



REPORT

Expert Working Group Meeting on Revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of Pest Status in an Area*) (2009-005)

**Hanoi, Viet Nam
18-23 September 2017**

IPPC Secretariat

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2017

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	4
2. Meeting Arrangements	4
2.1 Selection of the Chairperson.....	4
2.2 Selection of Rapporteur	4
2.3 Adoption of the Agenda	4
3. Administrative Matters	4
4. Review of ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>)	4
5. Review of Specification.....	5
6. Development of the draft ISPM.....	5
6.1 Background papers	5
6.1.1 IRSS survey on ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area	5
6.1.2 Editorials errors tracking sheet.....	6
6.2 Discussion papers	6
6.2.1 Discussion paper: Information, evidence and uncertainty (prepared by USDA-APHIS) ..	6
6.2.2 Discussion paper: Current understanding of pest presence and revision of ISPM 8 (prepared by USDA-APHIS).....	7
6.2.3 Discussion paper (prepared by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency).....	7
6.2.4 Discussion paper (prepared by the Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources)	7
6.2.5 Comparing terminology (prepared by CABI)	8
6.2.6 Discussion paper (prepared by SENASA - Argentina)	8
7. Development of text for draft	8
8. Operational and Technical Implementation Issues and Possible recommendations (task 18)	15
9. Next Steps.....	16
10. Other business.....	16
11 Close of the meeting	16
APPENDIX 1: Agenda.....	17
APPENDIX 2: Documents list.....	19
APPENDIX 3: Participants list	20

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] Mr Brent LARSON, Standard Setting Team Lead of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat, opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the Expert Working Group (EWG) on the revision of the International Standard on Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) 8: *Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005).
- [2] Mr Nguyen Quy DUONG, Deputy Director-General of the Vietnamese Plant Protection Department, welcomed all participants to Hanoi and to Viet Nam. He expressed his pleasure to support the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter “Secretariat”) by co-organizing the meeting, as this was a means to enhance collaboration between the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) and the IPPC Secretariat. He highlighted the importance of accurate pest status as one of the basis for appropriate and effective phytosanitary measures. He wished a fruitful meeting and encouraged the experts to complete successfully their task.
- [3] The participants introduced themselves briefly.
- [4] The Secretariat made a presentation on the IPPC vision and mission, the governing bodies, and the standard setting process. The Secretariat outlined the work of the Standards Committee (SC) and of the EWG explaining the roles of the participants. It was mentioned that the outcomes of this meeting will be presented to the SC in their May 2018 meeting for approval for first consultation. The Secretariat also highlighted the links that ISPM 8 has with other ISPMs, for example ISPM 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*) currently being revised, and ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*).

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

- [5] Ms Christina DEVORSHAK (USA) was selected as Chairperson.

2.2 Selection of Rapporteur

- [6] Ms Anne Sophie ROY (European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)) was selected as Rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the Agenda

- [7] The EWG adopted the agenda ([Appendix 1](#)).

3. Administrative Matters

- [8] The Secretariat introduced the documents list ([Appendix 2](#)) and the participants list ([Appendix 3](#)). It was noted that the expert from Dominica was unable to attend due to force majeure.
- [9] The local organizers introduced the local information document¹ and provided an update about the field trip on 23 September 2017 to the Plant Quarantine Office in Hai Phong and the Ha Long Plant Quarantine Check Point.

4. Review of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*)

- [10] The Steward introduced the current ISPM 8². She mentioned that the revision of the existing standard had been considered necessary as new information was available, experience with implementing the standard had been gained and some problems with its implementation had arisen. She outlined the scope of the existing ISPM 8, highlighting that the main goals are the quality of pest reporting and the reliability of information. She also noted the definitions, not only the ones in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of*

¹ 04_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep

² ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/612/>

phytosanitary terms), but also the ones in the ISPM 8, such as “*pest status*” and “*pest records*” and therefore invited the members to consider them.

- [11] The Steward pointed out the differences in responsibilities between the importing and exporting countries, as this may need to be further differentiated. She highlighted the need to clarify the concept of “transience”, either keeping the term or not. She also mentioned the need to clarify general and specific surveys within the ISPM 8, noting the links with ISPM 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*), as they may influence trade.
- [12] The Steward also mentioned that, one important concept in ISPM 8 is the presence or absence of a pest in an area, noting that pest presence is based on scientific evidence which includes both taxonomic identification as well as detection tools. Consequently, the ability to detect an organism varies with the quality and specificity of the detection tool(s). Thus, she also pointed out that lately, highly sensitive diagnostic techniques are being developed by using sophisticated molecular or other techniques; however, these detections may not be associated with evidence of living pests or the establishment of the pest, therefore, this needs to be considered carefully.

5. Review of Specification

- [13] The Steward introduced Specification 59³. She mentioned that one of the reasons for a revision of ISPM 8 was that it was adopted more than 18 years ago, and that new information is available (e.g. pest risk analyses and pest free areas) and additional ISPMs have been adopted (e.g. ISPM 11. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*), ISPM 17. *Pest Reporting* and ISPM 26. *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). The Steward recalled the scope and purpose of the revision of ISPM 8, where it mentions that the ISPM 8 describes the content of a pest record and its use, the use of other relevant information, the description of pest status categories, and that it is not concerned with reporting obligations but with the quality of the reported information.
- [14] The EWG went through the tasks outlined in the Specification.

6. Development of the draft ISPM

6.1 Background papers

6.1.1 IRSS survey on ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area*

- [15] The Secretariat introduced the papers⁴ and presented the main results from the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) survey conducted in 2011 on the review of the implementation of ISPM 8⁵. It was mentioned that in this survey, the IPPC contracting parties identified ISPM 8 as one of the most essential ISPMs. Approximately two thirds of contracting parties⁶ responding to the questionnaire rating their implementation of ISPM 8 as partial, and a third indicated that they had totally implemented the standard. Only very few indicated that they had not implemented the ISPM at all. Some reasons why contracting parties have only partially or not implemented ISPM 8 include issues associated with human and financial resources, operational aspects, access to information, policy and legislation, coordination and communication.
- [16] The Secretariat summarized the feedback received from contracting parties on how to improve ISPM 8, which included the following:
- Access to publications and databases is limited, therefore publishing institutions should notify NPPO's on updated pest statuses.
 - Revision of terminology: pest, pest status and presence.

