



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

## **REPORT**

# **Expert Working Group on Guidance on pest risk management (2014-001)**

**Qawra, Malta  
5-9 March 2018**

**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 of FAO.

## CONTENTS

Contents.....	3
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 .....	5
4. Review of Specification.....	5
5. Review of Discussion Papers.....	5
6. Development of Text for Draft .....	8
7. Potential Operational and Technical Implementation Issues and Possible Recommendations (Task 5 of Specification 63) .....	14
8. Any Other Business .....	14
9. Close of the Meeting.....	15
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	16
Appendix 2: Documents List.....	19
Appendix 3: Participants List .....	21

## 1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] Mr Brent LARSON, Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU) Lead of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat, opened the meeting and welcomed all participants to the Expert Working Group (EWG) on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001).
- [2] Mr Sharlo CAMILLERI, Director Plant Protection, head of the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of Malta, also welcomed all participants to Qawra, Malta. He expressed his pleasure to support the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “Secretariat”) by co-organizing the meeting, as this was a means to enhance collaboration between the NPPO of Malta and the Secretariat. He wished a fruitful meeting to the EWG members.
- [3] Mr Brent LARSON thanked the European Commission for their financial contribution that had enabled the Secretariat to organize the EWG meeting, and also thanked the Plant Protection Directorate of Malta which had co-organized the meeting and additionally offered to host a welcome drink and a dinner. He explained that, having led the Standard Setting Unit of the Secretariat for several years, he had recently been appointed as Lead of the IFU. He recalled that the Commission on phytosanitary measures (CPM) had added the topic *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001) to the *List of topics for IPPC standards* in 2014 and that the EWG’s objective was to draft a globally acceptable standard according to Specification 63<sup>1</sup>. He also mentioned that the development of a manual on pest risk management was part of the IFU work programme in order to help contracting parties implement International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) related to pest risk management. He acknowledged that it would be better to wait for the new draft standard on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001) to progress within the Standard setting procedure before developing the manual, and noted that the ideal aim would be to have both the standard and the manual finalized simultaneously. He highlighted that any recommendation from EWG members regarding the implementation of pest risk management would be useful to consider for the development of the manual (especially regarding what requirements should be in the standard and what additional information would be better suited to the manual).
- [4] The participants introduced themselves briefly.
- [5] The Secretariat made a presentation on the IPPC and the Standard setting process. The Secretariat outlined the functions of the Standards Committee (SC) and the EWG, specifically explaining the roles of EWG participants. The Secretariat also emphasized the importance of ensuring that correct phytosanitary terminology is used in standards and organized a short game to familiarize EWG participants with terminology from ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

## 2. Meeting Arrangements

### 2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

- [6] Mr Harry ARIJS (European Commission) was selected as Chairperson.

### 2.2 Selection of Rapporteur

- [7] Ms Barbara PETERSON (Canada) was selected as Rapporteur.

### 2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [8] The EWG adopted the agenda as presented in Appendix 1 to this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Specification 63 on Guidance on pest risk management](#)

### 3. Administrative Matters

- [9] The Secretariat introduced the documents list (Appendix 2), the participants list (Appendix 3) and the local information<sup>2</sup>. The meeting organizers explained logistic arrangements.
- [10] The Secretariat noted that unfortunately Mr Thomas Kimeli KOSIOM (Kenya) was not able to attend the meeting, due to visa issues.

### 4. Review of Specification

- [11] The Steward introduced Specification 63<sup>3</sup>, recalling the reason and scope for the standard as well as the tasks that should be addressed by the EWG during the meeting.
- [12] The EWG agreed that they would first address task 1 of Specification 63 (“Description of the processes for the identification of pest risk management options”) and develop draft text for a standard, before considering task 2 and whether the text developed should be a stand-alone ISPM or an annex or a supplement to another ISPM such as ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*).

### 5. Review of Discussion Papers

- [13] **Review of NAPPO Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) 40 “Principles of Pest Risk Management for the Import of Commodities”<sup>4</sup>**. Mr Walter GUTIERREZ (United States of America) introduced this regional standard developed by the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO), which provides detailed guidance on how to complete the pest risk management stage (stage 3) of pest risk analysis (PRA). RSPM 40 provides guidance to NPPOs of NAPPO member countries in identifying, evaluating and selecting appropriate risk management measures following the completion of the risk assessment stage (stage 2) of a PRA. He stressed that the information provided in RSPM 40 could be helpful for several of the tasks in Specification 63, especially regarding the identification, evaluation and selection of phytosanitary measures. In particular, he highlighted that evaluating the efficacy of measures represents a significant challenge and further elaboration on this subject would be worth considering: NPPOs tend to focus on pest mortality because it is well understood but many phytosanitary measures do not have “mortality” as an end point.
- [14] **Discussion paper from Canada<sup>5</sup>**. Ms Barbara PETERSON (Canada) introduced her discussion paper. She indicated that the standard should address aspects of pest risk management such as: when it is necessary; to what extent it should be applied; how key concepts such as managed risk, technical justification, appropriate level of protection and equivalence relate to it; and how countries can improve its harmonization. She underlined that the exporting NPPO should be notified and asked to identify any existing phytosanitary measures that are already in place and could prevent the introduction of the pest or contribute to risk mitigation. The importing NPPO should also be prepared to recognize and accept alternative phytosanitary measures that are proposed by the exporting NPPO as equivalent, if those measures provide a comparable level of protection.
- [15] **Discussion paper from the Philippines<sup>6</sup>**. Ms Lorelie AGBAGALA (Philippines) introduced her paper focusing on the effects of uncertainty in relation to the identification and selection of pest risk management options. She felt that harmonized guidance for assessing the quality of evidence and the related uncertainty was lacking and she recommended the establishment of a framework for assessing and quantifying uncertainty in terms of reliability and applicability of the available information.

