

**REPORT OF THE APPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON DRAFT ISPMS – 2019**  
**2-6 September, 2019**  
**Busan, Republic of Korea**



## Summary

The participants, 37 from 20 countries, IPPC and APPPC were updated on activities concerning the following areas:- the 14<sup>th</sup> session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM14); the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030; the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH); the Ministerial Statement for CPM15; the Standards Committee; the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee; the National Reporting Obligations (NRO); ePhyto; and the activities of the APPPC. Participants were encouraged to hold informal consultations on the declaration for CPM15. It is hoped that there will be sufficient resources to hold two meetings of the Standards Committee and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee in 2020.

The draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMS) were considered and comments discussed with those agreed on by the participants being noted. The ISPMS were:- Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001); Revision of ISPM 8. Determination of pest status in an area (2009-05); Requirements for National Plant Protection

Organizations if Authorization entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002); Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006); and the review of eight phytosanitary treatments. There was some support for the retention of transience as a separate category within the pest status revised standard. A number of participants proposed that the authorization of entities standard be complemented with comprehensive procedures.

Emphasis on that the authorization of entities is not mandatory for NPPO activities was provided to facilitate the discussion about concern on implementation of this draft ISPM. Most participants supported the introduction of this ISPM. It was suggested that the modified atmosphere standard be accompanied by an appendix describing key technical requirements.

The participants then reviewed the draft CPM recommendation on Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation: the Sea Container Hygiene System; and the Focus Group on commodity and pathway standards. There was general support for this CPM recommendation though a number of participants expressed the opinion that as this is an important subject it should have been covered by a standard.

A next regional workshop on draft ISPMs is planned for 2020 hosted by the Republic of Korea.

## **Report**

### **1. Opening of the workshop**

#### **Welcome address (APPPC/FAO)**

The meeting was opened by Mr Sridhar Dharmapuri, Senior Food Safety and Nutrition Officer, FAO, Bangkok. He explained that he was standing in as the Plant Protection Officer for the meantime. He welcomed participants.

Dr BongKyun Park, Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Commissioner welcomed participants to the Republic of Korea and wished them a successful meeting and an enjoyable stay in Busan.

#### **Election of chair**

Dr Yim, Republic of Korea was proposed by New Zealand as chair and seconded by Viet Nam. The proposal was agreed to by participants.

#### **Election of rapporteur**

Dr Hedley, New Zealand was elected as rapporteur.

#### **Local and logistical information**

The participants introduced themselves. There were 37 participants from 20 countries, IPPC and APPPC.

#### **Adoption of the agenda**

Dr Yim discussed the agenda. Some flexibility would be applied with the time management to ensure that all the draft ISPMs were covered. The Diagnostic protocol on *Striga* will be noted if there are comments. The topic of Emerging pests was found to be not included in the agenda. This was inserted.

### **2. Updates**

#### **2.1 CPM 14**

Dr Yim provided the update. CPM14 endorsed the content of the IPPC Strategic Framework. This will be adopted by the Ministerial session of CPM15.

The Focus group on Commodity and Pathway Standards reported to the meeting. Such standards will not affect a country's sovereign rights. All drafts will be pending until the concept commodity standard is adopted. The leadership work of the APPPC on commodity standards was noted.

The implementation plan for the five-year ePhyto strategic plan was described. The E-commerce project work plan was presented with a budget. However, funds were not available. Canada is providing some in-kind resource.

Updates on the pest outbreaks and alert system were discussed at length. The Fall Armyworm was the centre of discussions. An action plan for an IPPC emergency system is to be submitted to CPM15.

Regarding antimicrobial resistance in relation to plant health species, this will be monitored via an FAO Task Force subject to resource availability.

CPM14 adopted a recommendation on:- High-throughput sequencing (HTS) technologies as a diagnostic tool for phytosanitary purposes. Other recommendations on the Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation and Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods were considered.

The Framework for standards and implementation was noted with a reformatted version available. The report of the Task Force on Topics is available. The Surveillance pilot project analysis was reviewed by SPG and the IC and was presented with a request for further funds.

The report on standards was presented with a number of standards adopted. These were DP 2 revision: *Plum pox virus*, DP 25: *Xylella fastidiosa*, DP 26: *Austropuccinia psidii*, DP 27: *Ips* spp., DP 28: *Conotrachelus nenuphar*, DP 29: *Bactrocera dorsalis*, ISPM 43: Requirements for the use of Fumigation as a phytosanitary measure, and 2017 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*)

The Implementation and Capacity Development Committee report was presented. The IPPC Secretariat Work Plan and budget was presented. A Five-year investment plan was adopted.

## **2.2 IPPC strategic framework 2020-2030**

This overview was presented by Dr Adriana Moreira of the IPPC Secretariat. The impact of pests was noted – 10-16 % of the global harvest, 40% of the global food supply costing some 220 Billion USD. The current Strategic Framework expires this year. The new one will be adopted by the CPM15 Ministerial session. The development from 2014 to the present was described.