³ [Specification 59. Revision of ISPM 8 \(Determination of pest status in an area\)](#)

⁴ 12_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep and 13_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep

⁵ IRSS Survey - ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area: <https://www.ippc.int/en/irss/activities/21/>

⁶ As per August 2017, the IPPC has 183 contracting parties.

- Clarification on terminology (e.g. “present under eradication”, “transient under eradication”, “present at low prevalence”, “seasonally” and “only in some areas”).
- Inclusion of capacity building aspects for contracting parties.
- Inclusion of lists of taxonomic experts and identification keys.

[17] Contracting parties comments from IRSS general surveys⁷ on the implementation of the Convention’s provision for pest status, are summarized below:

- Contracting parties’ stated that pest status information is available in different ways, including lists of pests and individual pest statuses for regulated pests of economic significance on national websites, lists on the international phytosanitary portal (IPP) and generation of awareness material.
- Several contracting parties were aware that they were not undertaking this obligation to the best of their ability and intend to improve adherence in accordance with ISPM 8 in the future.
- Some contracting parties reported that they do not develop pest status information at all due to insufficient financial and human resources to perform this activity, including surveillance, pest diagnostics and formal reporting of pest status.

[18] The Secretariat informed the EWG that the development of a manual providing guidance to help contracting parties to implement ISPM 8 is on the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) of the IPPC Secretariat’s work plan, and it is expected that work on the manual would start in December 2017. One EWG member queried how the manual would be developed before the revision to ISPM 8 had been adopted. Some other members also expressed concerns on this issue, as it could lead to manuals being out of sync with adopted ISPMs, which may lead to discrepancies between the standard and guidance material. It was explained that the implementation programme needs to continue, and that the Implementation Committee (IC) will meet in December 2017 and this issue on alignment with the work of the SC will be discussed.

6.1.2 Editorials errors tracking sheet

[19] The Secretariat presented the paper⁸ outlining submission of errors and editorials that had been identified and recorded over the years. The EWG noted these and agreed to try to address them in the revision. It was noted that some of the points identified had already been addressed when ink amendments had been incorporated and adopted by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).

6.2 Discussion papers

6.2.1 Discussion paper: Information, evidence and uncertainty (prepared by USDA-APHIS)

[20] Ms Christina DEVORSHAK introduced the paper⁹ which outlined the levels of uncertainty associated with evidences in the framework of pest risk analysis (PRA). It was emphasized that gathering, analyzing, and documenting information and evidence is central to several core activities undertaken by National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), as for example the determination of pest status in an area, determination of hosts of pests, establishment of pest free areas (PFA), areas of low pest prevalence (ALPP) and the establishment of surveillance programs, and in the implementation of several ISPMs.

[21] A detailed explanation was given on the uncertainty associated with the available evidence, and how uncertainty can be evaluated in relation to its reliability. The EWG agreed that elements on reliability of sources of information from the paper would be suitable for inclusion in the draft standard.

⁷ [Link to IRSS 2016 IPPC General Survey](#) and [link to IRSS 2012 IPPC General Survey](#)

⁸ 05_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep

⁹ 06_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep

6.2.2 Discussion paper: Current understanding of pest presence and revision of ISPM 8 (prepared by USDA-APHIS)

- [22] Ms Marina ZLOTINA introduced the paper¹⁰ which outlined the issues when pest presence was based on highly sensitive detection tools. She noted that the ability to detect an organism varies with the quality and specificity of the detection tool(s). A problem arises with reporting a pest presence, when NPPOs use detection tools that have different levels of sensitivity for the same pests, even though with methods are internationally recognized.
- [23] The EWG noted that this issue is highly linked with Next Generation Sequencing (NGS, also referred as High Throughput Sequencing (HTS)), and may be outside of the scope of the work of this EWG. One member pointed out that this may have a stronger link with ISPM 17 and that the SC should carefully consider this as these highly sensitive tools are being developed and that they can detect sequences of organism that may not cause disease, i.e. may not be pathogenic.

6.2.3 Discussion paper (prepared by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency)

- [24] Mr Robert FAVRIN introduced the paper¹¹ outlining the links that pest status has with surveillance. He noted that the pest status categories need to be clearly defined but also to describe the obligations with respect to surveillance, i.e. maintaining accurate pest records and reporting. He also pointed out that the validity of the pest records is important and noted this is currently not addressed in ISPM 8 and thus, guidance should be added. He also stressed that pest absence declaration should be made through surveys, and guidance on this issue should also be provided.
- [25] Regarding the category “transient”, he outlined that this term is not widely used in adopted ISPMs. He mentioned that it is used once in ISPM 11, twice in ISPM 17 and three more times in ISPM 26.
- [26] Regarding task 15 of the specification 59, where it asks the EWG to discuss the influence of a pest interception on the pest status, Mr Favrin expressed concerns that the incorporation or use of interception data in pest status could cause significant confusion and undue negative effects on trade. He mentioned that interception data should not directly influence the pest status in a country and should not be considered when revising ISPM 8. Other member supported this, as in some cases, the country of origin of the pest may be incorrectly identified, as interceptions may be done under strict time constraints. Another member noted that this frequently happens as some countries do not really know what pests are present in their country. It was noted that, if the diagnosis is clear and solid, this will help to determine the pest status. The EWG agreed to discuss interception data further.