---

<sup>2</sup> 04\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_MARCH

<sup>3</sup> [Specification 63 on Guidance on pest risk management](#)

<sup>4</sup> 05\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March (RSPM 40 available at <https://www.nappo.org/files/8314/3889/6413/RSPM40-e.pdf>)

<sup>5</sup> 06\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>6</sup> 07\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

- [16] **Discussion paper from New Zealand**<sup>7</sup>. Ms Wendy ODGERS (Australia) presented a paper outlining the perspective from New Zealand, which had been submitted by Ms Joanne WILSON and Mr Stephen BUTCHER from the Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI), New Zealand. In relation to pest risk management, this discussion paper specifically underlined that pathways which present a higher risk (taking into account the likelihood of introduction and consequence) require more stringent measures compared to pathways where the risk is lower. The MPI of New Zealand determines which phytosanitary measures to apply based on the risk assessment of the pest on a particular pathway (basic measures for pests presenting a lower risk, targeted measures for quarantine pests presenting a moderate risk and MPI-specified measures for quarantine pests presenting a higher risk) and has developed guidance documents on the strength of phytosanitary measures, treatment efficacy and phytosanitary security.
- [17] **Discussion paper from Ghana**<sup>8</sup>. In the paper Ms Ruth WOODE (Ghana) had submitted to the EWG, she highlighted several challenges for NPPOs, especially those of developing and least developed countries, such as limited technical capacities and resources to carry out PRA, and processes related to the pest risk assessment stage and to the selection and evaluation of risk management options that seemed to be cumbersome. Thus, she believed that the proposed standard on pest risk management would help address these challenges by providing harmonized guidance on how to evaluate and select appropriate pest risk management options.
- [18] **Publications from the European Food Safety Agency (EFSA)**<sup>9</sup>. Mr José María GUITIAN CASTRILLON (Spain) explained the system in place for PRA in the European Union (EU), where PRAs are initiated for specific pests. He highlighted that, in the EU, there is a clear separation between the scientific risk assessment (EFSA's role) and the risk management (role of the European Commission, EU Parliament and EU Member States); in line with this, EFSA provides scientific advice on pest risks for the EU and may propose pest risk management options if requested to do so. He presented the following EFSA publications:
- EFSA Panel on Plant Health (PLH). 2010. Guidance on a harmonized framework for pest risk assessment and the identification and evaluation of pest risk management options by EFSA. *EFSA Journal*, 8(2): 1495, 66 pp. Available at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/1495>.
  - EFSA Panel on Plant Health (PLH). 2009. Evaluation of pest risk assessments and risk management options prepared to justify requests for phytosanitary measures under Council Directive 2000/29/EC. Guidance of the Panel on Plant Health. *EFSA Journal* 1194, 18 pp. Available at <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/1194>. This guidance followed a request from EFSA.
  - EFSA Panel on Plant Health (PLH). 2012. Guidance on methodology for evaluation of the effectiveness of options for reducing the risk of introduction and spread of organisms harmful to plant health in the EU territory. *EFSA Journal*, 10(6): 2755, 92 pp. Available at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/2755>. This document presents two operational tools: a checklist for evaluating a proposed risk reduction option and a database of references of scientific documents presenting recommendations on how to assess risk reduction options or describing experimental assessments of risk reduction options.
  - Pautasso M. 2012. *Review of quantitative assessment of risk reduction options applied in the EFSA outputs on biological hazards, in support of a guidance document of the EFSA Panel on Plant Health*. EFSA External Scientific Report. EFSA Supporting Publications 2012:EN-251, 168 pp. Available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/sp.efsa.2012.EN-251/epdf>. Mr GUITIAN CASTRILLON explained that EFSA was moving from qualitative assessments towards more quantitative assessments.

---

<sup>7</sup> 08\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>8</sup> 09\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>9</sup> 10\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March, 11\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March, 12\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March, 13\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

- [19] **European Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) Guidelines on Pest Risk Analysis (PM 5/3 (5))**<sup>10</sup>. Mr José María GUITIAN CASTRILLON (Spain) presented these guidelines, which consist in a decision-support scheme for quarantine pests based on a sequence of questions for deciding whether an organism has the characteristics of a quarantine pest, and if appropriate for identifying potential pest risk management options. The guidelines indicate that each potential pest risk management option identified should be evaluated for its reliability, a reliable measure being effective, feasible and reproducible.
- [20] **Documents from the United States Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA APHIS)**. Mr Walter GUTIERREZ (United States of America) introduced the USDA APHIS *Guidelines for plant pest risk assessment of imported fruit & vegetable commodities*<sup>11</sup> and the USDA APHIS *Importation of fresh apricot, Prunus armeniaca Marshall, fruit from continental Spain into the United States, including Hawaii and U.S. territories* risk management document<sup>12</sup>. Stage 3 of the former document contains guidance for risk analysts in order to perform the pest risk management stage of PRA, and to identify and evaluate mitigation measures that may be used to reduce the risk. The latter outlines the phytosanitary measures required by APHIS for the importation of apricot fruit from continental Spain.
- [21] **Discussion paper from Vietnam**<sup>13</sup>. The Secretariat introduced a discussion paper submitted by Ms HA (Vietnam) which provided comments on the tasks of Specification 63.
- [22] **Discussion paper from Argentina**<sup>14</sup>. Ms María Elena GATTI (Argentina) introduced her discussion paper, which listed factors to consider for the identification of phytosanitary measures, their evaluation (efficacy, feasibility and impacts), their selection, the documentation, the monitoring and re-evaluation of phytosanitary measures and the uncertainty.
- [23] **Discussion paper from Australia**<sup>15</sup>. Ms Wendy ODGERS (Australia) introduced her discussion paper. She noted that relevant concepts, principles and frameworks for pest risk management are already contained within existing ISPMs: ISPM 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*), ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*), ISPM 11 and ISPM 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*). Unless there is significant new content relating to pest risk management, she felt that any additional guidance would be best suited to implementation of the existing standards rather than a separate ISPM or inclusion as an annex or supplement to an existing ISPM.
- [24] **IPPC pest risk management related resources and tools applicable on a global level**<sup>16</sup>. The Secretariat presented a document outlining existing global technical resources related to pest risk management: the IPPC market access guide<sup>17</sup>; the IPPC import verification manual<sup>18</sup>; the IPPC export certification manual<sup>19</sup>; a study on *Diversion from intended use*, from the IPPC Implementation Review

