as FAO TCP, FAO GCP, NZAID, ADB, Japan, etc. assisted projects).

In response to a question regarding information relative to the status of the implementation of ISPMs, Mr. Paio indicated that six ISPMs are being fully implemented by the countries that provided plant protection profiles and he noted that further information is available on the IPPC website.

5.2 Andean Community (CA)

No representative was present from CA.

5.3 Southern Cone Plant Health Committee (COSAVE)

Soledad Castro, on behalf of COSAVE, presented a review of activities since the last TC and informs the next issues:

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

- a) Since March 2008, Paraguay presides COSAVE's Directive Committee and Council of Ministers.
- b) COSAVE continues studying the possibility to fix Headquarters.
- c) On March 9th 2009 COSAVE has twenty years of formal activity
- d) During this year COSAVE has been doing an evaluation of the activities of the organization and it has been included in the work plan with IICA. The result of this evaluation will be presents to the next Directive Committee for his knowledge and analysis.

Related with the IPPC 7 Goals the report is as follow:

Goal 1: STANDARD IMPLEMENTATION

- a) Main constraints in ISPM implementation have been identified for the Region and regional expertise has been identified to address them.

b) Activities included in the Work Plan take care of some of the constraints, as for instance workshops on sampling, inspection and certification or activities related to surveillance for specific pests.

One example of this activities is the "Workshop on interactive learning about phytosanitary inspection and hazard profiling" which was organized jointly with IICA. Held in Asunción , Paraguay, in November 2009. The main objective was to strengthen knowledge and exchange expertise and practices about inspection, train inspectors on the use of adopted ISPMs and on hazard profiling. The participation was more than 60 participants form the region.

- c) Related with the ISPM's implementation, COSAVE looks first for realistic and applicable ISPM texts and continues to look for common positions for comments to ISPMs and CPM issues, and produce regional technical documents to support NPPOs negotiations.

d) To prepare comments of draft ISPMs in the Region COSAVE, produced a multilayer system for preparation of comments that includes meetings of, Ad Hoc Working Group on Quarantine Issues, followed by consideration by the IPPC Issues Ad Hoc Working Group, finally approval by consensus or not by the Directive Committee.

- e) All COSAVE member countries call for public comments to draft ISPM's through their Web Sites

f) Participation is low and mechanisms to increase it are encouraged through other activities of COSAVE's Work Program. One of those activities has been a Workshop on the impact of ISPM's on family growers. Held in Asunción, Paraguay, in June 2009. The objective was to inform and train grower associations of the region on how to participate in the standard setting process. Attended by more than 40 associations from all over the region.

- g) A new RSPM (3.17, v1.1), has been adopted on: Guidelines on Phytosanitary contingency plans. It is available in COSAVE's Web Site. It has been under public consultation for 90 days in the Web Site.

h) Need for new RSPMs is under examination by the Directive Committee, and suggestions have been raised by some COSAVE Working Groups.

Goal 2: IMPLEMENTATION OF INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Capacity building on information exchange activities for member NPPO's has been undertaken by the Secretariat for this region some years ago. At least once a year COSAVE's Coordination Secretary reminds NPPO's about reporting obligations under the IPPC

Goal 3: ENCOURAGEMENT OF THE USE OF DISPUTE SETTLEMENT SYSTEMS

All NPPOs are aware and able to use the system, but it has not been needed.

Goal 4: TECHNICAL COOPERATION FOR THE IPPC WORK PROGRAM

The Regional Workshop for Latin America on draft ISPM wasn't realized because the financial support wasn't obtained on time. Contacts have been performed to organize, jointly with IICA. In other hand, an activity of three days has been organized jointly with IICA in December 2008, related with the IPPC standard setting process and ISPMs currently adopted, by videoconference to all countries of Central and South America and the Andean Region.

