

REPORT OF THE 16th APPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON DRAFT ISPMs

(IPPC Workshop Asia, 2015)

October 19-23, 2015

Jeju Island, Republic of Korea



Summary

The 16th APPPC regional workshop on draft ISPMs, and the 10th hosted by the Republic of Korea, was opened by Mr Suhyon Rho, Director General of the Department of Plant Quarantine. After an update on the issues discussed at CPM 10, provided by the meeting Chair Dr Kyu-Ock Yim, the participants submitted comments on the first draft ISPM examined - Appendix to ISPM 20 on arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003). APPPC members agreed that draft should refer to the facilitation of trade only and because of this, some members found the reference to PRA in paragraph 9 confusing. The APPPC members present provided many comments on the restructuring of the document along and on amended and inserted text. Minor text amendments were proposed for the Draft ISPM: revisions to ISPM 15 (regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) Annex 1 and 2 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section of Annex 1 of ISPM 15.

The Chair of the IPPC Standards Committee, Dr Jan Bart Rossel, updated the meeting on recent Standards Committee issues including the need for a call for phytosanitary treatments and the difficulties with deciding how to deal with commodity standards.

Participants provided summaries of the surveillance work being undertaken in their countries. The work was recognized as considerable compared to that done a few years ago. Some cooperation and system sharing is taking place but the benefits could be much great if this

sharing was increased. Several countries made valuable contributions to the discussions on surveillance programmes. Australia provided an outline of the APPPC 6 year surveillance plan.

Regarding APPPC regional standards for phytosanitary measures, a modified standard setting system was suggested, using guidelines from the IPPC Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatments, for the development of a hot water treatment for mangoes. It was stressed that countries must submit data to the APPPC for this proposal to work.

The ePhyto programme was discussed at length. Dr Yim described the benefits of the hub-based information transfer system, the developments with resource acquisition and the upcoming Global ePhyto meeting in Incheon, Republic of Korea in November 2015.

Participants were informed of recent developments with the International Year of Plant Health. The aims, outputs and activities were outlined. The need for awareness raising with politicians was stressed giving rise to the proposed Ministerial CPM in 2020.

Report

1. Opening of the session

Participants introduced themselves.

1.1 Opening remarks of the organizer

Mr Suhyon Rho, Director General of the Department of Plant Quarantine welcomed the participants to the workshop. Korea has supported this workshop for 10 years now. Mr Rho thanked the FAO for their preparation of this workshop which provides the valuable opportunity for APPPC members to discuss the draft standards.

1.2 FAO opening statement

Dr Piao Yongfan also welcomed participants to the 16th APPPC workshop on draft standards. He stated that standard setting is a most important part of the work of the IPPC Secretariat and the APPPC's input into this work has been shown with the increasing influence of the comments from Asian and Pacific countries. The agenda this year includes draft ISPMs along with IPPC and APPPC business. The recent session of the APPPC has adopted a new work programme and aspects of this will be discussed at this meeting. The pilot surveillance long term plan was a significant aspect of this. Dr Piao noted that the Korean input into the surveillance programme has been significant over recent years with the assistance through a field project from Korea being most important in many of the achievements of the APPPC.

1.3 Introductory presentation on the objectives of the workshop

Dr Yim thanked Mr Rho for his attendance at this meeting. Dr Yim noted the development of the workshop over the last 10 years and how the workshop now offers a significant contribution to the work of the IPPC. The agenda of the workshop has been extended to cover the many issues of the APPPC work programme. Dr Yim thanked the SC members for their contribution to the work of the workshop.

1.4 Update on CPM 10 and current projects

The efforts of the region in the area of surveillance programme and the upcoming work on ePhyto were described by Dr Yim. In updating the meeting on developments on the IPPC, Dr Yim noted the appointment of the new Secretary Dr Xia Jingyuan. The June Bureau meeting has reviewed the comments on the evaluation of the Secretariat. Eight recommendations were submitted. One of particular importance was that on division of the structure of the Secretariat into two programmes – standard setting and implementation. Dr Ren Wang (FAO ADG) attended a part of the recent Bureau meeting and is working with the Bureau on this.

Participants were informed that the application to STDF for ePhyto funding has been approved. The global Symposium on ePhyto will proceed in November. The International Year of Plant Health is continued to be developed. It is likely that the 2017 meeting of the CPM will be held in Rep. of Korea.

Dr Yim noted that the funding for the IPPC is insufficient – the Multidonor Trust fund is much smaller than earlier years and some staff positions will be terminated because of this.

2. Administrative matters

2.1 Election of chair

Dr Yim was elected as Chair. Jenny Mai, Singapore was to operate the OCS system for the meeting.

2.2 Election of rapporteur

Dr Hedley was elected as rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of agenda

This was modified so the draft ISPMs were to be dealt with first. Then APPPC matters were considered. The Chair requested flexibility with the agenda matters depending on participant interest and the time available.

3. Analysis and discussion on draft ISPMs

3.1 Draft ISPM: Appendix to ISPM 20 on arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003) (Appendix XXX)

Dr Rossel introduced the draft with the power point presentation. This issue had been worked on since 2005. There has been many discussions and many meetings of small Standards Committee (SC) groups. This particular draft was developed by the SC in 2014 and 2015.

Participants made a number of basic points. It was stressed that the phytosanitary certificate is issued by the exporting country not the importing country. The IPPC does not stop countries from making an arrangement for pre-export inspection by an importing country. It was noted that an arrangement would be set up after the phytosanitary import requirements are established. Some countries found it confusing that the PRA and the pest risk management options, mentioned in para 9, may be described in the arrangement. This was thought by some participants as implying that the arrangement might be regarded as a phytosanitary measure. However, it was stressed in discussions that arrangement was voluntary (see para 7) and was only for facilitating trade logistics (see para 6 and the last sentence of para 13).

There has been ongoing disagreement as to the meaning and use of the term pre-clearance. This is why the term is not used in this document. The term and its definition are to be reconsidered by the Technical Panel for the Glossary.

Thailand – noted the lack of dashes or bullets in front of the lists in the draft document and suggested this be amended.

Japan – could not determine which section of ISPM 20 is referred to. Japan found the terms “audit” and “verification of compliance procedure” confusing. Other participants stated that an audit was a much more comprehensive check of systems compared to a compliance check.

Australia – stressed the points above and noted the requirement in the draft para 7 regarding the voluntary nature of the arrangement. Para 8 states how the procedure should take place – and there should not be additional checks. Para 13 states the arrangement should not be initiated to allow trade.