Dr Moreira considered the various sections of the framework – the mission, vision, goal, and the strategic objectives. The key result areas of the objectives were noted: global food security and increase sustainable agricultural productivity; protect the environment from the impacts of plant pests; facilitate safe trade development and economic growth. These are achieved through the core activities – standard setting, implementation and capacity development, and communication and international cooperation.

The new IPPC Development Agenda was noted. It has eight items – harmonisation of electronic data exchange, commodity and pathway specific ISPMs, management of E-commerce and courier mail pathways, developing guidance on the use of Third Party Entities, strengthening pest outbreak and alert response systems, assessment and management of climate change impacts on plant health, global phytosanitary research coordination, and diagnostic laboratory networking. Funds need to be identified for these activities.

This was followed by discussions on resource mobilisation – 2.3 million USD is required each year.

It was suggested that each region should agree by consensus on three of the eight areas to concentrate on.

The participants were asked if they had used the IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy. Only three countries had. There needs to be within country discussions on how to use the information provided.

Dr Yim noted at the APPPC planning group had suggested that the November APPPC commission meeting put aside time to discuss which goal should be pursued and what would be the associated activities. The APPPC has been leading in a number of areas – ePhyto, pest surveillance and commodity standards. It was proposed to have a workshop on the emerging pest issue with the all of the three APPPC standing committees being involved.

Australia noted again the IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity development strategy is little used so far. The best work could be achieved on a regional level – better resources and networking. Australia has now a Chief Environmental Biosecurity Officer. There should also be more ideas put forward regarding the funding of the projects identified.

Japan suggested that there be more discussion on implementation issues. This could be extended to include other activities. But this would depend on the roles of the participants (i.e. technical vs policy). The APPPC is able to provide technical guidance to the IPPC – as the APPPC is leading in a number of initiatives.

New Zealand is funding commodity standards and ePhyto work. A workshop on commodity standards is proposed. Cambodia would like to find a mechanism that will help countries to make use of the resource strategy.

FAO Bangkok noted some of the trends for resource mobilisation in the region – Asia is a very fast-growing region and funding is more in the type of investment planning – part loan and part grant. There is the need for more integrated proposals eg with Codex, closer links with associated organisations, and a more forward-looking strategy eg with FAW. Aid organizations are more interested in wider projects – more “one health”. The need to work with other organisations e.g. ePhyto with Codex and OIE, was stressed.

### **2.3 IYPH – international Year of Plant Health**

This was presented by Dr Yim. The purpose of IYPH is to increase the awareness of plant health. The background of the preparation of the IYPH proclamation was described. The basic activities include: –

- December, 2019 - launching event in Rome in and in New York
- CPM15 April 2, 2020 - the Ministerial session
- October 5-8, 2020 - International Conference on Plant Health, Helsinki
- October 16, 2020 - World Food day will focus on PH.

The promotion activities were noted. There will be regional and global activities. The IYPH planning group will meet September and October before the launch in December. NPPOs and RPPOs are expected to arrange activities. There will be promotion activities amongst academia, the civil society and the private sector. The estimated budget is some 857,000 USD. However, funds still needed – 562,000 USD.

The Logo can be used by academia and private bodies as long it is not used for commercial purposes.

Nepal reported on the activities planned for the IYPH. China is contributing 100,000 USD to the IYPH activities and has developed a number of videos on plant quarantine. There may be other communication projects developed. Japan is acquiring a budget for IYPH activities. Australia has a steering committee which is working with industry and environment groups to develop cooperation in the plant health area. There is a National Coordinator appointed. New Zealand will connect IYPH with current activities. Some resources have been acquired so that there are communications with industry. There is a parliamentary celebration scheduled.

#### **2.4 Ministerial statement for CPM15**

The statement is on the OCS to collect comments. The declaration was drafted by Dr Stephen Butcher after consultation with various officials from foreign affairs and legal departments. A second draft has been developed. It is suggested that FAO Legal be consulted as well.

In short the statement includes – acknowledging the IYPH, the importance of plant health and the IPPC, the contribution to the UN SDGs, the impact of plant pests, and endorses the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030..

The 2<sup>nd</sup> draft includes sections noting:-

- the IYPH and its purpose,
- the irreversible impacts of plant pests on food security, the environment and rural economies,
- the crucial importance of plant health and the pre-eminence of the IPPC,
- a common vision for global action to protect plant resources and facilitate safe trade,
- with a commitment to support the systematic implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030,
- while strengthening efforts to minimise the risk of pest spread as a result of trade and travel, and avoiding unjustifiable barriers to trade, and to ensure our exports are free of regulated pests to the fullest extent possible
- and calling on governments around the world to provide the necessary resources to protect plant health and working with industries,
- calling for donors to provide for on-going material support and invest in capacity and capability building in developing countries.