6.2.4 Discussion paper (prepared by the Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources)

- [27] Ms Wendy ODGERS introduced the paper¹² mentioning that the EWG should consider including a table listing each of the categories of potential pest status determinations. She also mentioned that the table could include a definition for each category of pest status and references to relevant ISPMs, with the aim to align the terminology. She also provided some proposals for the words “widely distributed” and “not widely distributed”. It was also pointed out that there is a need to clarify the reliability of pest records, specifically for old records, secondary references and records missing critical information. The EWG agreed to consider this in the revision.
- [28] She also highlighted that references in the current appendix to ISPM 8 are out dated and should be left out from the revision of the ISPM, suggesting that it could be included in guidance material, for example a manual on pest status. The EWG unanimously agreed with this proposal (see also task 16 below).

¹⁰ 07_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep

¹¹ 08_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep

¹² 09_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep

6.2.5 Comparing terminology (prepared by CABI)

- [29] The invited expert, Ms Lucinda CHARLES, introduced the document¹³ outlining some comparison of the pest status categories used in ISPM 8 and the pest status/situation categories used by CABI Crop Protection Compendium, CABI Distribution Maps of Plant Pests and EPPO, along with the frequency of use of each of the categories.
- [30] Ms Charles highlighted that reliability is a key issue for pest records and for CABI. Therefore, some guidance is needed on how to deal with conflicting information. She suggested having clearer and shorter list of categories, with subcategories as supplementary information.

6.2.6 Discussion paper (prepared by SENASA - Argentina)

- [31] Mr Pablo CORTESE introduced the document¹⁴ which outlined the need to clarify the expression “documented evidence” as not all documented evidence is equally reliable. Therefore, it is necessary to establish the reliability level of each piece of evidence. He also mentioned that there are lists published in international databases showing “pest status” or “pest presence”, and that in some cases the information has not been verified by the NPPO. Thus, he also outlined the need to clarify the links of pest records with ISPM 6, hence “pest record” under ISPM 8 states that it is explained in ISPM 6. Thus it may not be necessary to also explain it in ISPM 8.
- [32] Regarding reliability of information, he pointed out the need to clarify that a pest record is an individual observation made in a certain time and space. Each pest record should be evaluated to define if it can support the determination of the pest condition in an area - all by itself or together with other existent pest records or available information. Some suggestions were provided and the EWG agreed to consider this further in the revision.

General comments

- [33] Ms Kyu Ock YIM suggested having a pest status category as “unknown” or “undetermined” for those situations where the pest presence cannot be confirmed by surveillance, or that cannot be confirmed because there are no surveillance activities being undertaken by the NPPO. She also suggested in having a link between “pest status” and “quarantine pest” with explanations on how to regulate them. She explained that some countries face difficulties with the terminology “cosmopolitan pests” and “worldwide pests” and did not understand how they would regulate them, as in most cases they are not regulated. However it was noted that some countries do regulate them. Therefore, she suggested in having some guidance on this matter. Some members pointed out that this is more related to pest risk analysis (PRA) rather than pest status determination.
- [34] Regarding “pest presence”, Ms Kyu Ock noted that in the current ISPM 8, simplification is needed, and that the “transient” category needs to be more precise, outlining which cases the NPPO could regulate them as quarantine pests. She also suggested that the revision of ISPM 8 could provide guidance on how to use “interception data”, noting that the absence of data and the quality of the information are essential for the reliability of the determination of pest status.

7. Development of text for draft¹⁵

- [35] Review the consistency of information in ISPM 8 with that in other relevant and subsequently adopted ISPMs (task¹⁶ 1). The EWG noted that ISPM 6 has strong links with ISPM 8, as well as with other ISPMs, for example ISPM 17 and ISPM 26 (see also task 20). Hence surveillance is a crucial activity for the determination of pest status in an area, the EWG aligned the revision of ISPM 8 to the draft ISPM

¹³ 10_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep

¹⁴ 11_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep

¹⁵ For reference: IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/development-standards/>

¹⁶ Tasks referenced are from Specification 59

6 on *Surveillance*, which is currently under revision, to ensure consistency between the two as they are interdependent.

- [36] Regarding “pest record”, the EWG added general information and made some adjustments, as the draft ISPM 6 now calls it “surveillance record”, noting that the draft ISPM 6 states that “surveillance record” includes “pest record”.
- [37] The EWG also agreed to add information, in the background section, that pest records and pest status are also used by NPPOs in pest reporting; therefore, making the appropriate link with ISPM 17.
- [38] Review the existing pest status categories in ISPM 8 and propose new categories if appropriate, specifically the category “transient” (tasks 2, 3 and 4). The EWG reviewed the pest status categories of the standard and agreed there should be only two main categories: “absent” and “present”, which would also align better with the current definition of “*pest status*” in ISPM 5, in which they felt it suffices. The EWG also agreed that there was no need to revise the previous category “transient” as it was no longer retained but this meant that pests previously considered as “transient” would now be included under categories describing presence.
- [39] The EWG agreed that each of the new pest status categories should be accompanied by a clear description, i.e. make the text more prescriptive to provide better guidance to countries. Therefore, the EWG provided further guidance for each pest status category describing the “presence” or “absence” of a pest, in the form of a short description with a reference to relevant ISPMs (whenever appropriate) that are associated with the pest status category. The EWG agreed to put this guidance in two tables (one for “present” and the other for “absence”), as it was deemed more comprehensive for the NPPOs and to avoid overlaps in the category descriptions (see also tasks 7 and 8).
- [40] For “present”, the EWG agreed to a total of seven categories, as follows:
1. Present: widely distributed
 2. Present: not widely distributed
 3. Present: not widely distributed and under official control
 4. Present: at low prevalence
 5. Present: except in specified pest free areas
 6. Present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites
 7. Present: but not expected to establish.
- [41] For “absent”, the EWG agreed to a total of seven categories, as follows:
1. Absent: pest not recorded
 2. Absent: pest free area (entire country)
 3. Absent: pest records invalid
 4. Absent: pest records unreliable
 5. Absent: pest no longer present
 6. Absent: pest eradicated
 7. Absent: intercepted only.
- [42] In the discussions, the EWG stressed that a pest is “absent” only if surveillance and other information indicate this. So, when a NPPO cannot provide such objective information, the pest status may be “undetermined”. This guidance was included in the draft standard.
- [43] The EWG discussed at length the current pest status “transient”. One member queried for how long a pest could remain with the status of “transient” as it was not clear in the current standard and causes a lot of confusion when considering global pest distributions. Another member queried if “transient” was more related to the information that the NPPO was aware of rather than the true state of distribution of the organism. The EWG noted that “transient” is a temporary condition and agreed that a new category under the status group Present, “Present, not expected to establish”, should be added to cover this concept. It was recalled that the definition for “transient”, as related to pest status in ISPM 5 is when a pest is present but establishment is not expected to occur. Thus, when doing a PRA, when the pest status