Participants discussed the nature of the document. It was stated that an Annex is prescriptive and contains technical detail; a supplement is also prescriptive but is more for describing a concept.

Therefore, according to Australia, this document is more of a supplement in nature. The Chair noted that if it is an Annex, then it would be more of a routine practice. Other participants favoured the idea that the document should be an appendix so that it does not have requirements. It was suggested that the document should be referred to within ISPM 20.

Para 6 – Japan noted that the document does not mention reduction of spread of regulated pests. Other participants felt the document to be concentrated on facilitation of trade and does not need to mention the reduction of spread of pests.

Para 7 – Singapore added an editorialfor a time period agreed by both parties.

Para 8 – it was agreed to add text....procedures again unless there are justifications... – to allow for additional checks in the importing country. It was also agreed to add a reference to ISPM 23.
–

Para 9 – It was agreed to an additionregulated articles or groups of regulated articles with similar requirements

Para 13 – Regarding the last sentence and whether or not it should be deleted - there was more discussion on the concept that the arrangement is for facilitating trade and is not a phytosanitary measure. There was agreement on this matter and the last sentence was kept.

Para 15 – It was agreed to remove ...the following typical ones: -as it was unnecessary.

Para 17 – It was agreed to delete this paragraph. Setting up an arrangement is not the way to deal with numerous non-compliances. Japan suggested adding – When measures in an exporting country are necessary and effective to reduce pest risk (e.g. insect egg, pathogen with a high risk of spread) rather than measures in an importing country. This was not agreed to as it was making the arrangement into a phytosanitary measure.

Para 20 – some participants found this was difficult to understand. It was suggested to change recondition to disinfest. However, it was agreed to replace the para with - When the importing country does not have the infrastructure to address any non-compliances regarding regulated articles. This was much clearer.

Para 21 – This was amended to basic conditions for an arrangement.

Para 23 – It was agreed to shorten this long paragraph to enhance clarity ...When developing an arrangementcountry, it should be developed through consultation jointly by the NPPOs of the exporting and importing countries. Japan suggested that “may” be used – but this was not agreed to.

Para 24 – Extra text was proposed by Australia to clarify when additional checks may be used:
“Reasons for additional checks or inspection procedures in the importing country may include:

- Checks on consignment documentation
- Inspection of consignments where packaging has been compromised and the consignments phytosanitary integrity may have been compromised
- Inspection of consignments for contaminant pests i.e. hitchhikers in containers

- Inspection of consignments due to an emerging pest risk not known at time of inspection in the exporting country
- Verification of compliance of a consignment for other than phytosanitary purposes i.e. chemical residues
- Inspection of consignments where an arrangement allows for a phytosanitary measure after offshore inspection has occurred i.e. in transit cold treatment for fruit flies.”
- Examination for other purposes - food safety
- Off shore inspection (eg cold treatment)

Japan suggested – When an arrangementminimal or procedures such as document or identity checks and scaling down inspection may be carried ... This was not agreed to.

Para 25 – Japan wanted ..may ... Other participants disagreed as this could imply that the arrangement does not require agreement by both parties.

Para 26 – It was agreed to amend the paragraph so it reads ...technical and operational details ...and that “scaling down” be replaced with “reducing the compliance verification measures”. Japan wanted to change the “should” to “may” but this was not agreed to.

Para 27 – Japan wanted to delete this. But it was agreed to retain it.

Para 32 – It was agreed to add to the 1st “and vice versa”. The sentence .. The Initiativeorigin. was deleted.

Para 33 – It was suggested that the section be entitled Examination of the proposal

Para 34 – it was agreed “pest mitigation measures” was added after pest risk concerns.

The NPPO receiving the proposal should examine the development of an arrangement and/ formalisation of an arrangement.

Re last sentence – Other factors that may be considered in the proposal include: para 35-38. – It was agreed to move this text to para 32 – being more appropriate in this section.

Para 36 – It was agreed to add “and quarantine pests” – to be in line with ISM 31.

Para 39 – It was agreed that this sentence be deleted – it is redundant.

Para 40 – agreed that it is deleted.

Para 41 – It was agreed that this be shortened – The NPPO proposing an arrangement has the primaryrequires the agreement of both NPPOs. This paragraph is to be moved to section 5 as para 53.

Para 44 – It was agreed for this to be changed to “inspection and sampling”

Para 45 – It was agreed to change this to Sampling and testing procedures.

Para 52 – and following section. After the chapeau, this section was rearranged under three headings – Administrative requirements, Operation requirements, and Compliance requirements. See Appendix XXXXX

Para 57 – It was agreed to delete “participating parties” as it is covered in paras 58 and 59.

Para 59 – It was agreed that this be modified to - approval system for growers and exporters

Para 63 – It was agreed to amend to - Required phytosanitary actions (such as sampling, inspection, testing

Para 64 – It was agreed to delete this because of the duplication.

Para 67 – let as financial aspects with no examples as different arrangements could have quite different costs involved.

Para 68 – This was amended to “regulated pest”...not quarantine.

Para 73 – This was agreed to be deleted as redundant.

Para 75 – It was agreed that this was moved to section 3 and modified. An arrangement may be subject to implementation conditions i.e. to all exported consignment of a particular commodity, categories of regulated commodities, defined time period during the shipping season etc – rest deleted.

Para 76 – It was agreed to delete this as the arrangement is voluntary to facilitate trade and would be resourced.

Para 78 It was agreed to remove from regularly to period.

Para 80 – deleted.

Para 81 – It was agreed to amend this - Normally, non-compliances would be dealt with by the same procedures as non-. compliances in the importing country. However, specific conditions as in original para 81.

Para 82 – It was agreed to remove last sentence as is not a phytosanitary measure. Shorten the first sentence to - Wheremay resolve issues and reinstate the arrangement.

Para 83 – It was agreed to change this o Conclusion of an arrangement.

Para 84 – remove last bracket and change to - the arrangement should be concluded.

Para 85 – deleted.

Para 86 – It was agreed to remove “downscaling” and last sentence and add “that have not the importing country’s phytosanitary import requirements” after seasons.

Para 87 – remove.

3.2 Draft ISPM: revisions to ISPM 15 (regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) Annex 1 and 2 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section of Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B)

China commented that the sulphuryl fluoride treatment was not effective in killing all pinewood nematodes at 20 degrees. The Chair suggested that any information available on this subject be submitted to the TPPT and reviewed. It was noted that this has a greenhouse effect. Methyl bromide is an ozone depleting chemical under the Montreal Protocol. Both chemicals have a greenhouse effect – but the effect of both is low.