Australia commented that funds by donors may be able to be contributed to specific projects rather than a general contribution to the IPPC. The wording could be amended by the IPPC Secretariat if necessary to cover this.

Cambodia stated that an official letter should be sent to all countries regarding the declaration. FAO Secretariat noted that the whole procedure will be under FAO rules and procedures – and therefore will take time. Before this occurs there will be input from the Bureau and SPG and NPPOs.

FAO noted that this is not a commitment, just a declaration and this draft can be used for informal consultation. Dr Yim advised that informal consultation with high level officials should take place at an early stage if possible. The formal procedure will take some time – so this early action would be useful.

#### **2.5 Standards Committee**

This was presented by Mr Sai, Japan. Bruce Hancocks has resigned and Sophie Petersen has taken his place. Dr Jo Wilson has taken the place of Dr Stephen Butcher.

ISPMs for first consultation include: amendments for ISPM 5 – delayed till 2020 as only one term involved, Guidance to risk management – retitled as Pest Risk management for quarantine pests. This will incorporate information from ISPM 11.

The SC will continue working on the reorganisation of PRA standards. More discussion will follow.

Commodity and pathway standards: there will be a concept standard, a new Panel, a permanent steward and work on a specific example.

The SC did not agree with the reduction of the work and number of meetings of the SC as suggested by the Bureau and considered that the activities should not be so reduced. But there will be no SC7 meeting in 2020 as there is no material to be considered. The decision on the two SC meetings is still to be made. There is a problem with the Secretariat resources available for all the meetings planned. With emerging pests – the TPG proposed a definition – but it was not agreed to. The TPPT and TPDP are to comment on ways the time could be shortened in the development of standards.

Five terms were added to the list – emergency action, clearance (of a consignment), general surveillance, specific surveillance, modified atmosphere treatment, with commodity to be removed.

Other issues included discussions with the IC on joint work on the revised surveillance project plan, the task force on topics, the updating of the FSI and the organization of IPPC Regional Workshops. The TPs were reviewed and it was decided the TP for Fruit flies was no longer needed.

## **2.6 Implementation and Capacity Development Committee**

Dr Sharma, Nepal provided a review of the IC's purpose, composition and activities. Key areas of work included: the Strategic Framework, the concept of emerging pests, the task force on Topics, Standards and Implementation, Framework of standards and implementation, conceptual challenges to standards, sea containers and the IYPH.

The PCE and strategy have been discussed. There is material to be shared and developed.

Dr Chris Dale amplified some parts of the report. The IC tries to draw on country's expertise to help support standards. The IC team is small which means the members have to multitask. The membership will all be up for nomination next year. The IC has three sub-groups concerning the:– IRSS, Dispute Avoidance and Settlement, and the SCTF. Regarding the Dispute body – there has been no opportunity to work yet. The IC has oversight of the NRO. It also sets strategies and direction for: the PCE, Guides and training materials, Phytosanitary resources, the IPPC Global plant health surveillance initiative and Projects.

The APPPC has been leading the work on surveillance with a number of surveillance activities and products. This is being shared where possible.

## **2.7 NRO**

This was presented by Dr Chris Dale. There are two levels of reporting - bilateral and global. The work of NRO includes: the designation of CP, the description of NPPO, Phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions, lists of entry points, the establishment and

updating of lists of regulates pests, the reporting of occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests, and to immediately report emergency actions. Some of the statistics of reporting were presented. The IC checks these statistics each year.

Bilateral NRO work includes: the description of organizational arrangements of plant protection, the rationale for phytosanitary requirements etc, the reporting of non-compliance with phytosanitary certification, the reporting of the result of investigations regarding significant instances of non-compliance with Phytosanitary Certificates, the development and maintenance of information on pest status and making such information available, providing the technical and biological information necessary for pest risk analysis.

Dr Dale discussed the production of reports of pest incursions and the need to produce such reports immediately on occurrence. Associated information on a detection is also most important so as to put a detection in context.

The term emergency action was discussed – with its difference from phytosanitary action.

It was asked - why do countries not report as required? There was also the comment that often NPPOs do not know how up to date the reports of other countries are. One country mentioned that rapid reporting of pest incidence can cause problems in some cases. Some sources of information can be anomalous or constitute a discrepancy e.g. some reports from CABI or EPPO.

## **2.8 ePhyto**

This was presented by Dr A. Moreira, IPPC Secretariat. A short video was shown. It was noted that this was unnecessarily critical of the paper PC system which has served the phytosanitary community well for over sixty years. The Hub based and the GeNS systems were briefly described. The security of ePhyto was confirmed. With paper PCs there can be a number of non-compliant documents, inefficient processes, and a greater likelihood of fraud. EPhyto provides transparency, supports good governance and modernises procedures. There will be full release of the GeNS by 15 July. Interface and exchange with other systems is in progress (e.g. Single Window), and work moving towards integration with Customs. It is hoped to continue to streamline the system.