“transient” is declared, it would be considered as present. The EWG agreed that the circumstances that may lead to the establishment of a pest, as referenced in task 4 of the specification 59, do not fit within the scope of ISPM 8. If additional guidance is required in relation to “transience” and circumstance that may lead to the establishment of a pest, then it would be more appropriate to include this in ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) rather than ISPM 8.

- [44] Regarding the review of “transient: actionable, under eradication”, the EWG agreed that, eradication is an objective and not necessarily a certainty while in progress. Again, the EWG reiterated that transient is a condition that it is still being determined, and that the pest status should indicate it is “present”. Therefore, the EWG agreed that “transient: actionable, under eradication” was covered by “under official control”.
- [45] Review and update terms (task 5). The EWG discussed terminology to be used in the draft standard and agreed that “transient” was indeed a temporary pest status for “present” (see discussions above) and that the current definition of “*pest status*” in ISPM 5 suffices and that there was no need for it to be revised. Regarding the definition of “outbreak” in the current ISPM 8, the EWG deemed that the definition from the one in ISPM 5 suffices.
- [46] The EWG agreed that it was not necessary to propose new definitions to be included in ISPM 5 on any of these terms as the existing guidance on “pest status”, “outbreak” and “transience” were adequate.
- [47] Pest status for pests in relation to specific host commodities (where the pest is present only on specific hosts) (task 6). The EWG discussed this task and decided that this should be part of the PRA process when evaluating the risks associated with the host, and felt that it was not necessary to explain it in this standards nor did it need a specific category. Though, the EWG agreed to insert in the draft standard that, in some cases, additional information about pest presence may be useful when the pest has been reported on specified hosts.
- [48] How to combine the qualifications associated with pest status categories under “present” (task 7). The EWG agreed that the new pest status categories should be clearly described, i.e. make the text more prescriptive to provide better guidance to contracting parties. For the pest status “present”, the EWG reviewed the current categories and proposed new ones. The EWG agreed to a total of seven categories to describe the presence of a pest in an area (see also tasks 2, 3 and 4).
- [49] For the category “present: not widely distributed and under official control” the EWG noted that official control is linked with pest distribution. Therefore, the EWG agreed that the category “present, under official control” is a subset of “present, not widely distributed”, as a NPPO will not have official control for a widely distributed pest – these two categories were combined.
- [50] Regarding “present: at low prevalence”, the EWG agreed that this category of pest status should be kept in the draft ISPM. The EWG added some description to provide better guidance to countries and also made the link with ISPM 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*).
- [51] For “present: except in specified pest free areas”, the EWG agreed to keep this category as it was deemed relevant. The EWG discussed whether an entire country would fall under this category and after some discussion, the EWG agreed that in the case where an entire country has a pest free status for a particular pest, then indeed it would fall under the categories describing absence.
- [52] In regards to “present: only in protected cultivation” in the current ISPM 8, the EWG discussed what this category implies (see also tasks 9 and 10). Some members mentioned that it meant that a pest would not survive outdoors, noting however that this would not be a matter of physical barrier or containment, but a matter of not having the ability to survive. The EWG noted that this concept of “protected cultivation” is too broad. One member mentioned that maybe this concept applies to regions in which climatic conditions allow well defined seasons (e.g. temperate regions). One member stressed that protected cultivation is not the same as a quarantine facility, and queried the possibility of a pest being able to spread to nearby crops during summer, i.e. favorable conditions for the pest. One member explained that, for PRA, a pest category “only in protected cultivation” would not make a difference, as the pest would still present a potential risk. Therefore, the EWG agreed to remove the category “protected cultivation”, but guidance was included in the draft ISPM to outline that this can be a special situation.