Japan proposed that the extension provided for MBr treatment be applied to the sulphuryl fluoride treatment i.e. the piece below table 1 to be put under table 3 as follows – i.e. In circumstances when the minimum final concentration is not achieved after 24 hours, a deviation in the concentration of ~5% is permitted provided additional treatment time is added to the end of the treatment to achieve the prescribed CT.

Para 57 - There was some discussion on the point that the minimum temperature for this treatment on WPM is 20 degrees whereas it is 15 degrees for insects on debarked wood and 15 deg C is not effective against nematodes. It was proposed that this be changed The minimum temperature of the wood must be not less than 20 °C and the minimum exposure time must be not less than the time stated for each temperature.

Paras 59 and 72 - It was proposed that the “and” s in both tables were changed to “or”s.

Para 72 - Table 4 – second column – it was suggested that the term “dosage” be deleted.

Para 72 - It was noted that table 4, 30 and above, had different figures from the ISPM 28 annex nematodes table. This is a formatting error in the ISPM 28 annex.

Para 75 It was suggested that after table 4. 5th line, to remove “preferably”

Para 75 – there was a discussion of the terms “equilibrium” and “standard equilibrium”. Some participants did not use the latter term in their countries.

China proposed an additional sentence that stated that MeBr and sulphuryl fluoride are ineffective against nematodes.

Para 85 – it was suggested to use the same sentences as for MeBr

Para 86 – There was some discussion on this dashpoint - Instruments used for measuring sulphuryl fluoride may be affected by altitude, water vapour, carbon dioxide or temperature. These instruments need to be calibrated specifically for sulphuryl fluoride.

It was suggested to add - in accordance with the manufacturer's instruction.

It was also suggested that this dashpoint be amended with para 84 added here - Temperature and gas concentration sensors and data recording equipment are calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions at a frequency specified by the NPPO. For the purposes of auditing, the treatment provider keeps records of sulphuryl fluoride treatments and calibration for a period of time specified by the NPPO.

Para 87 – It was suggested that this be amended to ...must consult and follow the national label instruction...

4 Update on the Standards Committee activities

This was provided by the Standards Committee (SC) Chair, Dr Rossel. The SC is drafting standards on how to apply treatments – fumigation, heat treatments etc. This will be a significant contribution to the folio of standards. The Technical Panel for Diagnostic Protocols has 27 DPs under preparation. The November SC will consider what standards are to go to CPM. These include the drafts on growing media, the movement of wood and the host standard for fruit flies. The outcomes of the meeting on Commodity standards will be discussed in the November SC meeting. There will be 11 new topics to be evaluated - two are commodities, apples and tomatoes. The SC will look at the Standard setting procedures and the more recent changes. The SC will discuss whether or not there should be a call for phytosanitary treatments. The SC Chair thinks this is essential to enable the development of a comprehensive series of phytosanitary measures.

5 Experiences of countries in surveillance

The Chair introduced this subject – noting the programme of work included work on surveillance. The recent session adopted a six year plan to develop surveillance activities in APPPC countries.

Australia – the areas of work include pre-border, border, emergency response, post- border and information management. The Border surveillance strategy, Northern Australia Quarantine strategy Surveillance programme, National Plant Health Surveillance programme, Emergency response and the Regional programmes for exotic and established pests were discussed. The pre-border activities includes work with the near neighbours that facilitates surveillance activities. The border work concentrates on areas of greatest risk with a concentration on public

awareness. The emergency response activities are funded by the government. The regional programmes include management of pest free areas.

Regarding General surveillance – this consists of the usual public contributions and reference material and literature. The Information Management systems include the Australian Plant Pest Status Database.

Bangladesh – Delimiting surveys are conducted to delimit fruit fly free areas.

Cambodia – A pest survey was undertaken 2013-15. This developed an up-to-date pest list including crops such as rice and corn in both the rainy and dry seasons. Insects, pathogens and weeds were recorded. Recent surveys were for mangoes and cassava. New equipment and techniques are needed as are taxonomists. There is a lack of surveillance systems and sufficient finance. An action plan has been developed with the priority crops listed and training plans for surveillance methodology development.

China – Important pests include the quarantine pests and recently found pests. The national monitoring system includes some 3000 monitoring sites located at high risk places such as ports or market places.

Japan – the national network includes information sources (research institutes, universities, the general public, producers, scientific journals), MAFF and prefectural governments. Specific surveys include: surveys for the early detection of quarantine pests at sea or air ports etc; monitoring surveys for export; and monitoring surveys on pests by prefectures. Training programmes are instituted to achieve good surveillance practices. Diagnostic services are suitably technically equipped. The plum pox programme was briefly noted.

Indonesia – The supporting legal basis for surveillance was described. The types of pest surveys include: quarantine pest surveys – to determine the possibility of quarantine pest introduction; regular pest surveys – to determine the pest status of specific crops in an area at a certain time; and forecasting surveys - to estimate the likelihood of certain pest outbreaks. Surveys involve training, guideline production, the development of survey and reporting systems, data collection, data validation, and pest data sharing with other countries on request. Quarantine Pest surveys are conducted once a year, regular surveillance has surveys at least once a year or when required, pest forecasting twice a year.

Laos – determine what outbreaks there are in the country and neighbouring countries. Surveillance is conducted on rubber, rice, maize, water melon, cassava and banana. Specific surveys are undertaken on bamboo locust swarms.

Malaysia – General surveillance, with the production of technical documents, is conducted on export crops, industrial crops and food crops. Specific surveys are for mango seed weevil, Khapra beetle, *Parthenium* weed, *Bactrocera correcta*, rice pests, red palm weevil, papaya dieback and others. Brown plant hopper is the most important pest of rice that is surveyed for.

Red palm weevil is attacking oil palm and is difficult to control. A pheromone is used for detection. Banana wilt is monitored. There has been a detection survey on *Parthenium hysterophorus* that has to be controlled and eradicated. Current or upcoming work includes whitefly on basil and aquatic plants, *Parthenium* weed, pests of pineapple, jackfruit and papaya.

Myanmar – General surveillance is undertaken for the preparation of a pest list and is in line with ISPM 6. Specific pest survey programmes for pests of mango and pulses have been undertaken. In the future there will be surveillance on rice, maize, vegetables and fruits, and oil seed crops. The service needs financial assistance, expertise, taxonomists, molecular technology training and facilities.