Another activite included in this issue was the next:

- a) Workshop of the Seed Association of the Americas (SAA), held in Brasilia, Brazil, on 29 and 30 September 2008. The objective of this activity was to understand phytosanitary regulatory programs of SAA member countries. Information was delivered on the IPPC standard setting process and particular interest was focused on the review of ISPMs 7 and 12.
- b) Seed Congress of the Americas (SAA) Congress held in Atibaia, SP, Brazil, on 29 and 30 September 2009, one of the objective was to present the comments performed under public consultation and the industry presented its main concerns. COSAVE presented the regional position on how to deal with re-export of seeds.

Goal 5: EFFECTIVE AND SUSTAINABLE SUPPORT TO THE IPPC

COSAVE assisted the Secretariat with the implementation of the annual CPM program partially or totally financing the assistance of delegates to the SC, TPG, TPDP, TPPT, TPFQ and EWG. In 2009 this assistance should reach about US \$ 30.000. COSAVE assisted the Secretariat hosting the 2008 meeting of the TPFQ (December 1-5 , 2008, Puerto Varas, Chile)

Goal 6: EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION WITH THE SECRETARIAT

COSAVE collaborated with the Secretariat to compile member comments of the draft ISPM submitted to public consultation, on post- entry quarantine. The number of countries that submitted comments was 31 and the number of comments received was 546. Main problems detected were cases in which suggested modifications were not highlighted, erased text that was not crossed out or items that were not clearly identified. No operational difficulties were detected. Some recommendation were made as, the person in charge of compiling comments must know English and other languages, more training to countries is needed, on how to perform the comments, more coordination is desirable to communicate to the Secretariat that comments of some member countries are the same. This is a very concrete and positive way to help the Secretariat to deal with a rush before the SC. May be other RPPO's could get involved in compiling comments, due to their training and expertise in dealing with templates.

Goal 7: EXAMINATION OF CPM GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Through the NPPOs of its member countries, COSAVE uses to present positions on issues of particular concern to the CPM. Permanent financial support of one its member NPPOs to attend to SPTA meeting.

There was some discussion regarding the database of signatures of officers in member countries that issue phytosanitary certificates. It was noted that the password protected database was difficult to maintain but was popular with member countries and had helped to identify fraud. With respect to member consultation on draft ISPMs, Ms Castro further clarified that consultations take place both nationally and regionally.

5.4 Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)

No representative was present from CPPC.

5.5 European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)

The Director-General of EPPO, Mr van Opstal highlighted the activities in EPPO which are of most importance for IPPC.

In September, 2009 the EPPO Council adopted 11 standards for plant protection and 30 phytosanitary standards. The adopted EPPO standards for plant protection provide specific guidance for efficacy evaluation of Plant Protection Products. In addition to standards, extrapolation tables are drafted which allow for registration of Plant Protection Products for minor uses based on a limited data requirement.

The adopted EPPO phytosanitary standards cover a variety of different topics. The EPPO Council approved the revision of the EPPO List of pests recommended for regulation and the revision of the Decision-Support Scheme for quarantine pests (DSS). The Council approved a standard elaborating a guideline for establishing a Code of conduct, which is the first standard of this kind for EPPO. The purpose of this Code of conduct is to prevent introduction and spread of Invasive Alien Plants in the horticultural sector. Certification schemes for *Rubus* and *Humulus lupulus* were approved, as well as a standard addressing soil test for virus-vector nematodes. The Council also adopted 15 diagnostic protocols. Standards guiding procedures for official control for several Invasive Alien Plant species were approved as well as a standard elaborating the elements which should be addressed in a contingency plan. In regard to Coniferae, a standard addressing the commodity specific phytosanitary measures was approved. Finally, four phytosanitary treatments were adopted.

EPPO is partner in an EU funded research project (PRATIQUE) which aims to provide data sets as basis for PRA in Europe, enhance PRA techniques and improve further the decision-support scheme for PRA.

A detailed overview of EPPOs PRAs and their conclusions is available on the EPPO website. Training of national experts in performing PRA, making use of the DSS for PRA, continues to receive much attention. A Russian- and English speaking workshop took place in 2009 and a French speaking workshop is in preparation.

EPPO's work programme shows increased emphasis on developing guidance to address outbreaks. For several important pests standards have been developed to recommend how official control should be carried out. Some of these standards are under revision and will provide more detail for eradication actions and new standards are under development.