- [53] The EWG also agreed to remove the current category on “present seasonally”, because seasonality is not relevant for determining pest presence, but rather related to prevalence. Guidance was also provided in the draft ISPM for when a pest may be present only at certain times of the year, as the word “seasonally” does not necessarily apply for tropical areas, and that it is more related to certain environment conditions rather than seasons. Again, the EWG felt that the category “only in protected cultivation” and only in “protected cultivation” were more relevant when conducting PRA rather than when determining pest status in an area.
- [54] For “present: under eradication” in the current ISPM 8, one member queried about the differences between “containment” and “eradication” because there is an expectation that extra phytosanitary measures are needed in the case of “containment of a pest”. One member pointed out that the pest status category “under eradication” may need to be changed to “under containment” for cases when eradication was no longer expected to be successful. Another member outlined that this category “present: under eradication” was very important for trade purposes, but did not necessarily describe a pest status *per se* and it was felt that “under eradication” was covered under the category “under official control”. Thus, the EWG agreed to remove the category “present: under eradication”.
- [55] Regarding the category “present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites”, the EWG felt it was necessary to include it in the draft ISPM as a new category because this is another form of a pest free area and relates to ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*), noting this should be explained in the pest status description.
- [56] For the newly added category “present: not expected to establish”, the EWG had in depth discussions and noted that it would be a temporary status. It also noted the fact that if a pest is not expected to establish this does not mean that it may not cause damage while being present (see also tasks 2, 3 and 4). The EWG recalled the ISPM 5 definition for “*transient*”, highlighting that “transient” still indicates that the pest is present. The EWG agreed that this category would also cover situations in which the pest is not expected to establish due to its biology and environment ecology, as well as due to an action being undertaken (such as measures being applied during an outbreak in a PFA). Therefore, the EWG agreed that such a category should be included in the draft ISPM to cover the concept of “transience” and other situations as outlined in the pest status description (e.g. phytosanitary measures being applied during an outbreak in a PFA).
- [57] How to determine pest absence when only very old pest records, not confirmed by further surveillance, are available (task 8). The EWG felt that this was intrinsically related to the reliability of the information. As additional guidance was provided on the reliability of information resources (table proposed in the draft standard) (see also tasks 12 and 14), and that the EWG had agreed on the absent categories “absent: records invalid” and “absent: pest records unreliable”, the EWG felt this task was covered.
- [58] Pest status in the particular situations where a pest is present only in collections of living organisms (e.g. botanical gardens) and for plants that are grown or kept under protected conditions (e.g. in a greenhouse) only, and for which the NPPO has determined cannot survive outdoors in the area (tasks 9 and 10). The EWG had several discussions about whether a pest should be categorized as present if only present in botanical gardens or in greenhouses (see also task 7 and discussions on “present: only in protected cultivation”).
- [59] The EWG noted that for collections of living organisms such as botanical gardens, some pests are only present in such locations normally on specific hosts, because their host plants are not grown anywhere else. The EWG also noted that plants can be pests. Regarding what is preventing these pests from escaping from these collections or botanical gardens, the EWG could not really address the reasons but felt there was often some type of containment. Therefore, the EWG agreed to insert text in the draft ISPM that under in some cases, when pest presence is being reported under limited specific conditions, additional information about the pest presence would be useful. This concept on having “additional information about pest presence” was also extended to specified hosts, enclosed structures (including botanical gardens), soil and water, and times of the year.

- [60] The EWG also noted that collections of living organisms can include pests for research or diagnostic purposes. Additionally, to avoid the misinformation of having an entire country reporting the presence of a pest because the pest is only in such locations, the EWG agreed that such pests that are under contained conditions for research or diagnosis purposes were outside the scope of the draft ISPM. The scope section of the draft ISPM was modified accordingly.
- [61] Provide recommendations on the meaning and use of phrases such as “finding of a pest”, “pest is not known to occur”, “pest known not to occur” and “worldwide distributed”, which are often used in pest reports (task 11). For the phrases “finding of a pest”, “pest is not known to occur”, “pest known not to occur”, the EWG felt they were complex cases and not used very often. The EWG noted that these phrases are mostly used in pest reports or in the context of a PRA and not used so often in the context of determining pest status, i.e. to be used under surveillance and PRA rather than under ISPM 8. The EWG agreed to not include such explanations in the draft ISPM and encouraged NPPOs to not use such wording as it may cause confusion.
- [62] Regarding the phrase “worldwide distributed”, one member mentioned that this often refers to cosmopolitan pests. The EWG then discussed the meaning of this phrase and agreed that the pest status category “present: widely distributed” would cover this concept. The EWG noted that ISPM 5. Supplement 1 *Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of “official control” and “not widely distributed”* has a detailed explanation on the use of this concept of “widely distributed” for determining if a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest. Thus, the EWG agreed on having these two categories of presence: “present, widely distributed” and “present, not widely distributed”.
- [63] Discuss, and if appropriate provide recommendations on, the relationship between official pest reports and other published pest information; in particular how information can be evaluated and described according to quality and validity, and how uncertainty relates to pest status and pest records, and include guidance on conflicting opinions, contradictory reports and weight of evidence (multiple reports versus single reports). Consider providing additional guidance on factors determining the validity of pest records (tasks 12 and 14). The EWG discussed in length and in detail these tasks hence the EWG felt that the quality of the information and its reliability are fundamental for pest status determinations, stressing that accurate pest records are crucial.
- [64] The EWG discussed the use of the words “validity” and “reliability”, noting that, according to the Oxford Dictionary, “validity” is the quality of being logically or factually sound; and that “reliability” is the quality of being trustworthy or of performing consistently well. The EWG noted that pest information can be highly variable based on quality, quantity, types of source(s), applicability and relevance, and reliability. One member stressed that the way information and evidence are handled (cited, analyzed and discussed) can have serious and lasting consequences for NPPOs. Consequently, the EWG agreed that guidance on evaluating the reliability of information provided for the determination of pest status should be included in the draft ISPM in detail. Moreover, sources of uncertainty in determining the pest status in an area were discussed and the EWG agreed that sources of uncertainty may include, among other things: limited available critical information on pest biology, unknown etiology, pest taxonomy changes, conflicting / contradictory or outdated information, difficulties with diagnostic and survey methodologies and reliability of the information sources used to determine pest status.
- [65] One member pointed out that reliability is defined in relation of the quality of the information source, date of the source, the methodology used, and the degree of consensus in the professional community (i.e. the extent to which methods or interpretation of results are generally accepted and agreed upon by experts). The EWG noted that the quantity of information available can also be used in evaluating the source. For example, a variety of pest reports from lesser quality sources that have consistency in their conclusions may be more convincing in terms of certainty than a single reference from a publication from a reputable source.
- [66] The EWG highlighted that information may be available from many sources, including pest records from surveillance, and has varying levels of reliability. The EWG felt that it would be useful to provide

recommendations on how to handle this. The EWG fully revised the guidance on reliability in the table - proposed a rank of degrees of information reliability (from high, moderately high, moderately low and low) and provided practical examples. In regards to the major information sources, it was noted that several sources may be used to determine pest status. It was agreed to provide guidance on the reliability of information sources in a table, indicating whether the information was gathered from: surveillance, another NPPOs, peer-reviewed journals, databases and websites, other published expert sources that are not peer-reviewed (e.g. from universities, subject matter experts) or unpublished communications from sources other than NPPO. The EWG also provided guidance for situations where highly reliable sources are not available, i.e. when information gaps exist, surveillance could be a way of filling in those gaps.