Mongolia – Crops are surveyed once every three years. Grasslands can be affected by grasshoppers (130 species), forests by gypsy moth, crops by *Phytophthora infestans*, *Alternaria solani*, *Erwinia carotovora*, etc. Four hundred weed species are found in the major crops. Rodents are a major problem. Pests are controlled by domestic quarantine, international quarantine, and chemical pesticides. In the future, pest lists will be updated every year.

Nepal – general surveillance includes inspection and surveillance at 16 customs points. There are technical guidelines for surveillance of plant pests in natural and agricultural ecosystems. With specific surveillance, there are surveys for fruit flies and certain weed plants. The targeted pests for specific surveillance include: *Bactrocera correcta*, *B. cucurbitae*, *B. dorsalis*, *B. tsuneonis*, *B. zonata*, Citrus Huanglongbing (greening) disease, and *Xanthomonas campestris* pv.citri. Current pest surveillance is also undertaken for Gentian (*Neopicrorhiza scrophulariflora*), Chireeta (*Swertia chiraytia*), Prickly Ash (*Zanthoxylum armatum*), Soapnut (*Sapindus mukorossi*) and Asparagus (*Asparagus racemosus*). Future work includes work for PRAs on pests of lentil, apples, cabbage, tea, tomato, citrus, ginger etc. There are to be surveys on betel nut, pumpkin, chillies, cucumber, cauliflower, etc. Laboratory resources continue to be built up. Diagnostic protocols for quarantine pests are being prepared. An electronic plant pest surveillance network to stakeholders including growers from the NPPO is being developed.

Pakistan – surveillance is carried out at two levels – a Federal and provincial network of laboratories specializing on particular crops and Plant Protection Department (the NPPO) dealing with exportable commodities and their pests. At regional level there are provincial pest warning and monitoring systems. Specific surveillance is conducted in those crops which are prone to the serious economic damage by a complex of pests ie. cotton, citrus, mango, potato and vegetables. There is a farmer's surveillance system that is particularly useful.

Rice, mango, citrus and potato etc are exported but because of insufficient staff, the system is not effective. There are SOPs for different commodities with stakeholders. Exports are controlled which makes exporters work together with farmers. Now farmers conduct the surveillance and bring material to the department. The programme will be extended to vegetables. The best surveillance is to mobilize farmers to bring material to government diagnostic laboratories.

Philippines – The Nationwide Low Monitoring survey on mango pulp and seed weevil has achieved the setting up of pest free areas in 16 regions and 79 mango provinces. Identification of high and low risk provinces was determined based on their proximity to weevil-infested areas and the intensity of movement of agricultural commodities and travelers/ passengers at sea/air ports where there is high movement of agricultural commodities and travelers/ passengers. Mango production trees are mapped. MPW is present in Palawan. High risk areas have been identified and are inspected. A fruit fly monitoring system has been set up that includes a national surveillance system for the detection of exotic fruit fly species and monitoring of endemic fruit fly species in the Philippines, a data base and the establishment of appropriate phytosanitary regulations.

Republic of Korea – QIA has six regional offices which are responsible for their areas. The RDA undertakes some surveillance. General surveillance includes surveillance carried out by recognized growers, importers etc. QIA monitors for prohibited pests – shoot blight, fire blight, pinewood nematode and fruit flies at points of entry, orchards and wholesale markets. QIA is working with several SE Asia countries for surveillance training Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, Viet Nam and Nepal.

Singapore – Surveillance activities include a delimiting survey on Circular scale, *Chrysomphalus aonidum*, pest incursion and eradication plan of action guidelines, and the development of a high priority pest list register.

High priority pest register. Singapore has vegetable farms (conventional and vertical) and community and urban gardening (including roadside trees) that can have problems.

Thailand – The DOA has conducted a surveillance programme since 2007. This includes a detection survey for the production of a pest list and pest status. This work has involved: re exported plants – taro and pumpkin, and imported plants – and cassava. Upcoming work includes surveys on banana, marian plum, jack fruit, turf, dragon fruit, pineapple, melon, lemon, pepper, eggplant, soybean and cucumber. A further surveillance activity will include surveys for 16 pests.

Timor-Leste - Present work conducted is to determine national and regional biosecurity risks, to support claims of pest absence, to develop pest lists, to conduct eradication measures and to meet international reporting requirements. Specific surveillance includes surveys for exotic fruit flies and warehouse surveys for Khapra beetle. Current activities, many of these are in association with the DoA, Australia, include fruit fly surveillance, training, a joint plant health survey, remote microscopy diagnostics, surveillance information management system, the P-tracker project for field mapping, and specific surveillance exercises.

Viet Nam – General surveillance activities have been undertaken by the Plant Protection Research Institute over many years. Specific surveillance programmes have included work on nematodes on rice, mango seed weevil, cassava mealy bug, and harmful organisms of longan and litchi. Currently there are programmes on capacity development on plant pest surveillance

and information management and training on pests etc. Many diagnostic methods have been published.

Executive Secretary – Feedback

Noted that many programmes are commodity or pest based surveys and that upcoming programmes were impressive. At this time, countries have surveillance programmes compared to a few years ago. The idea of close cooperation between countries is taking hold but constraints still remain for many countries. Also, countries should think about integrating work into existing programmes. Where possible countries should share SOPs and protocols.

6 Pilot programme on surveillance and IPPC surveillance manual

Dr Rossel asked what countries wanted from this programme – countries could ask for material directly linked to their needs. The implementation pilot on surveillance includes: current resources (manuals, etc); the development of resources and tools; and a consideration of the revised ISPM 6.

Countries are encouraged to be involved by: contributing surveillance resources; promoting the importance of surveillance; reviewing national and regional priorities; and contributing funds to help support the pilot programme activities.

The Chair noted Korea's experience with fireblight. This included the destruction of 200 orchards in the infected area for which \$600mil was paid in compensation. The RDA did the major survey and undertook the destruction of trees. The emergency response protocol is to be revised. Eradication is not confirmed. There has been a large economic effect with great losses suffered by the specialist pear growers. The greatest challenge has been cooperation with domestic organizations.

With Malaysia, red palm weevil in oil palm has caused problems. There have been difficulties with cooperation between different ministries. There is a national committee on pest management involving some 30 agencies. Some agencies are not aware of ISPMs. There must be a national meeting of all agencies involved.

Pakistan mentioned a number of problems. There were fruit flies found in mango exports. A public private partnership was developed and material was allocated to farmers in one area. Farms were registered (which produced a price incentive). Farmers are cooperative to gain advice. This year there will be 170 farmers involved but there will with another condition added to the agreement – the farm must not be near an infested farm. This allows the development of PFAs. With this system the number of intercepts by importing countries on Pakistan exports has decreased markedly. There was technical support from Australia with trapping technology. This will be used widely this year.