---

<sup>10</sup> 14\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March (see [https://www.eppo.int/QUARANTINE/Pest\\_Risk\\_Analysis/PRA\\_intro.htm](https://www.eppo.int/QUARANTINE/Pest_Risk_Analysis/PRA_intro.htm))

<sup>11</sup> 15\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March (available at:

[https://www.aphis.usda.gov/import\\_export/plants/plant\\_imports/process/downloads/PRAGuidelines-ImportedFruitVegCommodities.pdf](https://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/plant_imports/process/downloads/PRAGuidelines-ImportedFruitVegCommodities.pdf))

<sup>12</sup> 16\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>13</sup> 17\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>14</sup> 18\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>15</sup> 20\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>16</sup> 22\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>17</sup> IPPC market access guide: <http://www.phytosanitary.info/information/market-access-guide-phytosanitary-issues-national-plant-protection-organizations>

<sup>18</sup> IPPC import verification manual: <http://www.phytosanitary.info/information/import-verification-manual>

<sup>19</sup> IPPC export certification manual: <http://www.phytosanitary.info/information/export-certification-manual>



and Support System (IRSS)<sup>20</sup>; and the *Beyond compliance* tools, developed under a project funded by the Standards and Trade Facilitation Facility<sup>21</sup>. The Secretariat also outlined the process that would be used for the development of a manual on pest risk management: a draft manual would be drafted by an expert working group and then reviewed by the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.

[25] The Secretariat presented results of **general surveys conducted in 2012–2013 and 2016 by the IRSS regarding the implementation of adopted ISPMs**<sup>22</sup>. One of the key findings of the 2012–2013 general survey was that countries considered PRA standards (ISPM 2 and ISPM 11) as priority standards to implement. Similar findings were obtained from the 2016 general survey.

[26] **Discussion paper from Kenya**<sup>23</sup>. The Secretariat introduced a paper that had been submitted by Mr Thomas KOSIOM, the EWG member from Kenya who was unable to attend the meeting. In this paper, Mr KOSIOM highlighted that harmonized guidance for the evaluation and selection of pest risk management options would be useful. He listed several challenges that countries may face while conducting PRAs, such as:

- relying too much on some sources of information and missing out other sources
- having limited information on the available pest risk management options, which would lead to inadequately informed decisions, resulting possibly in the selection of options that are ineffective or trade restrictive
- carrying inadequate or too limited consultations outside the NPPO, which could lead to the omission of pest risk management options that may not be known to the analysts
- having limited pest mapping, extrapolation techniques and forecasting of future events such as pest establishment, pest impacts or effects of proposed mitigation measures.

## 6. Development of Text for Draft<sup>24</sup>

[27] The EWG agreed that it would be very useful to provide more guidance in an ISPM on how to harmonize further the different approaches used by countries with regards to pest risk management, for instance by developing criteria on how to identify, evaluate and select pest risk management options. They recognized that a new standard on pest risk management should add value and should not be limited to summarizing or collating information already available in existing ISPMs.

[28] EWG members acknowledged that NAPPO RSPM 40 provided a good basis to start drafting the ISPM, but that some aspects may need to be deepened or adapted. When developing text for the standard, the EWG reviewed text from NAPPO RSPM 40 and considered additional elements presented in the above discussion papers.

### Scope.

[29] The EWG noted that the scope described in Specification 63 referred to pest risk management for regulated pests. They discussed whether the scope of the draft ISPM being developed should include regulated non-quarantine pests, and stressed that this was not appropriate because guidance on pest risk management for regulated non-quarantine pests would differ too much from guidance for pest risk management for quarantine pests. They felt that, if needed, guidance on pest risk management for regulated non-quarantine pests should be provided in a separate document. Therefore, the EWG

---

<sup>20</sup> Diversion from intended use: [https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/irss/2016/09/09/ippc-irss\\_diversion\\_from\\_intended\\_use.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/static/media/files/irss/2016/09/09/ippc-irss_diversion_from_intended_use.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> eBook Beyond Compliance: [www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Beyond\\_Compliance\\_eBook.pdf](http://www.standardsfacility.org/sites/default/files/Beyond_Compliance_eBook.pdf)

<sup>22</sup> 21\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>23</sup> 23\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>24</sup> For reference: IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/development-standards/>; [ISPM 5 \(Glossary of phytosanitary terms\)](#); Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology (19\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March)



agreed that the scope of the document developed should be to provide guidance on pest risk management for quarantine pests associated with the international movement of regulated articles.

### **Outline of requirements.**

- [30] The EWG noted that, as per the *IPPC style guide*, the outline of requirements is a summary of the substance of the standard, and they agreed that it would be finalized by the Steward for the draft ISPM and the Secretariat after the meeting, based on the text developed during the meeting.

### **Background section.**

- [31] The EWG felt that a reference to principles (necessity, managed risk, minimal impact, harmonization, non-discrimination, technical justification, cooperation, transparency and equivalence) described in ISPM 1 and in the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement (SPS Agreement) of the World Trade Organization (WTO) was relevant background information for a standard on guidance on pest risk management. They also agreed that the first paragraph of section 3 (Stage 3: Pest risk management) of ISPM 11 was useful introductory information to include in this section. Furthermore, they added background information on the “acceptable level of risk”.

### **Use of “pest risk management options” versus “phytosanitary measures”.**

- [32] The EWG agreed that, throughout the draft standard, the words “pest risk management options” should be used when referring to the identification and evaluation of the options that may be selected to address the pest risk, but that once one or several options have been selected, the term “phytosanitary measures” should be used to refer to the option or options being decided upon and implemented.