EPPO maintains a Russian translation programme which in particular focuses on translation of ISPMs. Currently, the text of the IPPC and 31 ISPMs have been translated into Russian. Several EPPO standards have also been translated.

For the first time in the EPPO region and in collaboration with IPPC, a workshop regarding ISPMs currently in country consultation, was organized. This was a very useful workshop which engaged Russian-speaking, countries both in the process of developing and approving ISPMs. The comments from this workshop were very important for EPPO members to establish their view on the draft ISPMs.

The EPPO Council addressed the concern about the increasing risks of introduction of new pests with the increase of trade. In particular, they highlighted the risk from plants for planting for ornamentals and woody plants and plants imported from origins which are rather new to Europe. Possible improvements of the system to address such increasing risks will be discussed in 2010.

In response to the presentation by EPPO, in regard to pest reporting and shortcomings in ISPM No. 8, Mr. McDonnell noted that NAPPO member countries would appreciate a revision of ISPM No. 8 as well.

5.6 Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)

Mr. Mezui M'ella presented the IAPSC report.

5.6.1 Introduction

The Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC), besides implementing its 2009 budget programme within the framework of strengthening the Regional Pillars of Cooperation, Development and Regional Integration, that included four projects: Strengthening continental-wide Cassava protection initiatives against major diseases, Meetings and training workshop for reclassification and improving integrated pests' management, Control phenomenon of the trans-boundary pest in Africa: Grain Eating Birds (*Quelea*-sp) Phase II and updating spatial and temporal analysis of pests and plant diseases in Africa; the office has started executing the PANSPSO with AU-IBAR and Regional Economic Communities. IAPSC also took part in many meetings scheduled by the African Union Commission, IPPC Secretariat, different National Plant Protection Organizations of the continent, and some regional organizations and Regional Economic Communities. This aimed at preventing the introduction and spread of plant and plant products pests in Africa, while strengthening the phytosanitary situation of African countries and boosting inter-intra African trade and reducing poverty among the rural masses.

5.6.2 IAPSC's 2009 Budget programme,

Concerning the project on the Strengthening continental – wide Cassava protection initiatives against major Diseases; Phase one; the study team set up by IAPSC successfully conducted from July - to August, 2009 a survey in eight African countries (Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, Cote d'Ivoire, Liberia, Mozambique, Nigeria and Uganda for data collection and reviewed numerous assessments of the specific African countries in the area of cassava germplasm and planting material exchange, linkages networks, crop diseases affecting yield and productivity, since more than 300 million people feed on cassava and it is the second staple food in the Sub Sahara Africa. This study tour enables the team to also assess the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation of these countries. The phytosanitary situation of these countries still generally very weak. If nothing is done this may jeopardize the inter-intra African trade and compromise the poverty reductions which still the main goals of agricultural programme of many African countries and governments of the continent. In order to create awareness of different governments of countries producing cassava and build capacity in cassava diseases and pests diagnosis, IAPSC organized a workshop on cassava production and protection in Bujumbura-Burundi in November 16-17, 2009, where participants came from National plant protection Organizations of countries surveyed with Experts from IITA, FAO, IAPSC and National Research Organizations and Universities to address these problems and help those present to be more armed and know the identification of cassava diseases and control methods as well as understand the principle behind cassava germplasm movement and planting material production and distribution to the poor cassava growers.

Necessary arrangements have been made with the Egyptian government and the training workshop on reclassification and improving integrated pests' management with focus on fruit flies for central and north African countries will take place in Cairo in December 14-15, 2009 so as to enhance the capacity of some National Plant protection Organization Officers on this pest which is one of the main problem for fruits export.

Work is on –going with the Control phenomenon of the trans-boundary pest in Africa: Grain Eating Birds (*Quelea*- sp) invasions in Africa. This aimed at describing the situation as it occurs in the continent and coordinating controls methods used by affecting countries. The workshop is also scheduled in Sudan to enhance the capacity of African countries in the control of Grain Eating Birds so as to increase cereal production in the region affected.