Pilot countries as of July 2019 include: Argentina, Australia, Chile, China, Ecuador, Kenya, Rep. of Korea, Netherlands, New Zealand, USA, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Columbia, Costa Rica, Morocco, Mexico.

A Pacific workshop held in Samoa has been successful. Australia is supporting training for ePhyto for countries in the Pacific. It was noted that some paper PCs have contained other information alongside the phytosanitary information – but ePhyto does not allow this. It may be useful to consider this aspect of ePhyto as well as the interfaces permitted.

## **2.9 Update on the activities of APPPC**

Dr Yim noted that the plan and budget was developed at the planning meeting that met in August in Bangkok. Some aspects of the last biennium plan could not be completed. The new plan will include:

- The implementation of the ISPM 6 Surveillance programme – Phase 4 will be in 2020 not 2019.
- Workshop on ISPM 32 – postponed to 2020. Possibly funded by Indonesia.



- Molecular diagnostics for SALB – postponed.
- Regional workshop – continue, possibly funded by Korea.
- Regional workshop on commodity based standards – supported by New Zealand, concept paper provided.
- ePhyto workshop – to be led by Australia covering components, capacity building, single window.
- Further work on Chilli seed RSPM. This could be an SC meeting - decision to be made by 31st commission.
- APPPC pre-CPM consultation.
- Fall armyworm – experience sharing workshop. This could be an emergency response workshop – with the three APPPC Standing Committees.
- IPM workshop on pests of palms.
- Pesticide management– pesticide residue detection – hosted by China November 2019 - needs to be organised.
- Workshop on pesticide application by unmanned aerial vehicles.
- IYPH – do not really need new events but could incorporate planned activities into the IYPH.

FAO Bangkok noted the input from FAO for the programme is limited. Indonesia suggested that the ISPM workshop could be rebranded as an IYPH activity in 2020. New Zealand observed that travel to New Zealand is too expensive so a co-host in Asia for the APPPC commodity standard workshop would be required. This could be a joint IPPC-APPPC workshop. Australia mentioned that the surveillance workshop has been delayed – to last week in February 2020 in an Asian country. The international PFA – surveillance workshop is going ahead with registrations and papers in Japan.

It was noted by the Chair that there have been no offers to host the 32<sup>nd</sup> APPPC Commission meeting.

### **3. Emerging pests**

Fall Armyworm was discussed by Nepal. The pest can be dispersed over long distances – flying 100km per day. The biological life cycle was described. It is polyphagous with over a 100 recorded hosts and needs high temperatures for development - 28C is the optimum. Detection and control were discussed. Monitoring should be carried out by scouting or pheromone trapping. A mobile app developed by FAO is available. Data sharing is most important. The movement of the pest in Nepal was noted. Workshops were conducted.

FAO Bangkok described the FAW work in the region. The pest is endemic to South America, came to Africa and then Asia – Bangladesh, Myanmar, Indonesia, India, Nepal, Thailand. Immediate responses include short term projects with longer term projects including monitoring. Damage can be from 5% to 100%. FAO advocates a monitoring method with standard measurement and sampling. Response should be anchored around the farmer. The App can be used – and can be translated. There is much information on the website. Working with the commercial firms needs to be stressed. This pest is made important by the dominance of the cropping of maize. Regarding the strains of the pest – the rice strain prefers maize and the damage to rice is still slight.

#### **4. Review and discussion of draft ISPMs 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation**

Except where stated “APPPC agreed” the comments below are national comments.

##### **4.1 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)**

This was presented by Mr Sai. Participants were reminded to use only the latest version. There are five deletions and four revisions. The deletions are commodity class, bulbs and tubers (as a commodity class), flowers and tubers (as a commodity class), fruits and vegetables (as a commodity class), plants *in vitro* (as a commodity class).

The revisions were seeds (as a commodity class) to seeds (as a commodity), grain (as a commodity class) to grain (as a commodity), wood (as a commodity class) to wood (as a commodity), treatment to treatment (as a phytosanitary measure) with a modified definition.

There were very few comments. China suggested the term treatment be changed to phytosanitary treatment.

##### **4.2 Revision of ISPM 8. Determination of pest status in an area (2009-05)**

This was presented by Dr Wilson. General points were that the tables were retained with some modifications. A new category was inserted. The reliability section could be moved out of the standard.