Regarding citrus – exports were banned last year. Farmers have still not reached the mark set by the government. So the prohibition may be continued. Exporters are now investing in orchards. With potatoes, all exports are to be tested by an authorised laboratory. The involvement of the private sector in protection work has been most successful.

Nepal noted that cooperation between agencies has been limited. The NPPO is the Directorate of Plant Protection but the staff have no time for the surveillance programme. The NPPO needs staff and funds for surveillance. There is collaboration with NARC but they do not have time for surveillance.

Mongolia has scientists but they are in different agencies – but they manage to collaborate. Mongolia needs more modern equipment, along with more funds. The frequent change of government can lead to deficiency of funds. The rodent problem is very difficult. Greenhouse pests are also a problem. Border control is unsatisfactory so far.

It was noted that some countries have domestic crops as priority for surveillance whilst other countries have export crops as priority.

Philippines noted the presence of a phytoplasma in cassava. There is a prohibition on the movement of this planting material to other areas – but this has been difficult to implement.

Thailand note the interception of *Cercospora* on corn seed.

Industry and the public in Singapore have been discussing surveillance – and the public has said that there is no issue. However, being ASEAN, the authorities feel that the left over rubber trees in isolated areas should be monitored for SALB. Now it is known they are SALB free but there is a problem of resource availability in the future. It is suggested that a high priority pest list be developed. At the moment there is an incursion of Circular scale on citrus. This has not been eradicated and a delimitation survey is continuing. The resources for this work is severely limited. It was suggested that the position of Singapore as a hub means that authorities should attempt to keep Singapore as pest free as possible.

The existence of pinewood nematode in Jeju Island was described as a most difficult problem. The pest is spreading but the authorities cannot apply strong control chemicals as the island is a holiday island. Jeju Island also does not have a strong quarantine system – and this could be a big problem for the rest of Korea.

It was noted that Viet Nam also needs a surveillance programme. They wish to develop a list of RNQPs. Laos have not been able to control the bamboo locust.

7 Discussion on IPPC/APPPC related topics

7.1 Discussion on APPPC 6 year surveillance plan from the 29th Session

Dr Rossel mentioned the previous APPPC and IPPC meetings on surveillance. The Global Symposium promoted the development of manuals. This was followed by considerations on information collection to produce good records. Now this can be put into usable data bases. This has been linked to the IPPC implementation plan for standards. It is hoped that the work of the APPPC, as planned for the future, will act as a model for other regions. The 6 year plan was discussed. It contains a number of workshops: surveillance management systems; planning, coordination and delivery; information management systems; surveillance statistical analysis, mapping and intelligence generation; surveillance communication, reporting and response; and the establishment of PFAs.

The Framework for standards and implementation was discussed. It is proposed that future work includes contingency planning and the development of some pest protocols. Singapore proposed mango as a priority crop.

7.2 Discussion on APPPC regional standards from the 29th Session

It was noted that this region has developed regional standards that have become international standards. Mr Hancocks (Australia) discussed the development of phytosanitary treatments by the APPPC. A modified standard setting system was suggested. The use of guidelines for the submission and evaluation of information was discussed. Dr Rossel offered to provide guidelines from the TPPT for these functions. Dr Yim said that countries must submit data on the hot water treatment of mangoes to the APPPC for this proposal to work. It was suggested that the APPPC asks TPPT experts from the region to become involved in the evaluation of information.

The Commodity standards

Dr Yim noted the proposal by African countries for a grain standard. The movement of wood standard suffered a formal objection at CPM 10. The general concept of commodity standards is recognized as desirable by countries but the form and nature of such standards is not understood.

Dr Hedley noted some of the points brought up by the working group on commodity standards – both for and against the establishment of commodity standards. Dr Rossel then discussed the work of the Standards Committee in determining a list of priorities and the need for criteria for prioritizing submissions for commodity standards. The usefulness of manuals instead of standards needs to be considered. Dr Ha said that a standard on the movement of fruit could be developed and have annexes for different species.

8 Exercise on National Reporting Obligations (NROs): collection, verification and provision of information

The reporting requirements were noted. Dr Piao described the means of updating the country pages.

9 ISPM 15 Registration: updated table on situation of countries

The registration of the symbol by countries was noted. The IPPC Secretariat has put a great deal of effort into assisting countries to renew the registration of the symbol. The Chair described how the FAO Legal, via the IPPC Secretariat, can assist countries with registration of the symbol.

10 E-phyto update: request to be presented to the e-Phyto Steering Committee

Dr Yim introduced this topic. ePhyto certification provides a means of transmitting a secured data set using XML securely and electronically between NPPOs. eCert is a general term for veterinary or phytosanitary for food safety certification. ePhyto is the term for phytosanitary certification only.

Benefits include improved security, reduction in costs, the expediting of data transfer, and the improvement of inspection timing schedules. The system is compatible with “single window” systems.

The IPPC has requested funds from the STDF for the development of a hub and generic system. The IPPC Steering group is continuing to work under the oversight of the Bureau. Business rules for the hub are being developed. Critical components include the availability of a national system, the harmonization of data exchange, and an efficient electronic exchange system (hub). The hub is thought to be more effective than the development of bilateral systems.

The basic functionality of the systems were discussed. Where countries do not have their own system they could use the generic system. Then these systems can produce the ePhyto and transmit using direct exchange or a hub. A large country might have a number of bilateral systems but some smaller trading countries might not do this. It is suggested that all data is put on the hub and therefore there is no need to develop a number of bilateral systems. This process should be easier for developing countries and those with a smaller number of trading partners. The hub should reduce the work of setting up bilateral arrangements and will accelerate the use of ePhyto. The hub system is a voluntary system, provides good security and confidentiality. However, there is a cost for maintaining the hub. Also, participating countries will require a national system to exchange ePhyto data using the hub.

The current situation is: a generic system is to be developed; a pilot hub will be developed; a harmonized exchange protocol will be developed; a cost estimate is to be prepared; the financial resource will be developed; more harmonization of the message contents is needed (terms and codes); and there will need to be awareness raising exercises. STDF funds have been approved (\$1 million). This needs to be matched with further funds from countries. There will be a 2nd Global Symposium on ePhyto in Incheon, the Republic of Korea in November 2015. Korea is also funding a number (21) of participants plus supplying funds for some developing countries to attend. In the coming year the hub will need to be designed and a generic system developed. The hub and generic system will then have to be tested. There will be an update at CPM 11. OIE and Codex have stated that they are not ready yet to move ahead with the development of eCert so the IPPC is leading the way with ePhyto.