### **Description of the processes for the identification of pest risk management options (task 1 of Specification 63), including:**

#### ***The basis for decisions in the pest risk management process.***

- [33] The basis for decisions in the pest risk management process were described under “General requirements” and section 1 (Sources of information) of the “Specific requirements” of the draft standard that was developed by the EWG.
- [34] The EWG agreed that the “General requirements” should address general key concepts related to pest risk management, such as: when pest risk management is necessary; the principle of acceptable level of risk; and other key principles to follow when selecting pest risk management options (managed risk not equalling zero risk, feasibility of phytosanitary measures, technical justification, consistency with the pest risk involved, least restrictive measures, reassessment of previous requirements, equivalence, non-discrimination).
- [35] The EWG felt that providing guidance on the sources of information that can be used to inform potential risk management options was useful and drafted relevant text under the “Specific requirements”. First of all, they agreed that the outcome of pest risk assessment is a source of relevant information necessary to develop pest risk management options and that the pest risk assessment should clearly identify the quarantine pests that may pose an unacceptable level of risk and therefore may require additional risk management measures. They acknowledged that mentioning additional sources of information was also important: the NPPO of the exporting country, historical records (including on history of use), and importers.
- [36] The EWG specifically stressed that it was crucial to carry out consultations throughout the pest risk management stage in order to improve transparency and evaluate the feasibility and impacts of the potential pest risk management options. They agreed that the draft standard should provide guidance on when and how to carry out consultations and on what type of information should be shared and discussed between the NPPO of the importing country and the NPPO of the exporting country.

Therefore, they added text to provide for such sharing of information and consultations under several sections of the draft standard:

- *Section 1 (Sources of information)*. The list of quarantine pests that may require additional pest risk management measures and the technical justification for including them on the list should be shared with the NPPO of the exporting country, which should review and provide comments on the list, as well as providing potential pest risk management options. The NPPO of the exporting country should consult domestic stakeholders in relation to the feasibility of potential risk management options. The NPPO of the importing country may also consult importers in relation to the feasibility of potential pest risk management options.
- *Section 4.4 (Impacts)*. The potential economic, social and environmental impacts of pest risk management options should be identified and considered prior to selection and implementation. They should be discussed between the NPPOs of the importing and exporting countries.
- *Section 5 (Selecting appropriate phytosanitary measures)*. If the NPPO of the importing country identifies more than one appropriate measure to manage the risk, they should all be considered equivalent and shared with the NPPO of the exporting country. The NPPO of the exporting country should identify their preferred phytosanitary measure or measures to the NPPO of the importing country, in order to achieve minimal impact.
- *Section 6 (Documentation)*, which lists the main elements to be provided by the NPPO of the importing country to the NPPO of the exporting country.
- *Section 7 (Monitoring and re-evaluation of options)*. At any stage the NPPO of the exporting country can propose equivalent measures for evaluation by the NPPO of the importing country.

#### **Identification of pest risk management options.**

[37] Under section 2 of the draft standard, the EWG listed examples of pest risk management options commonly applied to regulated articles (examinations (inspection and testing), treatments, surveillance and monitoring, pest free concepts, sanitation, post-harvest processing and handling, post-entry options, examples of additional pest risk management options, systems approaches) and provided related guidance. They underlined that prohibition should only be used when no other alternative option is available.

[38] The EWG more specifically discussed the main following points:

- The EWG acknowledged that, in some cases, one pest risk management option may be sufficient to reduce the pest risk to an acceptable level, but, in other cases, a combination of two or more options may be required to do so.
- They felt that it was important to have some guidance on sampling under the subsection on “examinations” because sampling was usually performed before inspection and testing.
- Some EWG members highlighted that phytosanitary treatments adopted as annexes to ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) corresponded to measures that can be used on a stand-alone basis. However, other EWG members considered that, if countries provided technical justification for a higher appropriate level of protection than the stated level of efficacy of the ISPM 28 phytosanitary treatment, the treatment would then be used in combination with other treatments. The EWG agreed that ISPM 28 contains treatments that have been evaluated and found to be effective to the stated efficacy and may be used as stand-alone treatments; other treatments may also be used as stand-alone treatments or may be used in combination with other treatments or measures depending on efficacy.
- The EWG agreed to provide guidance for pest free concepts that are additional to pest free areas, pest free places of production and pest free production sites:
  - Pest free growing period.
  - Harvest and shipping windows. The initial wording proposed to reflect this concept referred to situations where the pest may be present but is not active and is unable to infest the commodity during the periods when harvest and shipping are permitted. Some EWG members were uncomfortable with such a wording because the pest still being

present would not be consistent with a pest free concept. The EWG agreed to describe this concept as harvest and shipping being limited to the period when the pest is seasonally absent or unable to infest the commodity or when the pest and host are asynchronous.

- The EWG wondered whether systems approaches should be listed as one pest risk management option as systems approaches already consist of a combination of measures, but they felt it was appropriate to list systems approaches as a specific option which helps address variability and uncertainty by combining measures.
- The EWG agreed that export certification was not a pest risk management option but was rather related to the verification of compliance. Thus, text on export certification was developed in a specific section after the section on the identification of pest risk management options.

***Evaluation of phytosanitary measures for their applicability, environmental impact, feasibility, cost-effectiveness and proportionality for achieving the acceptable level of risk.***