##### **General comments:**

- New Zealand wanted to retain the status transient as a separate section not in the Presence section. This would take into account temporary populations not expected to establish (as per Article VII, par 3 of the IPPC) and the category “Present: transient” may be read with an emphasis on presence and result in unjustified phytosanitary import requirements. It was suggested to replace present with detected in the description of transience as found in the original ISPM. It is suggested that there be two types of transience – “actionable under surveillance” and “actionable under eradication” (see under Para 113).
- There were a number of comments regarding the use of transient. It was suggested that the term is misused, and clearer with only two categories (compared to three in the original ISPM 8).
- There was no agreement on the comment to retain transience and develop guide material.
- Some participants suggested to remove the appendix.
- Korea wanted to keep the two categories only – and retain the table. China wanted to modify the table and consolidate the use official information.

There will be an IC workshop on developing guidelines for the pest status standard. Case studies could be provided. The Secretariat asked participants if appendices are considered useful as part of ISPMs. There was not clear reply.

##### **Specific comments:**

- Japan asked if within the context of the standard – pest maybe misunderstood as an individual specimen para 86. Participants did not agree with this.
- Viet Nam - suggested to put into Scope a reference to ISPM 17 after pest reporting.
- Para 34 - Japan thinks the appendix should not be referred to in the Scope.

- Para 45 - ...are used by NPPOs to determine the presence or absence ... APPPC agreed.
- Para 46 – Viet Nam suggested to add ...the main information....
- Para 55 – It was suggested to add specific point for surveillance – but then stated that pest management includes surveillance (as per last consultation).
- Para 74 – Nepal suggested to change this point to “taxonomy” only. APPPC agreed.
- Para 86 – Japan suggested “current distribution...” be changed to “...current situation of a pest ....” APPPC agreed.
- Para 87 – Viet Nam proposed to remove second sentence.
- Para 96 – Japan suggested an addition “...the pest is present in a local area, a part or parts .....”
- Para 106 – Japan – (...a pest free area or natural migration of a pest)
- Para 107 – Japan - In some cases it is necessary .....
- Para 112 – add extra point – at post entry quarantine/place ..but in Para 85 already.
- Para 113 – new suggested by New Zealand re transience
  - Pest status – Transient
  - Transient includes the following two types:
    - Transient: actionable, under surveillance
    - Transient: actionable, under eradication.
  - It was pointed out that actionable is rarely used now that the IPPC 1997 introduced regulated pests.
- Para 120 - ...the entire area is a .....Japan suggested. APPPC agreed.
- Para 128 - China suggested .....(Surveillance) – or there is no new report on the occurrence of the pest. The reason ...
- Para 129 – China suggested to add last line – changes of competing species (eg natural enemy) ...
- Para 135 – Indonesia proposes to add information regarding the time space (in years) needed to declare that a country has been free from specific pest when it was not found after several years surveillance...
- Para 138 – Japan suggested ...determine pest status (more information provide in section 2) .....outdated. The necessary information can be provided to other NPPO upon request. Moreover, surveillance maybe a method to supplement insufficient information.
- Para 138 - Thailand – delete section 3.3 could be a confused as a category. Is to be left.
- Para 141 – Japan – (...contradictory pest records or difference of taxonomical theories). Detail not agreed to.
- Appendix ... no agreement on suggested changes. Some participants proposed keeping the appendix, others preferred that the IC produced implementation material including the information.

Regarding implementation issues, there is a need to ensure consistency with other standards and to determine what guidance material should be developed. There are a number of opportunities coming up for coordination of efforts to support surveillance and reporting activities. This revised standard has great implications in making it necessary to undertake surveillance to confirm status, particularly absence.

### **4.3 Requirements for National Plant Protection Organizations if authorization entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)**

The draft summary was presented by Dr Wilson, New Zealand. Cambodia, Viet Nam, Malaysia, Laos, Mongolia and Timor-Leste have difficulty in accepting this standard. However, many countries need this standard to accomplish their phytosanitary procedures. The system is not mandatory – but if a country wants to authorise third parties, the standard offers rules to do this. The participants' consideration included the fact that delegation might compromise phytosanitary security. The SPG regarded this ISPM as an option and was not promoting it. Similarly, the SC noted that the standard does not mandate the use of third parties. CPM supported the concept but some countries expressed concerns. FAO Legal confirmed that the IPPC Article V 2. (a) permitted the authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions. It was noted that NPPOs should not authorize third parties unless an oversight system is in place (i.e. an audit system).

SC7 modified the title and changed the scope as well stressing the non-mandatory nature of the authorization. NPPOs should ensure that their legal framework allows the authorization. It is up to NPPOs to decide whether or not to authorize; there are criteria for eligibility. The difference of audit and supervision was clarified. Types of non-conformities were described along with suspension and revocation.

Potential implementation issues include:- legal framework, implementation guidance, capacity building, conflict of interest, and costs and technical guidance.