There is a separate IPPC ePhyto page <https://www.ippc.int/en/ephyto/> and <http://ephyto.ippc.int/>

The APPPC is continuing work in this area. Each year two countries will develop their ePhyto systems as assisted by Australia. This will take place over a period of three years and so involve 6 countries. The information gained on the systems that are developed will be shared amongst APPPC countries by means of a workshop. There will be a listing of all components of each country's systems and then the development of links to the hub.

11 Submission of formal objection; process and justification

Dr Rossel presented the power point material. The nature of formal objection was described and the type of justification that must be supplied. The formal objection should only be used if the country has had input throughout the development of standard but has not had its concerns addressed properly. The places of input during the standard setting process were noted. This was discussed by participants.

12 International Year of Plant Health

This exercise is primarily an awareness raising programme for plant health for hunger, poverty and threats to the environment. This is to take place in 2020. The aims are to support food security, protect the environment, facilitate trade, recognize climate change effects, support regional and national political support for plant health, and increase the resources for plant health. A number of outputs were outlined. Future activities include tool kit development, presentations at international meetings, resource mobilization, and work with FAO. A series of conferences will be developed. There could be ministerial level CPM meeting in 2020. A donor conference could be arranged along with more regional meetings. This whole programme will take careful arrangement. The matter was raised at the last conference. The proclamation of the IYPH will take time – to go through FAO Conference (2017) and the United Nations (2018).

The need for awareness raising with politicians was discussed. Basic documents explaining the work of the IPPC in its areas of activities are needed.

13 Closing session

Dr Yim closed the meeting at 12.30pm on Friday 23 October. Dr Piao thanked the participants for their input into the meeting – in particular into the valuable discussions on the draft ISPMs, surveillance systems and the APPPC programmes. He also thanked the Korean QIA for their successful hosting of the meeting noting the efforts of Dr Yim and Mr Baek. Dr Yim spoke for all the APPPC participants when she thanked Dr Piao for all his dedication and hard work over the last 12 years as Executive Secretary of the APPPC.

Agenda

Monday 19 October 2015		
Morning Session: 09:00 – 13:00		
Time		Facilitator
08:00-09:00	Registration of the participants	
09:00 -09:40	Opening of the session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcoming remarks of the organizer and introduction to the workshop - Host country opening statement Mr. No, DG, Rep. of Korea—welcome, 10 years since 2006 - FAO opening statement 16th-, ownership, capacity development, inputs to development of ISPMs, APPPC/CPM subjects - purpose of workshop - RPPO Presentation and updates 	Piao
09:40-10:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introductory presentation on objectives of the workshop - Update on CPM10 and current projects 	Yim
10:00– 10:30	Group photo Coffee break	
10:30-10:40	Local and logistical information and arrangements	Yim
	- election of Chair	Piao
	- election of rapporteur	
	- adoption of agenda	
Analysis and discussion on draft ISPMs		
10:40-13:00	- Draft ISPM: appendix to ISPM 20 on arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003) (Appendix XX)	SC members
13:00-14:00	Lunch break	
Afternoon Session: 14:00 – 17:00		
14:00-15:30	- Continue: Draft ISPM: appendix to ISPM 20 on arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003) (Appendix XX)	SC members
15:30-15:45	Coffee break	

15:45-17:00	- Continue: Draft ISPM: appendix to ISPM 20 on arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003) (Appendix XX)	SC members
Tuesday 20 October 2015		
09:00-10:00	Draft ISPM: revisions to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) Annex 1 and 2 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B)	SC members
10:00-10:30	Coffee break	
10:30-12:00	Experiences of countries in surveillance	Participants
12:00-13:00	continuation	
13:00-14:00	Lunch break	
Discussion on IPPC/APPPC-related topics		
14:00-15:30	Pilot programme and surveillance-IPPC; commodity standards-IPPC	Rossel, John
15:30-15:45	Coffee break	
15:45-17:00	Discussion on APPPC 6 year surveillance plan from Session 29	Rossel, Piao
Wednesday 21 October 2014		
Exercise on National Reporting Obligations		
09:00-11:00	Discussion on APPPC regional standards from Session 29	Piao
11:00-11:30	Coffee break	
11:30-13:00	ISPM 15 Registration: updated table on situation of countries.	Yim
13:00-14:00	Lunch break	
14:00-15:30	Submission of Formal Objections: process and justification	Bart, Yim, Piao
15:30-15:45	Coffee break	
15:45-17:00	E-phyto update: request to be presented to the e-phyto steering committee	Yim, Piao
Thursday 22 October		
09:00-16:30	Field trip Citrus museum	

Friday 23 October		
09:00-14:00	Exercise on National Reporting Obligations (NROs): collection, verification and provision of information	Yim, Piao
	WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement: update and comments	Piao
	Phytosanitary Resources Page and IPPC technical resources	Piao
	International Year of Plant Health	Yim
	Short introduction to the use of OCS	Piao
	Evaluation of Secretariat – report and discussion	Piao

List of participants

Australia

1. 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@agriculture.gov.au
bart.rossel@agriculture.gov.au

2. Mr. Bruce Hancocks
 Assistant Director
 International Plant Health Program
 Plant Health Policy
 Department of Agriculture
 GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 Australia
 Tel: 02 6272 3826
 Email: bruce.hancocks@agriculture.gov.au

Bangladesh

Mr Chabi Hari Das
 Director
 Plant Quarantine Wing
 Department of Agricultural Extension
 Khamarbari, Farmgate, Dhaka
 Bangladesh
 Email: chhabiharidas@gmail.com;
dpqw@dae.gov.bd
chhabiharidas@gmail.com;
dpqw@dae.gov.bd

Cambodia

Mr. OP Pich
 Deputy Director
 Department of Plant Protection Sanitary and
 Phytosanitary and IPPC Focal point

#54B, St. 271 Sangkat Tuek Laak3,
 KhanToukok Phnom Penh. Kingdom of
 Cambodia
 E-mail: op.pich@yahoo.com

China

1. Ms. LIU Hui
 Agronomist
 National Agro-Tech Extension and Service
 Centre
 Ministry of Agriculture, P.R. China
 No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street
 Beijing, 100125, China
 Tel.: +86 10 59194524, 13126816387
 Fax: +86 10 59194726
 Email: liu_hui@agri.gov.cn
liu_hui@agri.gov.cn