Updated spatial and temporal analysis of pests and plant diseases in Africa is an on-going process which requires strength and energy and enough funds to tackle the issues. The contribution of all African National plant protection organization is more than needed. Many countries are still having difficulties to establish their pests list, IAPSC has just started reviewing this list and it is going to take time to come up with an appropriate list of quarantine pests.

Given IAPSC mandate, mission and stakeholders concerns, about achieving greater effectiveness from budget programme allocations to project submitted, effort is still needed to the release and availability of funds in time when projects are approved. The percentage of the implementation of the above projects may reach 71% by the end of the year. However, there are still many challenges which IAPSC could achieve with the assistance of all and the experience and cooperation of sister organizations and donors institutions through partnership

5.6.3 Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) and standards for Phytosanitary Measures.

Two training of Trainers Workshops on improving the efficiency of participation of African Nations in the activities of WTO-SPS committee and International Standards-setting Organizations were held in Nairobi-Kenya and Bamako-Mali, respectively on 13-16 July, 2009 and 20-23 July, 2009 for English and French speaking groups. These as part of the implementation of participation of African Nations in Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards –setting Organizations project (PAN-SPSO). Trainers were taught in International trade and the SPS Agreement, The SPS committee, Information sources on SPS and International Standards Setting Organization (ISSOs)-three sisters (IPPC, Codex Alimentarius Commission and OIE). A workshop for reviewing of draft ISPMs by African countries took place in Nairobi-Kenya thanks to the PANSPSO project. Member present at this meeting brought their valuable comments, amendments and contribution on the draft standards submitted.

In order to strengthen East African countries in phytosanitary information exchange a 5th East African Phytosanitary Information Committee workshop was held in Kigali-Rwanda on March 2-6, 2009. It aimed at developing official country specific and regional pest reporting methods and Internet-accessible databases that support Sanitary and Phytosanitary requirements for the region. The EAPIC databases are use to complement trade initiatives in the region and help to prioritize specific needs for pest survey, detection, inspection, and diagnosis. EAPIC groups countries like Kenya, Burundi, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Rwanda and their activities are funded by the USDA in collaboration with USAID/EA and FAO which is also funding the improvement of the Pest Information Management System (PIMS) in response to requests by users.

Close to 37 participants from various West African countries (Benin, Burkina Faso, Gambia, Ghana, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, and Togo) and institutions like IAPSC, IPM-CRSP, IITA, AVRDC and USA attended the Regional Diagnostics as part of the International Plant Diseases Network (IPDN) in Bamako-Mali in February 16-20, 2009. The system requirements for west Africa need for plant disease diagnostics being to recognise symptoms, diagnose indigenous pathogens and recommend control options, test and certify food quality, share local and regional knowledge. The purpose of the workshop was to create a critical mass of stakeholders dedicated to IPDN and to conduct the West Africa Regional Diagnostics Workshop as part of the IPDN global theme; while stimulating support to produce an effective and sustainable diagnostic network in regional linked to world experts.

In the same line of action KEPHIS has been identified as a Phytosanitary Centre of Excellence (COPE) for east African countries and progressively, its activities are been implemented. However IAPSC recognizes that other Regional Economic Communities (RECs) are still to put in place these Centres of Phytosanitary Excellences in their regions.

Other major activities of IAPSC included its participation to the workshop on Agricultural Trade and export Development in Africa in order to Understand the implication of recent trends and developments in agricultural trade flows, recent global market developments and how they can contribute to economic growth and poverty reduction; and also effectively assist countries to participate in international (bilateral, regional or multilateral) agricultural trade negotiations; and design and formulate efficient unilateral domestic trade policies in the face of the challenges and opportunities presented by the developments in the international food and agricultural markets. Other centre of interest was the monitoring of the setting up of PANSPSO project in ECOWAS and in other

RECs, the participation to the technical committee meeting in Addis Ababa –Ethiopia, the 4th CPM meeting in Rome –Italy and other meetings which gear towards strengthening phytosanitary capacity in Africa and also improving phytosanitary regulation in the continent.