- [39] The EWG agreed that each pest risk management option should be evaluated to ensure it is effective, feasible and has a minimum impact.
- [40] EWG members stressed that it was important to provide guidance on the factors to be considered and the metrics to be used when determining the effectiveness of all pest risk management options, including those that do not directly affect mortality. When appropriate, effectiveness should be expressed in quantitative terms including the usual statistical parameters. When such calculation is not possible or not feasible, effectiveness may be expressed in qualitative terms such as high, medium and low. Regarding the efficacy of treatments, EWG members underlined that, although probit analysis has been used to establish the efficacy of high mortality treatments for certain arthropods, it may not always be feasible or technically justified. Alternative treatment efficacies may be considered when high mortality treatments are either not available, not feasible or not technically justified. The EWG felt that it was worth mentioning that a combination of lower mortality treatments may be as effective as a single high mortality treatment.
- [41] The EWG noted that several sections and Appendix 1 of NAPPO RSPM 40 provided guidance on how to deal with uncertainty in pest risk management, more specifically on how to evaluate the uncertainty associated with the available evidence in terms of both its reliability and applicability to the situation being considered. One member pointed out that Table 1 on the reliability of sources of information provided in Appendix 1 to NAPPO RSPM 40 was used and slightly revised by the EWG that worked on the revision of ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area* (2009-005)) in September 2017. The EWG agreed that including guidance on the evaluation of the uncertainty and the reliability of the information sources was also key for the draft ISPM on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001). Thus, they reviewed existing text from NAPPO RSPM 40 and the table on the reliability of sources of information from the draft revision of ISPM 8, which they adapted to the context of the draft ISPM on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001). The EWG discussed whether the information on uncertainty should fit under an annex or an appendix to the standard, but they agreed it was more relevant to have this information provided in the core text of the standard, in the section related to the evaluation of pest risk management options.
- [42] The EWG acknowledged that the reproducibility of the measure was a factor that was important to take into account, as the effectiveness of the measure may depend on environmental conditions (e.g. external temperatures), on the size of the consignment or on the commodity itself (e.g. size of the fruit, level of maturity). They discussed whether the concept of reproducibility deserved a specific subsection in the draft standard. They decided this was not needed because measures identified as pest risk management options should normally be reproducible, and the evaluation of the reproducibility would anyway be included in the evaluation of the effectiveness of the measure.
- [43] As regards to feasibility, the EWG felt it was important that the NPPO of the importing country considers identified pest risk management options for their feasibility in the exporting country. They

listed factors to take into account when determining feasibility. They felt that the concept of applicability was the same as the concept of feasibility.

[44] The EWG agreed that potential economic, social, and environmental impacts of pest risk management options should be identified and considered prior to the selection and implementation of the options, and that the NPPO of the importing country could not assess the impacts in the exporting country without consulting the NPPO of the exporting country. Section 2.3.3.1 (Economic impacts) of NAPPO RSPM 40 provided examples of potential impacts to consider, but the EWG noted that those examples were rather related to the analysis of the impacts done by the NPPO of the exporting country and they agreed that this was outside of the scope of the draft ISPM on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001). However, they felt such information may be relevant for the development of a manual on pest risk management.

[45] The EWG also considered section 2.4.1 (Comparing risk management measures) of NAPPO RSPM 40, regarding cost effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis of measures, and they felt this information was related to what the NPPO of the exporting country should do. Similarly, they agreed that such information was outside of the scope of the draft ISPM on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001) and may be relevant for the development of a manual on pest risk management.

[46] The concept of proportionality for achieving the acceptable level of risk was referred to in section 5 (Selecting appropriate phytosanitary measures) of the draft standard.

#### *Selection of appropriate phytosanitary measures.*

[47] The EWG drafted text to provide guidance for the selection of phytosanitary measures that are appropriate and proportional to the pest risk and technically justified, including guidance for sharing of information and consultation with the NPPO of the exporting country (see above paragraph [36]).

#### *Determination of documentation needed (related to evaluation and selection of phytosanitary measures for pest risk management).*

[48] Under section 6 (Documentation) of the draft ISPM, the EWG provided examples of the main elements to be provided by the NPPO of the importing country to the NPPO of the exporting country.

[49] Some EWG members suggested that the operational work plan that should be agreed between the NPPO of the importing country and the NPPO of the exporting country before trade can commence could be included in this section. However, other members felt that this was related to the bilateral implementation of the pest risk management process and was outside of the scope of the draft ISPM on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001). The EWG agreed not to mention this issue in the draft ISPM and noted that guidance on this issue would be better suited to a manual on pest risk management.

#### *Monitoring and re-evaluation of options.*

[50] Under section 7 (Monitoring and re-evaluation of options) of the draft ISPM, the EWG agreed that it was worth referring to situations when there is a change of the pest status, to the possibility of the NPPO of the exporting country proposing equivalent measures, to significant or repeated non-compliances and to systems audits.

#### **Consider whether this ISPM could be an annex or a supplement to another ISPM such as ISPM 11 (task 2 of Specification 63).**

[51] The EWG considered this task after having developed text for the draft standard. They noted that the text they drafted provides substantive guidance on pest risk management for quarantine pests (especially on how to evaluate and select pest risk management options), additional to the guidance already available in ISPM 11 (Stage 3: Pest risk management). They agreed that having two different ISPMs dealing with pest risk management for quarantine pests should be avoided and that, for clarity

and ease of reference, it would be better if all elements related to pest risk management for quarantine pests were included in a single document.

- [52] One EWG member suggested that ISPM 11 could be proposed for revision so that it focuses on the pest risk assessment stage of the PRA (stage 2) and that the new ISPM developed would be focused on the pest risk management stage of the PRA (stage 3). Other EWG members felt that this was an interesting suggestion to be considered further by the SC. Another option to consider would be to integrate the new text developed into the core text of ISPM 11 (section 3 on stage 3 of the PRA) so that ISPM 11 contains all the guidance related to PRA for quarantine pests. The EWG acknowledged that choosing the latter option would also imply revising the current section 3 of ISPM 11. The EWG agreed that both options should be recommended to the SC, since they did not have a strong preference for one or the other.
- [53] Some EWG members also mentioned that the revision or reorganization of all ISPMs related to PRA, including ISPM 2, ISPM 11 and ISPM 21, would be worth considering.
- [54] EWG members were not in favour of adding the text developed as an annex or a supplement at the end of ISPM 11 or another ISPM, because they stressed that the new guidance developed was a crucial component of PRA and deserved to be placed in the core text of an ISPM. They feared that provisions included as an annex or a supplement at the end of an ISPM might be less visible and risk being less taken into account. They noted that the text of a supplement could be integrated into the core text of an ISPM, if decided so by the CPM, but in this specific case it would not be possible to integrate easily the new text developed by pasting new paragraphs into section 3 of ISPM 11 without revising the current text of ISPM 11.
- [55] Consequently, the EWG invited the SC to:
- (1) *consider* the above discussion
  - (2) *agree* on one of the following options:
    - a. focusing ISPM 11 on the pest risk assessment stage of the PRA (stage 2) and having a new ISPM focused on the pest risk management stage of the PRA (stage 3)
    - b. integrating the new text developed into the core text of ISPM 11 (section 3 on stage 3 of the PRA)
  - (3) *recommend* that ISPM 11 be proposed for revision.