2. Ms. HUANG Jing
 Deputy Director
 Research Center for international Standard
 and Technical Regulation
 AQSIQ, P.R. China
 No.18 Xibahe dongli, Chaoyang District
 Beijing, 100028, China
 Tel.: +86 10 84603969, 13693268215
 Fax: +86 10 84603817
 Email: huangjing@tbtsps.com
huangjing@tbtsps.com

Indonesia

1. Mr. Hermawan
 Badan Karantina Pertanian (IAQA)
 Jalan Harsono Rm. No.3, Building E, 5th floor
 Ragunan, Jakarta Selatan 12550, Indonesia
 Email : hermawan1961@gmail.com
hermawan1961@gmail.com

Lao, PDR

1. Mr. Siriphonh Phithaksoun

Director of Plant Protection Center, DOA,
MAF

IPPC Official Contact Point

Tel/Fax: +856-21-812164

Mobile:+856-20-56879882

Email: syriphonh@gmail.com

syriphonh@gmail.com

2. Mr. Sitthiphone Phommasak
Technical Cooperation Unit, PPC

3. Mr. Vilosa Thalibouth
Technical Staff, PPC

4. Mr. Khamkerd Keobouathong
Head of International Border Check Point

Malaysia

Mr. Mokhtarud din bin Husain
Deputy Director (Plant Pest Management)
Plant Biosecurity Division
Department of Agriculture Malaysia
Jalan Gallagher
50632 Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia
Tel: 603-2697 7120/6019 667 4246
Mobile No: 6019-6674346
Email: mokh_zai@yahoo.com
mokhtarud@doa.gov.my

Mongolia

1. Mrs. Byambasuren Mijidsuren
Director of the Plant Protection Research
Institute
Zaisan-210153, Khan-Uulduuger
Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia
Tel: (976) 11 345212
Mobile: (976) 99264062
Fax: (976) 11 345212
Email: byamba0730@yahoo.com

Myanmar

Ms Su Mon Shwe
Deputy Staff Officer

Plant Protection Division
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation
Myanmar sumonshwe.ento@gmail.com

Nepal

Mr. Purushottam Lal Hada
Chief
National Plant Quarantine Programme
Hariharbhawan
Kathmandu, Nepal
Ph.no. 9841753833
Email: purushottamhaada@gmail.com;
chief@npqpnepal.gov.np
purushottamhaada@gmail.com

New Zealand

Dr. John Hedley
Principal International Advisor
International Standards Policy Branch
Ministry for Primary Industries
P.O. Box 2526, Wellington
New Zealand
Tel: 644 894 0428
Mobile: 64298940428
Fax: 644 894 0742
Email: john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz

Rep. of Korea

1. Dr. Kyu-Ock YIM
Senior Researcher
Export Management Division/DOP
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency
Tel : 82-31-420-7664
Fax : 82-31-420-7605
E-mail : koyim@korea.kr

2. Mr. Sang-Han BAEK
Assistant Director
Export Management Division/DOP
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency
Tel : 82-31-420-7665
Fax : 82-31-420-7605
Email : ignis@korea.kr

3. Ms. Ok-Kyoung JUN
Researcher

Export Management Division/DOP
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency
Tel : 82-31-420-7666
Fax : 82-31-420-7605
E-mail : plantclinic@korea.kr

4. Dr. Booja Lee
Researcher
Plant Quarantine Technology Center
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency
Tel : 82-31-202-6966
E-mail : bjlee94@korea.kr

Pakistan

Dr. Mubarik Ahmed
Director General
Department of Plant Protection
Government of Pakistan
Jinnah Avenue, Malir Halt
Karachi, Pakistan
Tel (Office): +92-21-99248607
Fax: +92-21-99248673
Email: gqtl_parc@yahoo.com
gqtl_parc@yahoo.com

Philippines

1. Ms. Merle B. Palacpac Chief Agriculturist
BPI – National Plant Quarantine Services
Division
3295 Maya St., Rhoda Subd., Anyos, Los
Banos, Laguna
Philippines
Tel: (02) 404 0409/524 3749
Email: merle.palacpac@gmail.com

2. Ms. Laarni Mary S. Roxas
Agriculturist II, BPI-National Plant Quarantine
Services Division
116 San Francisco, Magalang, Pampanga
Philippines
Tel : (02) 404-0409/524 3749
Email : imsoliman1981@yahoo.com

Singapore

1. Ms. Yap Mei Lai, Jenny
Programme Chief & Director

Plant Health Laboratory Department
Agri-Food & Veterinary Authority
Animal & Plant Health Centre
No. 6 Perahu Road
Singapore 718827
Tel: (65) 63165142
Fax: (65) 63161090
Email: yap_mei_lai@ava.gov.sg

2. Teo Shuan Hao
Senior Scientist
Plant Health Laboratory Department
Agri-Food & Veterinary Authority
Animal & Plant Health Centre
No. 6 Perahu Road
Singapore 718827
Tel: (65) 63165169/194
Fax: (65) 63161090
Email: teo_shuan_hao@ava.gov.sg

3. Ms. Ong Ai Khim
Senior Executive Manager
Import and Export Regulatory Department
Quarantine and Inspection Group
Agri-Food and Veterinary Authority
17Km, Sembawang Road, Lorong Chencharu,
Sembawang Research Station
Singapore 769194
Tel: (65) 67530658
Fax: (65) 67520170
Email: Ong_Ai_khim@ava.gov.sg

Thailand

1. Ms. Pornpimon Athipunyakom
Acting Senior Expert in Plant Pathology
Plant Protection Research and Development
Office (PPRDO)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 579 9582
Fax: 662 57909582
Email: pathipunyakom@gmail.com

2. Ms. Chonticha Rakkrai
Agricultural Research Officer, Senior
Professional Level

Plant Protection Research and Development
Office (PPRDO)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +662 579 8516
Fax: +662 579 4129
Email: rakkrai@yahoo.com

3. Ms. Watchreeporn Orankanok
Pest Management Expert
Department of Agricultural Extension
Paholyothin Road, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900 Thailand
Tel: +66 2579 3782
Fax: +66 2579 3798
Email: watchreeporn@yahoo.com

4. Ms. Ing-orn Panyakit
Standards Officer, Senior professional level
Office of Standard Development,
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity
and Food Standards (ACFS)
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +662 561 2277 #1452
Fax: +662 561 3357
Email: ingorn2011@gmail.com

5. Ms. Somrudee Rudeechoensakun
Standards Officer, Professional Level
Office of Standard Development
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity
and Food Standards (ACFS)
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +662 561 2277
Fax: +662 561 3357
Email: dora_am29@hotmail.com