5.6.4 Conclusions

There had been no developments in African phytosanitary standards despite effort made by the office through the implementation of PANSPSO project in the field. Regional Economic Communities are still as well as contracting parties of IPPC from Africa to concretely strengthen their capacity in WTO-SPS Agreement for better participation to CPM meeting and /or reviewing draft standards not to talk of setting standards. The situation of the phytosanitary capacity (PRA, Pests and diseases diagnostics and surveillance of African countries) is still for their majority weak. This observation calls for the attention of not only IAPSC but also the strong cooperation among all Regional Plant Protection organizations of IPPC. IAPSC will continue creating awareness among all contracting parties of IPPC from the continent and coordinating all activities undertaken by different National Plant protection Organizations (NPPOs).

Noting the observations regarding the increasing pest pressures that IAPSC member countries are now facing, Mr. Masamdu raised a question as to whether national legislations are up-to-date, thereby enabling countries to impose the phytosanitary restrictions to address these pest pressures. It was noted that land borders of many countries are porous, making it difficult to restrict the movement of material into countries.

5.7 North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)

Mr. Ian McDonell, Executive Director of NAPPO, reviewed NAPPO's main activities since the 20th TC-RPPOs.

During 2008/2009 NAPPO completed an exercise to review and update its strategic plan. This included developing a new mission statement for NAPPO which is to:

Provide a forum for public and private sectors in Canada, the United States and Mexico to collaborate in the development of science-based standards intended to protect agricultural, forest and other plant resources against regulated plant pests, while facilitating trade.

Participate in related international cooperative efforts.

To achieve this mission, NAPPO has established a number of key strategic goals

Protecting Plant Resources and the Environment

- Capacity Building
- Communicating Results
- Building partnerships
- An effective Dispute Settlement Mechanism
- Sound Management Practices
- A Stable Funding Base

Despite the travel restrictions faced by most NPPOs due to the H1N1 influenza and the global economic crisis, a number of other major activities were conducted in 2009 focused around regional standards and protocols.

A number of new NAPPO regional standards, treatment and diagnostic protocols were approved and are available on the NAPPO website at www.nappo.org.

Two International Workshops were organized and hosted by NAPPO:

- Citrus Quarantine Pest Workshop
- International Electronic Phytosanitary Certification Workshop

Priorities for the NAPPO 2010 Workplan include:

- Staffing the Technical Director position
- Re-export of Seed
- Biological control for Forestry Pests
- Huanlongbing and Asian Citrus Psyllid
- Wooden handicrafts
- Lures and traps for arthropod pests
- Light Brown Apple Moth
- Pathway Risk Analysis (Invasive Species)
- Effect of Climate Change on PRA
- NAPPO Curriculum project
- Christmas Tree inspection workshop

Mr. Van Opstal observed that with respect to the re-export of seed, official communication from the producing country to the final destination country may be needed. He noted that the EPPO member countries feel that the use of the additional declaration box on the phytosanitary certificate is an elegant solution to this problem. He also noted that EPPO countries recognize a lack of clarity globally as to what should be required with respect to seeds. He suggested that it would be very helpful if we could identify what important pests could be transmitted with seeds and propose treatments. NAPPO and Uganda supported the opinion that this is an important issue that needs to be addressed in the standard setting program. Meanwhile APPPC noted that Asian countries feel reluctant to address this issue at this time, particularly in light of the movement of seed through UN assistance programs that are responding to recent natural disasters in the region.

5.8 Regional International Organization for Agricultural Health (OIRSA)

No representative from OIRSA was present at the meeting.

5.9 Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO)

Mr. Roy Masamdu presented on behalf of the PPPO.

The PPPO had its 6th meeting in June 2009. All Heads of NPPOs including those of intending contracting parties as well the US and French Pacific Territories attended, that 19 out of the 22 PICTs. The meeting endorsed the activities implemented by the PPPO.