#### **General comments:**

- Viet Nam required details to set up a system. New Zealand suggested that the APPPC could help with training in this regard.
- New Zealand had three comments :- guidance material is required, there is difficulty with the term supervise, it is important to link this with the audit standard.
- Malaysia – does not agree with authorisation of entities and would like to see more case studies.

#### **Specific comments:**

- Title – Japan – suggested that there is no need the first part of the title just - Authorization of entities to perform ...
- Scope – Japan felt the fact that authorization did not cover the issuance of PCs needed to be stated – ...the IPPC authorization for phytosanitary actions does not include the issuance of PCs and NPPO core activities such as the development and establishment of phytosanitary measures.
- Para 44 – Japan suggested the modification – Phytosanitary actions to protect the introduction and spread of quarantine pests I are beneficial .....
- Para 44 – Modification - ...crucial to the conservation of biodiversity ... APPPC agreed.
- Para 46 - China proposed adding –... authorization or not should not be used as the evaluation standard for NPPO Agreement....
- Para 49 – China proposed the deletion of sentence .... Authorization for phytosanitary actions....
- Para 52 – New Zealand suggested to remove ...regulatory...
- Para 54 – China suggested deleting this heading.

- Para 55 ...Modifications included: ..should develop and maintain .... With an authorization ....
- Paras 56-71 Editorial - modify first words for points remove ..set the ..develop ..determine...
- APPPC agreed.
- Para 57 - Viet Nam suggested - ...develop specific procedures...
- Para 59 – New Zealand noted that implementation material is needed.
- Para 64 - New Zealand proposed ...which may include audit or ...
- Para 65 - Viet Nam noted that more information is required on non-conformities
- Para 66 - New Zealand suggested that reinstatement could be included here.
- Para 69 – Viet Nam stated it was not sure what contingency plans are available.
- Para 74 – Modified to read ...can legally operate... APPPC agreed
- Para 75 – addition proposed by New Zealand - ...for organisation and enterprises there should be an appointed/identified individual who is responsible for the delivery of the phytosanitary actions. APPPC agreed
- Para 94 - China suggested to delete -... voluntarily withdraw .... APPPC agreed
- Para after 111 – add new point – identification and management of conflicts of interest ..APPPC agreed.
- Para 112 - Modified to become .... critical non-conformity... APPPC agreed
- Para new 120 – Added new bullet –... to provide a regular report of activities to the NPPO. APPPC agreed
- Para 120 – New Zealand suggested that supervision be defined.
- Para 122 – It was noted that this could be included under implementation – APPPC agreed.
- Para 122 – Modified to read ...notification (within an agreed time frame) .... APPPC agreed.
- Para 124 – Modified ....and identify and manage any conflict of interest. APPPC agreed.
- Para 129 – Modified to ...(or its authorized audit entity) .... APPPC agreed
- Para 134 - Viet Nam proposed ... The NPPOs may also conduct unannounced audits. It was noted that this could be included in any legal agreement.
- Para 134 - China noted - Have difficulty accepting the 3<sup>rd</sup> party doing an audit. This point was discussed.
- Para 135 – Modified ....by the NPPO (or its authorized audit entity).... APPPC agreed.
- Para 140 – Modified ...the NPPO (or its authorized audit entity) .... APPPC agreed.
- Para Add new 142 – suggested by China. The NPPO of the import country have the right to require the NPPO of export country to provide information of the related authorized entity, if they find non-compliance.
- Para 148 - New Zealand suggested ...The NPPO should have a system in place to manage critical nonconformity. The NPPO should suspend or revoke an entity’s authorization to perform a specific phytosanitary action or require that corrective action must be taken the entity if a critical nonconformity is identified.
- Para pre 154 – New material added – The decision about whether to suspend, revoke or reinstate authorization of the entity rests solely with the NPPO. APPPC agreed.
- Para 154 on - Viet Nam suggests this needs further clarification.

Nepal general comment – very useful for developing countries but difficulty with legislation allowing this authorization. The PC and the non-compliance should be dealt with by the NPPO. Provincial and local governments as parties would be reliable and satisfactory.

New Zealand does not use extra legislation – and this standard should not trigger the need for legal change – it is covered in the IPPC text. The text is meant to cover the use of other government agencies.

#### **Implementation and capacity notes**

Dr Dale noted that there have been many views expressed. Key points include: guidance material for developing countries, the assessment of suitable eligibility, maintenance of an authorization programme, development of workshop materials at a regional and global level, workshop material for the authorized entities, development of templates, form and checklists, availability of case studies e.g. New Zealand diagnostic service, communication and advocacy. There are opportunities to develop workshops and to obtain funding from a number of donor agencies.

It was stressed that this standard would not be mandatory. Many countries already use such systems – the standard will help develop homogenous systems.