### **Consider including guidance on pest risk management for the introduction of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms (task 3 of Specification 63).**

- [56] The EWG acknowledged that guidance on pest risk management for the introduction of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms would differ quite a lot from guidance on pest risk management for quarantine pests. They agreed that it should be left out of the scope of this draft ISPM and that, if the need for guidance on pest risk management for the introduction of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms was confirmed, it would better fit in a separate standard or as part of ISPM 3.

### **Protection of biodiversity and the environment (task 4 of Specification 63).**

- [57] The EWG noted the draft ISPM on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001) was part of a process, the PRA, which is finalized when the selected phytosanitary measures are implemented. They acknowledged that, while the implemented phytosanitary measures may have an impact on the protection of biodiversity and the environment, the impact of the process itself would not be direct. Thus, they felt that this task was less relevant for this draft than for other draft ISPMs.
- [58] The EWG noted that the guidance provided in the section on the evaluation of the pest risk management options included the assessment of the environmental impacts of the options. In addition,



they added under the section on “impacts on biodiversity and the environment” a paragraph related to the management of environmental risks (the paragraph originally coming from ISPM 11).

## 7. Potential Operational and Technical Implementation Issues and Possible Recommendations (Task 5 of Specification 63)

[59] The EWG noted the following challenges related to the implementation of pest risk management by NPPOs, and especially those of developing and least developed countries, which were also highlighted in some of the discussion papers<sup>25, 26</sup>:

- limited technical capacities and resources in NPPOs to carry out PRA
- processes related to the identification, selection and evaluation of pest risk management options that may seem cumbersome
- regarding the identification, evaluation and selection of pest risk management options:
  - relying too much on some sources of information and missing out other sources
  - carrying inadequate or too limited consultations outside the NPPO(this could lead to the omission of options and inadequately informed decisions, resulting possibly in the selection of phytosanitary measures that are ineffective or too trade restrictive)
- having limited pest mapping, extrapolation techniques and forecasting of future events such as pest establishment, pest impacts or effects of proposed mitigation measures.

[60] While EWG members hoped that the new standard on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001) would help address some of these challenges, they recognized that the development of a manual would be very useful in helping contracting parties implement all ISPMs related to pest risk management.

[61] When developing text for the draft ISPM on *Guidance on pest risk management* (2014-001), the EWG had identified several points that they considered to be outside of the scope of this ISPM, but they felt these points may be relevant points to consider for the development of a manual on pest risk management:

- examples of potential impacts to consider as detailed in section 2.3.3.1 (Economic impacts) of NAPPO RSPM 40, which relate to the analysis of the impacts to be done by the NPPO of the exporting country
- guidance on cost effectiveness and cost-benefit analysis of measures (as detailed in section 2.4.1 (Comparing risk management measures) of NAPPO RSPM 40)
- guidance on the operational work plan that should be agreed between the NPPO of the importing country and the NPPO of the exporting country before trade can commence
- guidance on possible training to be organized in the exporting country
- references to useful documents to be consulted when performing pest risk management, such as the documents publicly available mentioned in section 5 of this report.

[62] The EWG invited the SC to:

- (4) *consider* the above information on potential operational and technical implementation issues.

## 8. Any Other Business

[63] The Secretariat explained the next steps to the EWG members:

- The draft ISPM would be edited by the Secretariat before being presented to the Standards Committee. The Secretariat would be in direct contact with the Steward for any query that would arise after this meeting.

---

<sup>25</sup> 09\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

<sup>26</sup> 23\_EWG\_PRM\_2018\_March

- The report of this meeting would be drafted by the Secretariat and forwarded to the Rapporteur, and Steward for their clearance. Any controversy would be decided by the Rapporteur. The report would then be posted publicly on the International Phytosanitary Portal<sup>27</sup> and the EWG members informed.

[64] There was no other business.

## 9. Close of the Meeting

[65] The Chairperson and the Secretariat thanked the NPPO of Malta for their very efficient organization of the meeting, as well as all participants for their fruitful contributions.

---

<sup>27</sup> International Phytosanitary Portal – Expert Working Groups: <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  
ON PEST RISK MANAGEMENT (2014-001)****AGENDA**

<b>Agenda Item</b>		<b>Document No.</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat</li> <li>Welcome by the meeting host and organizer</li> <li>Introductions</li> </ul>	--	LARSON / Malta NPPO (PPD)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Presentation of the standard setting process</li> <li>Roles of the Participants</li> <li>Terminology game</li> </ul>	--	GERMAIN LARSON GERMAIN
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>	--	
2.1	Selection of the Chairperson	--	LARSON
2.2	Selection of the Rapporteur	--	CHAIRPERSON
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda	01_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	CHAIRPERSON
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>	--	
3.1	Documents list	02_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	GERMAIN / CAMILLERI
3.2	Participants list	03_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	
3.3	Local information	04_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Review of Specification</b>	<a href="#">Specification 63 on Guidance on pest risk management</a>	FERRO (Steward)
<b>5.</b>	<b>Review of discussion papers</b>	--	CHAIRPERSON
5.1	Review of NAPPO Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures RSPM No. 40 "Principles of Pest Risk Management for the Import of Commodities" (submitted by Mr GUTIERREZ, APHIS-USDA)	05_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	GUTIERREZ
5.2	Canadian EWG member discussion document on Specification 63: Guidance on pest risk management (submitted by Ms PETERSON, CFIA, Canada)	06_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	PETERSON
5.3	Effects of Uncertainties in Risk Assessment in Identifying and Selecting Risk Management Options (submitted by Ms AGBAGALA, Philippines)	07_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	AGBAGALA
5.4	Phytosanitary risk management: A New Zealand perspective (submitted by Ms WILSON and Mr BUTCHER, Ministry for Primary Industries, New Zealand)	08_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	ODGERS