The PPPO has been actively assisting member countries to progress their new revised Biosecurity Bills. This is a holistic bill and includes animals, plants and environmental issues as they related to the IPPC and OIE, and its linkages with CBD and other international treaties. Two countries Cook Islands and Fiji have enacted the bill in late 2008 and become laws in 2009. It is expected that some more countries will pass the bill in 2010

The PPPO continues to provide support on the Biosecurity information facility, an operational manual and interlinked to database to automate export certification and import permitting. Six countries have this operational manual installed and is operational with room for improvement. This project is funded by EU, and is ending in June 2010. It is envisaged that some more countries will be included before the end of the project.

Phytosanitary capacity evaluations (PCE) have been completed in all 14 countries. Results were summarized and a one day regional workshop was held to discuss the results with member countries. PCE results show there is a need to update phytosanitary legislation; improve documentation of phytosanitary activities and improve export facilitation. The need for training of biosecurity officers in understanding and implementation of ISPMs and lack of basic diagnostic facilities and equipment was evident in the evaluations.

The PPPO continues to collaborate with USDA APHIS to provide regular annual refresher training of biosecurity officers in former and current US territories in the region. The training is usually held in Guam.

The PPPO made some general comments on draft ISPMs based on the SWP regional workshop on draft ISPM held in August and comments have been forwarded to the IPPC Secretariat. The PPPO Secretariat appreciates the support provided by FAO to convene these workshops.

The PPPO continues to maintain close working relations with other border management agencies in their region including Customs, Maritime and Security enforcement. It encourages NPPO's in the region to collaborate and jointly enforce border security.

The PPPO has been providing training on Pest Risk Analysis to biosecurity officers in the region. This has been possible through funding provided by Australia and New Zealand. It is envisaged that this training will continue and will include other ISPM's.

PPPO continues to assist in the safe movement of germplasm in the region through provision of relevant information.

The PPPO continues to assist countries hosting regional events such as the Pacific Mini-games, Pacific Festival of Arts and the Miss South Pacific Quest through provision of public awareness materials. The awareness material is provided to all NPPO's to brief their country participants on prohibited, restricted articles and treatment required for permitted items.

5.10 Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO)

No representative from NEPPO attended the meeting.

6. INTERREGIONAL COMMENTS ON DRAFT REGIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Mr. McDonnell observed that NAPPO allows and receives input from other regions on their regional standards and he posed the question as to whether this could be a model for other regions. Mr. Van Opstal noted that in general, EPPO strives to be as open and transparent as possible. All of the standards that are approved are freely accessible to the public, and EPPO has a section on its website with a list of its PRAs. He also noted that EPPO standards are recommendations to its members. In the circumstance that an NPPO or RPPO requires more information, they can request it. Likewise, observer RPPOs are welcome to attend the EPPO working party. He noted that there are many opportunities to react to proposed RSPMs. Meanwhile, he called attention to the fact that the responsibility to submit comments belongs to the NPPOs that are members of EPPO. In discussions on whether to involve other RPPOs in a formal way, EPPO decided not to do it as it would further complicate the process.

Mr. Piao remarked that the APPPC has a similar situation to EPPO. After last year's TC, the APPPC consulted and confirmed that the APPPC welcomed comments from outside on the

draft standards, which are available on the IPPC website (https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=apppc&no_cache=1&L=0). He indicated that if other countries or RPPOs want to comment on the draft RSPMs, they can. On the other hand, the RSPMs are focus of regional issues, and the APPPC normally aims to harmonize among members rather than with outside. So, RSPMs are more focused on regional concerns (only 8 RSPMs at present) and ISPMs are of global concern.

Ms Castro noted that it is important to know what each RPPO is working on, and it was suggested that the TC is the best forum for sharing this sort of information.