- [67] The EWG revised the section on “good reporting practices” in the current ISPM 8 to highlight the NPPOs responsibilities. The EWG clarified that the determination of the pest status is done by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned, and ensured that the good practices for determining and reporting pest status were explained more in detail. The EWG also stressed that, when a high degree of uncertainty exists, the NPPO of the importing country should use caution in considering whether phytosanitary measures should be applied, recalling that measures should be based on a risk assessment taking into account uncertainty.
- [68] Consider providing guidance on the timeframes for updating pest records (task 13). The EWG discussed the frequency needed for updating pest records and some guidance was provided in the context of assessing the reliability of the information sources. The EWG felt that there was no need to outline a specific time frame for updating pest records, as this is a decision to be taken by each NPPO considering the uncertainty associated with such information.
- [69] Discuss the influence of a pest interception on the pest status of the country of origin, especially when the pest status in the country of origin has been determined to be absent (task 15). The EWG discussed in length and felt that pest interception data should not be used to determine presence of a pest, hence an interception is not sufficient to substantiate pest presence. The EWG stressed that interception data should be used with caution and, in cases where repeated interceptions are obtained, this information should trigger further investigation. The EWG acknowledged that repeated interceptions may lead to a NPPO to challenge another NPPO on its pest declaration, highlighting that it is a sovereign right of a country to determine the pest status of a pest. The EWG agreed that, if a pest is detected only at interception points, then the pest status is absent. Consequently, the EWG agreed with the pest status type “absent: intercepted only” for those situations where the pest has only been reported on consignments at a point of entry, or initial destination, or while under detention before release, treatment or destruction (see also discussions under tasks 2, 3 and 4).
- [70] The EWG agreed to include further guidance under “NPPOs responsibilities section” when repeated interceptions and contradictory pest records are encountered, which may lead a NPPO to challenge the pest status declaration of another NPPO. The EWG highlighted that in these situations, bilateral contacts between NPPOs should be made to clarify the situation, and if needed, the pest status may be revised. The EWG noted that interception data should call for international communication and cooperation, to request additional information to support the determined pest status.
- [71] Review and update references in Appendix 1 and other relevant information to be updated (tasks 16 and 17). The EWG unanimously agreed that the list of references (i.e. Appendix 1 of ISPM 8) should no longer be included in the ISPM as such lists become out dated in a short period of time. Therefore, the EWG did not update the references in Appendix 1 of the current ISPM 8 and recommended that such references, if needed, should be included in a manual or other guidance material.
- [72] Regarding other relevant information to be updated, the EWG felt that this task was completed with the revision of the ISPM 8 as an inherent part of the revision process.
- [73] Potential operational and technical implementation issues (task 18). The EWG identified some elements to be considered for the implementation of the revised ISPM 8 as outlined below under agenda item 8.
- [74] Protection of biodiversity and the environment (task 19). The EWG felt that the draft standard would positively impact the protection of biodiversity and environment because determining and describing

pest status in a consistent manner will help countries identify risks associated with pests and to apply measures to protect biodiversity and environment. Text was developed and included in the relevant section of the draft ISPM.

[75] Review all references to ISPM 8 in other ISPMs to ensure that they are still relevant and propose consequential changes if necessary (task 20). The EWG reviewed this task as the Secretariat showed the results from a search done at the IPPC searchable database¹⁷ for “ISPM 8”. The EWG identified text that may be needed adjustments due to changes proposed in the revision of ISPM 8. The EWG agreed to the following and proposed changes as outlined below. The EWG invited the SC to note these proposed changes.

[76] **Consequential changes to adopted ISPMs:**

- ISPM 9 (Guidelines for pest eradication programmes)

[77] Section 1.3 Reporting requirements and information sharing

Verification of the occurrence of a new pest of immediate or potential danger initiates the process that leads to reporting requirements for the NPPO under the International Plant Protection Convention (see Article VII.2(j) and Article VIII.1(a) and VIII.1(c)) and is described in ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area).

[78] Recommendation by the EWG: To check reference to the title.

- **ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*)**

[79] Section 2.2.2 Probability of establishment:

In considering probability of establishment, it should be noted that a transient pest (see ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area)) may not be able to establish in the PRA area (e.g. because of unsuitable climatic conditions) but could still have unacceptable economic consequences (see IPPC Article VII.3).

[80] Recommendation by the EWG: The EWG agreed that it is still applicable as it is for the glossary term “*transience*”. No action needs to be taken.

- **ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*)**

[81] Proposed text recommendation to align with the revised draft ISPM 8:

[82] Section 5.2 Outbreak

An outbreak refers to a recently detected pest population. An outbreak should be reported when its presence corresponds at least to the status of “~~Transient~~ Present: actionable not widely distributed and under official control” in ISPM 8. This means that it should be reported even when the pest may survive in the immediate future, but is not expected to establish.

[83] Section 6.4. Good reporting practices

Countries should follow the “good ~~reporting~~ practices for determining and reporting pest status” set out in ISPM 8.

[84] Recommendation by the EWG: Text in ISPM 17 needs to be adjusted accordingly with the revisions done in ISPM 8.