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
5.5	A discussion paper for Specification 63: Guidance on pest risk management (submitted by Ms WOODÉ, Ghana)	09_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	KOSIOM
5.6	Publications from EFSA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Guidance on methodology for evaluation of the effectiveness of options for reducing the risk of introduction and spread of organisms harmful to plant health in the EU territory</li> <li>- Review of quantitative assessment of risk reduction options applied in the EFSA outputs on biological hazards, in support of a guidance document of the EFSA Panel on Plant Health</li> <li>- Guidance on a harmonised framework for pest risk assessment and the identification and evaluation of pest risk management options by EFSA</li> <li>- Guidance of the Panel on Plant Health following a request from EFSA on the evaluation of pest risk assessments and risk management options prepared to justify requests for phytosanitary measures under Council Directive 2000/29/EC</li> </ul>	10_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar  11_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar  12_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar  13_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	GUITIAN CASTRILLON
5.7	ISPM 11 ( <i>Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests</i> ): stage 3 (Pest Risk Management)	ISPM 11	GUITIAN CASTRILLON
5.8	EPPO Guidelines on Pest Risk Analysis: stage 3	14_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	GUITIAN CASTRILLON
5.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- USDA APHIS Guidelines for Plant Pest Risk Assessment of Imported Fruit &amp; Vegetable Commodities</li> <li>- USDA APHIS Importation of Fresh Apricot, <i>Prunus armeniaca</i> Marshall, Fruit from Continental Spain into the United States, including Hawaii and U.S. Territories – Risk Management document</li> </ul>	15_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar  16_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	GUTIERREZ
5.10	Discussion paper for consideration by the EWG on Guidance on pest risk management (submitted by Ms HA, Vietnam)	17_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	GERMAIN
5.11	Discussion paper – EWG on Guidance on pest risk management (submitted by Ms GATTI, Argentina)	18_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	GATTI
5.12	Discussion paper (submitted by Ms ODGERS, Australia)	20_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	ODGERS
5.13	IPPC pest risk management related resources and tools applicable on global level	22_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	LARSON
5.14	Review of the implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures related to pest risk management	21_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	LARSON
5.15	A discussion paper for Specification 63 (submitted by Mr Thomas KOSIOM, Kenya)	23_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
6.	<b>Development of text for the draft ISPM</b> <i>Reference documents:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates (particularly Part 1, sections 2, 3 and 5)</i></li> <li>- <i>ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)</i></li> <li>- <i>Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology</i></li> </ul>	<a href="#">Link to the IPPC Style Guide</a> <a href="#">Link to ISPM 5</a> 19_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	CHAIRPERSON
7.	<b>Identify Operational and Technical Implementation Issues and Possible recommendations (see task 5 of <a href="#">Specification 63</a>)</b>	--	CHAIRPERSON
8.	<b>Any Other Business</b>	--	CHAIRPERSON
9.	<b>Close of the Meeting</b>	--	IPPC SECRETARIAT / CHAIRPERSON

**Appendix 2: Documents List****EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON PEST RISK MANAGEMENT****05-09 March 2018 in Qawra, Malta****DOCUMENTS LIST**

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	2.3	Agenda	2018-02-01 2018-02-12 2018-02-16
02_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	3.1	Documents list	2018-02-01 2018-02-12 2018-02-16
03_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	3.2	Participants list	2018-02-01 2018-02-16
04_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	3.3	Local information	2017-12-08
05_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.1	Review of NAPPO RSPM No. 40 (submitted by Mr GUTIERREZ, APHIS-USDA)	2018-02-01
06_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.2	Canadian EWG member discussion document on Specification 63 (submitted by Ms PETERSON, CFIA, Canada)	2018-02-01
07_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.3	Effects of Uncertainties in Risk Assessment in Identifying and Selecting Risk Management Options (submitted by Ms AGBAGALA, Philippines)	2018-02-01
08_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.4	Phytopathological risk management: A New Zealand perspective (submitted by Ms WILSON and Mr BUTCHER, Ministry for Primary Industries, New Zealand)	2018-02-01
09_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.5	A discussion paper for Specification 63 (submitted by Ms WOODE, Ghana)	2018-02-01
10_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.6	Publication from EFSA: Guidance on methodology for evaluation of the effectiveness of options for reducing the risk of introduction and spread of organisms harmful to plant health in the EU territory	2018-02-01
11_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.6	Publication from EFSA: Review of quantitative assessment of risk reduction options applied in the EFSA outputs on biological hazards, in support of a guidance document of the EFSA Panel on Plant Health	2018-02-01
12_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.6	Publication from EFSA: Guidance on a harmonised framework for pest risk assessment and the identification and evaluation of pest risk management options by EFSA	2018-02-01

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
13_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.6	Publication from EFSA: Guidance of the Panel on Plant Health following a request from EFSA on the evaluation of pest risk assessments and risk management options prepared to justify requests for phytosanitary measures under Council Directive 2000/29/EC	2018-02-01
14_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.8	EPPO Guidelines on Pest Risk Analysis: stage 3	2018-02-01
15_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.9	USDA APHIS Guidelines for Plant Pest Risk Assessment of Imported Fruit & Vegetable Commodities	2018-02-01
16_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.9	USDA APHIS Importation of Fresh Apricot, <i>Prunus armeniaca</i> Marshall, Fruit from Continental Spain into the United States, including Hawaii and U.S. Territories – Risk Management document	2018-02-01
17_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.10	Discussion paper for consideration by the EWG on Guidance on pest risk management (submitted by Ms HA, Vietnam)	2018-02-01
18_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.11	Discussion paper – EWG on Guidance on pest risk management (submitted by Ms GATTI, Argentina)	2018-02-01
19_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	6	Guidelines for a consistent ISPM terminology	2018-02-01
20_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.12	Discussion paper – EWG on Guidance on pest risk management (submitted by Dr Wendy ODGERS)	2018-02-12
21_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.14	Review of the implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures related to pest risk management	2018-02-12
22_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.13	IPPC pest risk management related resources and tools applicable on global level	2018-02-12
23_EWG_PRM_2018_Mar	5.15	A discussion paper for Specification 63 (submitted by Mr Thomas KOSIOM, Kenya)	2018-03-06