Appendix III

STATUS OF THE 2008-2009 WORK PROGRAMME OF THE TECHNICAL
CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS

Activity / Topic		Responsible body	Status
1	In 7.2 of the Business Plan, the TC suggested that “compliance” should be replaced by “implementation”, as agreed at CPM3.	Secretariat	Completed
2	Subjects for possible discussion at CPM4 to be present to the SPTA	Secretariat	Completed
3	Include RPPOs databases as an active avenue for reporting under the IPPC	Secretariat	In progress
4	Should NEPPO and CAFPSA enter into force during 2008/09, then they should be made aware of the requirements for recognition as RPPOs.	Secretariat	Pending
5	Increased involvement by RPPOs in regional workshops on draft ISPMs available for country consultation	all RPPOs	In progress
6	Possible increased involvement by RPPOs in the training of IPP editors if appropriate	all RPPOs	Ongoing
7	Emergency response and contingency planning – exchange	all RPPOs	RPPOs reported at TC-21; to be return to this issue at TC-22
8	Purpose and use of regional pest lists	all RPPOs	RPPOs reported at TC-21
9	Economic impact of plant protection programmes	NAPPO/PPPO	RPPOs reported at TC-21
10	Movement of germplasm	PPPO	RPPOs reported at TC-21
11	Electronic certification	All RPPOs	RPPOs reported at TC-21; further follow-up at CPM-5
12	IRSS – input from RPPOs on priorities seem in different regions. Secretariat to provide guidance to RPPOs	All RPPOs	Return to this issue at TC-22
13	Quarterly reminders to all RPPOs about the tasks to be undertaken in the work programme	IAPSC (or EPPO)	Completed
14	TC did not want the FAO Weed Risk Assessment work to be used as the basis for the forthcoming development of an ISPM on plants as invasive species as it was not appropriate	Secretariat	Taken into consideration
15	Establish a rotation for TCs for the next 5 years	21 st TC	Completed

Appendix IV

**WORK PROGRAMME OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION
AMONG RPPOS FOR 2010 – 2012**

Activity / Topic		Responsible body
1	Include RPPOs databases as an active avenue for reporting under the IPPC	Secretariat
2	Should NEPPO and CAPHSA enter into force, then they should be made aware of the requirements for recognition as RPPOs.	Secretariat
3	Increased involvement by RPPOs in regional workshops on draft ISPMs available for country consultation	All RPPOs
4	Possible increased involvement by RPPOs in the training of IPP editors if appropriate	All RPPOs
5	Emergency response and contingency planning – exchange	All RPPOs
6	Electronic certification	All RPPOs
7	RPPO input into the implementation review and support system in regard to ISPMs on pest reporting (EPPO) and the systems approach (NAPPO)	EPPO, NAPPO
8	Internet sales and the potential introduction of pests	All RPPOs
9	Developments for PRA, e.g. Climate change and pest introduction potential, PRATIQUE, invasive species, pathway risk analysis	COSAVE, EPPO, NAPPO
10	Management of preparations for TC-22 – periodic email communication to provide updates and reminders	EPPO/Portugal
12	Update regarding regional pest lists, provided that new information is available	All RPPOs
13	Provide NAPPO with a contact point for the E-certification steering committee by the end of 2009.	All RPPOs

Appendix V

22nd Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations 2010

Tentative Agenda

1. Opening of the Technical Consultation
2. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-chair and Rapporteur
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. [[Matters arising from the 21st TC-RPPOs]]
5. Review of RPPO activities (incl. organisation, regional standards, workshops) and this will also include specific feedback on RPPO activities to realize the goals of the CPM Business Plan as listed in:
 - 1.2 Standard implementation
 - 2.1 Implementation of information exchange as required under the IPPC
 - 3.1 Encouragement of the use of dispute settlement systems
 - 4.2 The work programme of the IPPC is supported by technical cooperation
 - 5.1 The IPPC is supported by an effective and sustainable infrastructure
 - 6.3 Efficient and effective communication between the RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat
 - 7.1 Regular examination of the overall strategic direction and goals of the CPM with the adaptation of programmes to reflect/respond to new and emerging issues
 - 5.1 APPPC
 - 5.2 CA
 - 5.3 COSAVE
 - 5.4 CPPC/CAFHSA
 - 5.5 EPPO
 - 5.6 IAPSC
 - 5.7 NAPPO
 - 5.8 OIRSA
 - 5.9 PPPO
 - 5.10 NEPPO
9. Status of CAFHSA & NEPPO
10. Secretariat update
 - a. Standard setting
 - 7.2 Information exchange
 - 7.3 Reporting through RPPOs
 - 7.4 Information exchange capacity building
 - 7.5 Capacity building
 - 7.6 Dispute settlement
11. Follow-up from CPM-5
12. CPM-6: Topics for an External presentation
13. [[CPM Business Plan – role/activities of RPPOs]]