#### **4.4 Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)**

The draft was introduced by Mr Sai, Japan. The treatment is used for other purposes than phytosanitary treatment. It involves altering the ambient atmospheric gas concentrations – increasing the CO<sub>2</sub> or decreasing the O<sub>2</sub> or both.

Points revised from the previous country comments include:-

- Definition of modified atmosphere treatment – a description is inserted in the standard. Modified atmosphere and controlled atmosphere - suggesting controlled atmosphere treatment is a type of modified atmosphere treatment.
- Treatment parameters – main ones are gas concentration, treatment duration, temperature and humidity but pressure is not.
- Measuring gas concentration – text added to align with ISPM 43 to indicate equipment needed to measure gas concentration.
- Temperature mapping – align with ISPM 47. Temperature mapping is done to identify placement of temp sensors.
- Authorization of entities. It was suggested that this could be deleted as there is a draft ISPM on the subject. However, there are specific aspects that need to be covered in the authorization of treatment providers.
- Implementation issues: lack of technical capacity and financial constraints, development of treatment schedules re pests ...

#### **General comments:**

- China suggests should be an appendix to describe the key technical requirements of the MA – could clarify premises, critical facilities, operational training, product packing etc, procedure for MA treatment. Japan, Viet Nam support this.

#### **Specific comments:**

- Para 49 - move last sentence to Scope

- Para 57 – proposed by Japan - .....NPPO in the country in which the treatment is conducted or initiated.
- Para 57- suggested by Indonesia ....are undertaken by authorised treatment providers in approved treatment facilities.
- Para 57 - modified to read ...undertaken by the NPPO or authorized treatment providers ... APPPC agreed.
- Para 63 – modified to remove - Treatment parameters... APPPC agreed.
- Para 64 – Nepal suggested – add extra point – enclosure structure condition ..better for section 3.
- Para 64 – Australia proposed adding ...wind speed ..
- Para 69 – Modified - delete 1<sup>st</sup> sentence, then - Modified atmosphere treatments are conducted in an enclosure (e.g. vacuum chamber, freight container, warehouse, cargo ship holds or packaging). The lethal ..... APPPC agreed.
- Para 85 – China added a new point – safeguarding system – China – refers to workplace safety. Australia noted the SC prefers such advice in guidance material.
- Para 89 – Several modifications suggested ....achieved, for example, either when a negative pressure in the enclosure is used to remove O<sub>2</sub> gas by vacuum and when positive pressure in the enclosure is used to flush the enclosure of O<sub>2</sub> by adding nitrogen or other inert gas. In addition, gas absorption into articles may cause negative pressure in the enclosure. If pressure is important to achieve the required treatment condition, it should also be measured and recorded.
- Para 89 - China added to end of para or new para....The gas tightness of an enclosure should be required to prevent the air exchange to maintain the parameters of the treatment (such as the concentration). If necessary, before, a gas tightness test (measuring the pressure half time) should be performed.
- Para 94 – delete. Suggested to add.... MA treatments are frequently used in conjunction with modification of other parameters such as temperature. (from para 50). APPPC agreed.
- Para 95 – Modified addition .. ...measured and monitored to ensure ..... APPPC agreed.
- Para 99 – Japan suggested ... The NPPO of the country in which the phytosanitary treatment is conducted or initiated (the latter when the treatment takes place during transport) is responsible for the authorization of the treatment provider.
- Implementation material – workplace safety requirements, case studies – as it is new technology, training material, technical expertise.

## 5. Review of eight phytosanitary treatments

### Irradiation treatments

Viet Nam noted the range of doses with *Bactrocera tau*. It is suggested that some harmonization should take place. However, there is a difference in the efficacy level. Therefore, trading partners need to agree on the selected level.

A generic dose for *Anastrepha* will be put forward. The present specification is a higher level – and may be revoked to avoid confusion.

Participants asked - what about the generic treatments vs the specific treatments? It was stated that it is a matter of the time-frame of the development process – more information has

been now been generated. Nepal noted if *B. dorsalis* and *B. tau* is present together in an area, the higher level treatment is required.

Radiation is a basically a generic treatment i.e. the same efficacy for a specific pest on different products.

Regarding *B. tau* - China suggests delete schedule 1. But it was noted that Probit 9 is not a requirement under ISPM 28. However, there could be disagreement between import and export countries on which level to be used.

### **Cold treatments**

China – suggests that pupariation should be change to mortality. The Secretariat stated that these terms were used because the text in the treatment itself is more specific in terminology whereas the scope uses broad terminology. It was noted that there can be trouble with the possibility of live insects being found after treatment.

## **6. Review of the draft CPM recommendation on Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation**

This was presented by Dr Moreira. It was observed that recommendations are usually documents of encouragement. There are some 7 or 8 CPM recommendations so far.

This subject was proposed as a standard but CPM decided this should be a recommendation. The aid providers are not usually involved in the usual trading pathways and are often not aware of phytosanitary risks. Caribbean countries also supported this document. Some example of pests transferred by aid were shown.