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Annotated template for draft ISPMs: <a href="https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81325/">https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81325/</a>	1 / 6
IPPC Style guide: <a href="https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/">https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/132/</a>	1 / 6
ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms): <a href="https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/622/">https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/622/</a>	1 / 6
Specification 63 – Guidance on pest risk management <a href="https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81795/">https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81795/</a>	1 / 6
Adopted Standards <a href="https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm/">https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm/</a>	1 / 6

### Appendix 3: Participants List

#### EXPERT WORKING GROUP ON PEST RISK MANAGEMENT

#### PARTICIPANTS LIST

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.

	Participant Role	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Steward	<b>Mr Ezequiel FERRO</b> Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av. Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires <b>ARGENTINA</b> Tel/Fax: (+5411) 4121-5091	<a href="mailto:eferro@senasa.gov.ar">eferro@senasa.gov.ar</a> ;
✓	Member	<b>Ms María Elena GATTI</b> General Coordinator for Pest Risk Analysis of the NPPO, 315 Paseo Colón Av., floor 4th, office 14, ZIP 1063, Buenos Aires, <b>ARGENTINA</b> Tel : +54-11-41215245 Fax : +54-11-41215168	<a href="mailto:megatti@senasa.gob.ar">megatti@senasa.gob.ar</a> ;
✓	Member	<b>Ms Wendy ODGERS</b> Director, Plant Sciences and Risk Assessment, Plant Division GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel: +61 2 6272 5322	<a href="mailto:wendy.odgers@agriculture.gov.au">wendy.odgers@agriculture.gov.au</a> ;
✓	Member	<b>Mr Harry ARIJS</b> Deputy Head of Plant Health Unit European commission Rue Froissart 101, room 6/60 Brussels <b>BELGIUM</b> Tel: +32 2 29 87645	<a href="mailto:harry.arijs@ec.europa.eu">harry.arijs@ec.europa.eu</a> ;
✓	Member	<b>Ms Barbara PETERSON</b> Senior Horticulture Specialist Suite 400, 4321 Still Creek Drive, Burnaby, B.C. V5C 6S7 <b>CANADA</b> Tel : +1 604.292.5665	<a href="mailto:Barbara.Peterson@inspection.gc.ca">Barbara.Peterson@inspection.gc.ca</a> ;
	Member	<b>Mr Thomas Kimeli KOSIOM</b> Senior Inspector Kephis Mo-Mbasa, 80126-80100, Mombasa <b>KENYA</b> Tel: +254720398083	<a href="mailto:tkosiom@kephis.org">tkosiom@kephis.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:tkosiom@gmail.com">tkosiom@gmail.com</a> ;
✓	Member	<b>Ms Ma. Lorelie U. AGBAGALA</b> Supervising Agriculturist Post-Entry Quarantine Station BPI Compound, Economic Garden Brgy. Timugan, Los Banos, Laguna 4030 <b>PHILIPPINES</b> Tel: +6349-536-1678; +639178063668 Fax: +6349-536-1678	<a href="mailto:lorelieu5@gmail.com">lorelieu5@gmail.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:pqs.losbanos@gmail.com">pqs.losbanos@gmail.com</a> ;

	<b>Participant Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>
✓	<b>Member</b>	<b>Mr José María GUITIAN CASTRILLON</b> Tecnologías y Servicios Agrarios, S.A., S.M.E., M.P., (Tragsatec) Head of Department Julian Camarillo 6A Madrid 28037 <b>SPAIN</b> Tel: 00 34 610591439	<a href="mailto:JMGC@TRAGSA.ES;">JMGC@TRAGSA.ES;</a>
✓	<b>Member</b>	<b>Mr Walter Antonio GUTIERREZ</b> Assistant Lab Director 1730 Varsity Drive. Raleigh, NC 27606 <b>USA</b> Tel: 919-855-7529 Work mobile: 919 239 0613	<a href="mailto:walter.a.gutierrez@aphis.usda.gov;">walter.a.gutierrez@aphis.usda.gov;</a>
<b>OTHER PARTICIPANTS</b>			
✓	<b>Host representative (observer)</b>	<b>Ms Sandra CAMILLERI</b> Plant Protection Directorate 110, Annibale Preca Street, Lija, LJA 1915 <b>MALTA</b> Tel: +00356 2292 6500	<a href="mailto:alexandra.b.camilleri@gov.mt;">alexandra.b.camilleri@gov.mt;</a>
✓	<b>Host representative (observer)</b>	<b>Ms Marthese LICARI</b> Plant Protection Directorate 110, Annibale Preca Street, Lija, LJA 1915 <b>MALTA</b>	<a href="mailto:marthese.licari@gov.mt;">marthese.licari@gov.mt;</a>
✓	<b>IPPC Secretariat</b>	<b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> Implementation Facilitation Unit Leader International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO/UN) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 <b>Rome, Italy</b> Phone: + 39 06 570 54915	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org;">Brent.Larson@fao.org;</a>
✓	<b>IPPC Secretariat</b>	<b>Ms Céline GERMAIN</b> Standard Setting Officer International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO/UN) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 <b>Rome, Italy</b> Phone: + 39 06 570 54468	<a href="mailto:Celine.Germain@fao.org;">Celine.Germain@fao.org;</a>
✓	<b>IPPC Secretariat</b>	<b>Ms Janka KISS</b> Standard Setting Associate International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat (IPPC) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO/UN) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 <b>Rome, Italy</b> Phone: + 39 06 570 52454	<a href="mailto:Janka.Kiss@fao.org;">Janka.Kiss@fao.org;</a>