- **ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)*)**

[85] Proposed text recommendation to align with the revised draft ISPM 8:

[86] Section 2.3.3: Corrective actions (including response to an outbreak)

¹⁷ IPPC PDF Searchable database page: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/development-standards/searchable-pdf-database/>

The NPPO should have prepared plans for corrective actions that may be implemented if the target pest(s) is detected in the FF-PFA or in host material from that area (detailed guidelines are provided in Annex 1), or if faulty procedures are found. This plan should include components or systems to cover:

- outbreak declaration ~~according to criteria in ISPM 8~~ and notification

[87] Annex 1: Guidelines on corrective action plans, section (1.1):

If the detection is ~~a transient non-actionable occurrence~~ present: not expected to establish (ISPM 8), no further action is required.

[88] For the references to “transient”, proposed text recommendation to align with the revised draft ISPM 8 is provided below:

[89] Appendix 1: Fruit fly trapping (2011):

- Section 1. Pest status and survey types

Pest ~~transient~~ present. Pest under surveillance and ~~actionable, under eradication~~ under official control.

(...)

Detection surveys are to determine if the pest is present in an area, that is to demonstrate pest absence (situation D) and to detect a possible entry of the pest into the FF-PFA (~~pest transient actionable pest~~ present: not widely distributed and under official control) (ISPM 8).

- Review ISPM 26 to address any issue if there is a distinction between “outbreak” and “detection” and propose text changes if needed

[90] Recommendation by the EWG: Text in ISPM 26 needs to be adjusted accordingly with the revisions done in ISPM 8.

• **ISPM 29 (Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence)**

[91] Section 1. General Considerations

~~ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area) provides guidance on the use of the phrase “pest free area declared” in pest records.~~

[92] Recommendation by the EWG: Because no guidance is provided in the current ISPM 8 and in draft revision, it is recommended that this guidance should be under the pest free area ISPMs (ISPM 4: *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*, ISPM 26: *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)* and ISPM 29: *Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence*) where it is more appropriate.

8. Operational and Technical Implementation Issues and Possible recommendations (task 18)

[93] The EWG discussed the potential issues and challenges associated with implementing the revised standard and it was agreed that the revised standard needed to reflect the capability and capacity of both developed and developing countries contracting parties of the IPPC. The EWG addressed categories in the current ISPM 8 and the draft ISPM provides information in a more explanatory way to help NPPOs implement the standard. NPPOs will need to make some adjustments for the categories that have been removed or changed. The EWG felt that as the pest status groups were simplified, it should be clearer and implementation should be facilitated.

[94] The EWG provided guidance in the draft ISPM on how to evaluate the information to be used for the determination of pest status, for example the reliability table in draft standard and tried to link how the information on pest status may be used in databases. The draft ISPM is now more consistent with ISPM 5 terms, specifically with the terms “transient” and “pest record”, and with the wording in the draft revision of ISPM 6 (under second consultation in 2017) for “surveillance records”.

[95] The EWG also enhanced the standard by clarifying that the determination of the pest status is done by the NPPO responsible for the area concerned, as a sovereign right of a country to determine the status of pests in their country. The EWG provided good practices for determining and reporting pest status and explained them in more detail.

[96] The EWG made efforts to ensure consistency with other ISPMs. Where ISPM 8 is referred, the EWG proposed minor changes as appropriate (see also task 20). Regarding consistency across IPPC documents, the EWG felt that it would be more logical to revise the standard before developing a manual or any other guidance material, as the content of the standard should be set before developing guidance material; otherwise it might affect the implementation, especially if there are sections of the standard that are modified during the consultation process and then the standard and manual might not align.

9. Next Steps

[97] The Secretariat explained that the draft ISPM would be edited by the Secretariat before being presented to the Standards Committee in May 2018. The Secretariat would be in direct contact with the Steward for any queries that might arise after this meeting.

[98] The report of this meeting would be drafted by the Secretariat and forwarded to the Rapporteur for clearance. Any controversy would be decided by the Rapporteur. The report would then be posted publicly on the International Phytosanitary Portal¹⁸ and the EWG members informed.

10. Other business

[99] There was no other business.

11 Close of the meeting

[100] The Secretariat informed the EWG that an online meeting evaluation would be conducted to gather their comments and opinions about the meeting, to help the Secretariat improve future meetings and activities. The Secretariat thanked the local hosts for the excellent organization and hospitality. The Chairperson, thanked the Steward of the draft ISPM, the local hosts and the Secretariat. All thanked the participants for their efforts and acknowledged it had been a productive week which had resulted in a revised draft standard.

¹⁸ <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/expert-working-groups/>

APPENDIX 1: Agenda

**MEETING OF THE EXPERT WORKING GROUP (EWG) ON
REVISION OF ISPM 8 (DETERMINATION OF PEST STATUS IN AN AREA) (2009-
005)**

18 – 22 September 2017

23 September 2017: Field trip

Hotel Fortuna - Hanoi, Vietnam

AGENDA

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
1.	Opening of the Meeting		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat • Welcome by the meeting host and organizer • Introductions 	--	LARSON / DUONG (Deputy Director-General of the Vietnamese Plant Protection Department, Viet Nam NPPO)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of the standard setting process • Roles of the Participants 	--	LARSON / MOREIRA
2.	Meeting Arrangements	--	
2.1	Selection of the Chairperson	--	LARSON
2.2	Selection of the Rapporteur	--	CHAIRPERSON
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	CHAIRPERSON
3.	Administrative Matters	--	
3.1	Documents list	02_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	MOREIRA / BINH
3.2	Participants list	03_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	
3.3	Local information	04_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	
4.	Review of ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>)	Link to ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>)	ZLOTINA (Steward)
5.	Review of Specification	Specification 59 on the Revision of ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>)	ZLOTINA (Steward)
6.	Development of Draft ISPM	--	CHAIRPERSON
6.1	Background papers	--	CHAIRPERSON

Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
6.1.2	12_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep 13_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep Link to IRSS 2012 Survey on ISPM 8 Other surveys: Link to IRSS 2016 IPPC General Survey Link to IRSS 2012 IPPC General Survey	STEWART
6.1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Editorials errors tracking sheet 	MOREIRA
6.2	--	
6.2.1	06_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	DEVORSHAK
6.2.2	07_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	ZLOTINA
6.2.3	08_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	FAVRIN
6.2.4	09_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	ODGERS
6.2.5	10_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	CHARLES
6.2.6	11_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	CORTESE
7.	--	CHAIRPERSON
8.	--	CHAIRPERSON
9.	--	Secretariat
10.	--	CHAIRPERSON
11.	--	IPPC SECRETARIAT / CHAIRPERSON

¹⁹ For reference: IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/development-standards/>

APPENDIX 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	2.3	Agenda	1 st version: 2017-07-24 Latest version: 2017-08-21
02_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	3.1	Documents list	2017-08-21
03_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	3.2	Participants list	1 st version: 2017-08-11 Latest version:
04_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	3.3	Local information	2017-07-31
05_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	6.1.3	Editorial Errors	2017-08-17
06_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	6.2.1	Discussion paper: Information, evidence and uncertainty (prepared by USDA-APHIS)	2017-08-17
07_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	6.2.2	Discussion paper: Current understanding of pest presence and revision of ISPM 8 (prepared by USDA-APHIS)	2017-08-17
08_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	6.2.3	Discussion paper (prepared by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency)	2017-08-17
09_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	6.2.4	Discussion paper (prepared by the Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources)	2017-08-17
10_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	6.2.5	Comparing terminology (Prepared by CABI)	2017-08-17
11_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	6.2.6	Discussion paper (prepared by SENASA - Argentina)	2017-08-17
12_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	6.1.2	IRSS survey on ISPM 8 (prepared by IPPC Secretariat Implementation Facilitation Unit)	2017-08-21
13_EWG_RevISPM8_2017_Sep	6.1.2	Discussion paper (prepared by IPPC Secretariat Implementation Facilitation Unit)	2017-08-21

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Annotated template for draft ISPMs: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81325/	1 / 6
IPPC Style guide: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/	1 / 6
ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>): https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/622/	1 / 6
<i>ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area)</i> : https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/612/	4 / 6
Specification 59 - Revision of ISPM 8 (<i>Determination of pest status in an area</i>): https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2369/	5 / 6 / 7 / 8
IRSS survey on ISPM 8: https://www.ippc.int/en/irss/activities/21/	6.1.2
IRSS IPPC general surveys: - 2016: https://www.ippc.int/en/irss/activities/27/ - 2012: https://www.ippc.int/en/irss/activities/17/	6.1.2

APPENDIX 3: Participants list

Participant role / Country	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
Steward	Ms Marina ZLOTINA IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) Riverdale, USA Phone: +1-301 851 2200 Cell: +1 301 832 0611	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov ;
Member / Argentina	Mr Pablo CORTESE Director of Phytosanitary Surveillance and monitoring Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA) Buenos Aires, Argentina Phone: +5411 4121 5183	pcortese@senasa.gov.ar ;
Member / Australia	Ms Wendy ODGERS Director, Plant Sciences and Risk Assessment, Plant Division, Australian Government Department of Agriculture and Water Resources Canberra, Australia Phone: +61 2 6272 5322	wendy.odgers@agriculture.gov.au ;
Member / Canada	Mr Robert FAVRIN National Manager, Plant Health Risk Assessment Canadian Food Inspection Agency Ontario, Canada Phone: +01 613-773-5266	robert.favrin@inspection.gc.ca ;
Member / EPPO	Ms Anne Sophie ROY Information Officer European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) Paris, France Phone: +33 1 45 20 77 94	roy@epo.int ;
Member / Kenya	Ms Asenath Abigail KOECH Pest Risk Analysis expert/Plant health inspector Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) Nairobi, Kenya Phone: +254 709891110 Mobile: +254 722973535	akoech@kephis.org ; abigakoech@gmail.com ;
Member / Republic of Korea	Ms Kyu Ock YIM Senior Researcher Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Guyuensangbuk-do, Republic of Korea Phone: +82 10 8752 3132	koyim@korea.kr ;
Member / USA	Ms Christina DEVORSHAK National Science Coordinator USDA APHIS PPQ Science and Technology Raleigh, USA Phone: + 1 919 855 7547	Christina.devorshak@aphis.usda.gov ;
Invited Expert / CABI	Ms Lucinda Mary Frances CHARLES CABI Head Office Nosworthy Way Wallingford Oxfordshire OX10 8DE UK	l.charles@cabi.org ;

Participant role / Country	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
OTHER PARTICIPANTS		
Host / Viet Nam	Ms Ho Thi Xuan HUONG (MSc.) Head of Surveillance and Experimental Division Post-Entry Plant Quarantine Center No. 1, Plant Protection Department Pho Vien street, Duc Thang ward, Bac Tu Liem district Ha Noi VIET NAM Phone : +(8424) 37525491 Fax: +(8424) 38388800	hohuongkd@gmail.com ;
Host / Viet Nam	Ms Le THI Ngoc ANH (MSc.) Plant Quarantine Diagnostic Centre of Plant Protection Department 149 Ho Dac Di Street Dong oa District Ha Noi VIET NAM Phone : +(8424) 38571064	ngocanhkdtv@gmail.com ;
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON Standard Setting Unit Leader International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 53803	Brent.Larson@fao.org ;
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana G. MOREIRA Standard Setting Officer International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, ITALY Phone: + 39 06 570 55809	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org ;
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Leanne STEWART Implementation Facilitation Officer Implementation Facilitation Unit International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 53071	Leanne.Stewart@fao.org ;

Not attending

Member / Domenica	Mr Nelson LAVILLE Plant Health Officer Plant Protection and Quarantine Services Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries Roseau, Dominica Phone: +1 767 277 5353	nelson.laville@gmail.com ;
----------------------	--	--