14. TC among RPPOs Work plan for 2010 - 2012, including:

- 11.1 Current and emerging major pest issues
- 11.2 Developments for PRA, e.g. Climate change and pest introduction potential, PRATIQUE, invasive species, pathway risk analysis
- 11.3 Electronic certification
- 11.4 Emergency response and contingency planning – exchange
- 11.5 Internet sales and the potential introduction of pests
- 11.6 RPPO input into the implementation review and support system in regard to ISPMs on pest reporting (EPPO) and the systems approach (NAPPO)

12. Other Business

13. Date and location of next TC

14. Adoption of the Report of the 22nd TC-RPPOs

15. Closure

Appendix VI

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS

Participants	
<p>Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)</p> <p>Mr. Yongfan Piao Technical Secretary Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission c/o FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific Maliwan Mansion 39 Phra Atit Road Bangkok 10200 Thailand Tel: +66 2 2817844 - Ext. 268 Fax: +66 2 2800445 E-mail: Yongfan.Piao@fao.org</p>	<p>Comite de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE)</p> <p>Ms. Soledad Castro Plant Protection Division SAG – Chile Avenida Bulnes 140, Piso 3 Santiago Chile Tel: +56 2 3451454 Fax: +56 2 3451203 Email: soledad.castro@sag.gob.cl</p>
<p>European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)</p> <p>Mr. Nico van Opstal Director-General European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 1, rue le Nôtre 75016 Paris, France Tel.: +33-1 4520 7794 Fax.: +33-1 4224 8943 Email: vanopstal@epo.fr</p>	<p>Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)</p> <p>Mr. Jean Gerard Mezui M’Ella Director of AU/IAPSC P.O.Box. 4170 Nlongkak, Yaounde Cameroon Tel: (237) 22 21 19 69 Mob: (237) 94 89 93 40 Fax: (237) 22 21 19 67 Email: au-cpi@au-appo.org or jeangerardmezuimella@yahoo.fr</p>
<p>North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)</p> <p>Mr. Ian McDonell NAPPO – Executive Director 1431 Merivale Rd., 3rd Floor, Room 309 Ottawa, ON KIA 0Y9 Canada Tel.: +1-613 221 5144 Fax.: +1-613 228 2540 Email: ian.mcdonell@nappo.org</p>	<p>Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)</p> <p>Mr. Roy Masamdu Acting Executive Secretary Biosecurity & Trade Facilitation Officer Land Resources Division Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) Private Bag Mail Service, Suva Fiji Islands Tel.: +679 337 0733; 9258 Fax: +679 337 0021 Email: roym@spc.int</p>
Observers	
<p>Department of Crop Protection</p> <p>Komayombi Bulegeya Commissioner – Department of Crop Protection Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries PO Box 102 Entebbe Uganda</p>	<p>Phytosanitary Inspection and Quarantine</p> <p>Ephrance Tumuboine Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries PO Box 102 Entebbe Uganda Tel.: +256 414 320801</p>

<p>Tel.: +256 414 320115 Fax.: +256 414320642 Email: cepmaaf@gmail.com</p>	<p>Email: etumuboine@gmail.com</p>
<p>Department of Crop Protection</p> <p>Robert Karyeija Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries PO Box 102 Entebbe Uganda Tel.: +256 712985542 Fax.: +256 414320642 Email: robertkaryeija@yahoo.com</p>	
<p>IPPC Secretariat</p>	
<p>Ms. Melanie Bateman IPPC Secretariat Plant Production and Protection Division FAO 00153 Rome Italy Tel.: +39-06 5705 3071 Fax.: +39-06 5705 4819 Email: MelanieLynn.Bateman@fao.org</p>	