Timor-Leste

Mr. Valente Quintao
Chief
Department of Plant Quarantine

National Directorate of Quarantine and
Biosecurity
DNQ B-MAP
Comoro, Dili, Timor-Leste
Tel: +670 77235284
Email: valente.quintao@gmail.com
valente.quintao@gmail.com

Viet Nam

Dr. Ha Thanh Huong
Standards Committee of IPPC
Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine Division
(PQD)
Plant Protection Department (PPD)
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural
Development (MARD)
149 Ho Dac Di – Dong Da – Hanoi, Viet Nam
Tel: (0084) 4 35 331 033
Fax : (0084) 4 35 330 043
Email: ppdhuong@yahoo.com
huonght.bvtv@mard.gov.vn
huonght.bvtv@mard.gov.vn

Japan

1. Kunihiro YAMADA (Mr.)
Section Chief
Plant Protection Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
(MAFF)
Tel: +81-3-3502-5978
E-mail: kunihiko_yamada@nm.maff.go.jp

2. Hiroaki SHIRATO (Mr.)
Plant Protection Officer
Research Division
Yokohama Plant Protection Station
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
(MAFF)
Phone: +81-45-211-7164
Email : shirato@pps.maff.go.jp

Major restructuring suggestions for Appendix to ISPM 20 draft

The proposed re-structuring of Section 3, 4 and 5 are as follows:

Proposed revised Section 3:

(21) 3. Requirements for an Arrangement

(22) The following requirements are applicable to all arrangements:

(23) An arrangement for allowing verification procedures for consignment to be performed in the exporting country should be developed through consultation between the NPPO of the importing country and the NPPO of the exporting country, respecting the general principles of the IPPC regarding the responsibilities of both NPPOs.

(24) When an arrangement is in place, minimal or no procedures should be carried out upon entry of the consignment in the importing country to verify compliance with phytosanitary import requirements. (25) The financial aspects of the arrangement should be agreed on by the NPPOs of the importing country and the exporting country.

(26) The arrangement should specify the technical details as well as the conditions for scaling down inspection levels and suspending or terminating the arrangement.

(27) The arrangement may have a limited time frame, in which case this should be specified. (28) The arrangement should be subject to regular review.

(new 29) (formerly 75) An arrangement may be applied to all exported consignments of a particular commodity, or to only a percentage thereof. It may be limited to a certain time period during the shipping season.

(new 30) (formerly 76) An arrangement should aim for the lowest possible intensity of activities to be carried out by the NPPO of the importing country.

(new 31) (formerly 41) The NPPO proposing an arrangement – though it works collaboratively with the other NPPO – has primary responsibility for the development of both new and revised arrangements. As with new arrangements, revision of existing arrangements requires the agreement of the NPPOs of the importing country and the exporting country before implementation.

(new 32) 4. Process for Establishing an Arrangement

(new 33) The steps that may be followed to establish an arrangement are outlined below.

(new 34) 4.1 Proposal

(new 35) The NPPO of the importing country may propose an arrangement to the NPPO of the exporting country. The proposal should be assessed by the NPPO of the exporting country to determine whether the proposed arrangement would meet the requirements of this appendix. The initiative to establish an arrangement may also come from the NPPO of the exporting country. Regardless of the origin, the proposal may be in response to a need identified by the initiating NPPO or by industry representatives.

(new 36) (formerly 33) 4.2 Evaluation Examination of the Proposal (Include paras from 4.4 i.e. 44 – 48 under Formalization; Rest under Formalization to be deleted -)

(new 37) The NPPO receiving the proposal should examine the proposal in a timely manner.

(new 38) Some elements of a proposal may need to be discussed before the full development &/ formalization of an arrangement. These may include:

- (formerly 44) The inspection & sampling of the consignment
- (formerly 45) The testing procedures
- (formerly 46) The verification of any treatment used
- (formerly 47) The verification of the consignment identity
- (formerly 48) The time & location of verification of compliance of the consignment
- (formerly 49) notification to the point of entry of the arrival of the consignment
- (formerly 50) assignment of qualified staff to implement provisions under the arrangement

- (formerly 51) timing of the activities for the verification of compliance; for example, before or after issuance of the phytosanitary certificate by the NPPO of the exporting country.
- (new 47) 5. Components of an Arrangement (Group para 55 - 76 into Operational, Administration and Compliance components)
- (new 48) (53) The technical requirements for an arrangement should be determined and developed on a case-by-case basis and should be described in the administrative, operational and compliance details of the arrangement.
- (new 49) Administrative Requirements (55, 56, 57, 59, 67 & 71)
- (new 50) (formerly 55) legal and regulatory authorities
- (new 51) (formerly 56) phytosanitary legislation or regulations
- (new 52) (formerly 57) participating organizations
- (new 53) (formerly 59) approved growers and exporters / Approval system for growers & exporters
- (new 54) (formerly 67) financial aspects
- (new 55) (formerly 71) frequency & timing of reviews of the arrangement
- (new 56) Operational Requirements (61, 62, 63, 64, 58, 60, 65 & 66)
- (new 57) (formerly 61) regulated articles
- (new 58) (formerly 62) regulated pests and the relevant phytosanitary measures for these pests required by the NPPO of the importing country
- (new 59) (formerly 63) phytosanitary actions (such as testing, verification of treatment and verification of consignment integrity)
- (new 60) (formerly 64) inspection, sampling and testing regimes or conformity inspection scheme of the NPPO of the importing country
- (new 61) (formerly 58) roles and responsibilities (including those of NPPOs, exporters and growers)
- (new 62) (formerly 60) duration of activities
- (new 63) (formerly 65) infrastructure and equipment
- (new 64) (formerly 66) documentation to be maintained and provided by the NPPO of the exporting country to the NPPO of the importing country
- (new 65) Compliance Requirements (68, 69 & 72)
- (new 66) (formerly 68) notification of quarantine pest detection or non-compliance (new 67) (formerly 69) corrective actions following non-compliance
- (new 68) (formerly 72) criteria that could result in suspension or termination of the arrangement
- Delete 70 & 73 – unnecessary
- (70- propose to delete) provisions to bilaterally consider the least costly and acceptable risk management measures to potentially salvage a rejected consignment (reason: voluntarily arrangement & hence should go for least
- (73- propose to delete) Any actions undertaken by the NPPO of the importing country in the exporting country under an arrangement are subjected to and must comply with the legislation of the exporting country.

(Regional comments on both drafts will be uploaded to the APPPC website and also be sent to all participants through email)