### **General comments:**

- New Zealand – supports the adoption. But would suggest to develop a concept standard for NPPOs and donor organisations. Present import requirements should be followed. PPPO also would like to see a standard produced.
- China – noted ISPM 32 is available – so appendix should be consistent with this. The emergency situation component is not noted in the recommendations.
- Australia mentioned the destruction and damage as related to some events – particularly with climate change. The example of Timor-Leste with aid and pest introduction was noted. Emergency food aid can be followed up with other food aid that will also avoid inspection. Mention was made because of political interference. MOU arrangements can also facilitate the movement of food products.
- FAO described the difficulties of working with organisations dealing with food aid. Also, many countries have emergency response plans and these plans need to be linked with aid organisations
- Bangladesh noted that there are responsibilities for donors and for receiving countries.

### **Specific comments**

- (a) use introduction instead of entry. It was suggested that pests be regulated pests.
- (b) engage with relevant stakeholders e.g. aid agencies.....



- (d) ...use ...for the effective operation of their programmes to reduce phytosanitary risk...
- (e)...where advance bilateral agreement may be required
- Change the order of the appendices
- Remove all non-plant related risks in the appendices.

## **7. Sea container programme**

This was presented by Dr Dale. The Chair noted the import of Fire ant associated with sea containers. Dr Dale discussed the Sea Container Hygiene System. Measures need to be applied to full containers and empty containers being repositioned. Major pests transferred on sea containers include GAS, tramp ants, seeds, Brown Marmorated Stink bug, Khapra beetle, etc. Biosecurity risk management across the continuum was discussed. The system requires to thinking about hitch-hiker pests on inanimate objects rather than plant material being infested. Some countries do not have the same facilities as Australia to store sea containers (e.g. tarsealed or concrete covered areas) and so sea containers can be contaminated. The system has sea containers inspected and cleaned before shipping, carried out by the shipping companies. A third party can be used for the cleaning component of the system and be part of the system. Audits are undertaken as part of the programme.

Initial shipments are subject to a six-sided inspection on arrival in Australia. Once compliance has been established, the level of intervention may drop to as low as 5%. If contamination is found, further inspections will be carried out on the consignment. The SCHS provides a degree of confidence to the NPPO in the pest free nature of the sea containers and provides shippers with more rapid movement of 95% of sea containers.

## **8. Focus group on commodity and pathway standards**

Dr Ha, Viet Nam presented this material. The tasks of the group were to draft a concept standard for commodity and pathway standard and standards for specific commodities. It was recommended that a new TP be set up with a permanent steward. The draft APPPC standards were discussed by the group. Management material was developed. New Zealand is contributing 50,000USD and the EU 300,000 USD. The draft concept ISPM will be presented to CPM for approval for consultation.

## **9. Tentative date and venue for 2020 consultation**

It was suggested that the meeting be held on the week of September 7-12, 2020 – hosted by the Republic of Korea. The hosting city is to be decided.

## **10. Any other business**

Next year the consultation will include Audit, Pest risk management, amendments to ISPM 5, Concept standard on commodity standards, revision of ISPM 12, 4-5 phytosanitary treatments and one recommendation. There may be draft phytosanitary treatments that will sent for a further consultation.

There will be a working group of the IC on Pest status. Information from this regional working group will be shared. Participants discussed supplying material to this Pest status implementation workshop.

Dr Dale noted the progress with the surveillance project. There is work being undertaken on the review of the surveillance manual to align it with the revised ISPM 6. A training programme has been developed from the APPPC workshops.

The SPG meeting in October 2019 was noted. Participants were encouraged to attend. The 31<sup>st</sup> meeting of the APPPC will take place on the last week of November. This will confirm the work plan for the next two years.

Participants were notified again of the need to comment on the Ministerial statement for the Ministerial session at CPM 15. Ministerial attendance was encouraged.

### **11. Closure of the workshop**

The meeting was closed by Mr Won-il Kim, Director General of Department of Plant Quarantine. Mr Kim congratulated participants on the success of the meeting and stated that the outcomes would be a great contribution to the development of ISPMs. The APPPC had had twenty years of regional workshops with thirteen of them hosted by the Republic of Korea. Mr Kim noted that the emphasis on the IYPH and he encouraged all countries to be involved. He thanked all participants for their contributions to the meeting and wished them all safe travel to their homes.

## **List of Participants**

### **AUSTRALIA**

Mr. Chris Dale  
Director (A/g)  
Plant Health Surveillance and Diagnostics  
Program  
Plant Health Policy Branch, Biosecurity  
Plant Division  
Australian Department of Agriculture

### **BANGLADESH**

Md. Azhar Ali  
Director  
Plant Quarantine Wing,  
Department of Agricultural Extension  
(DAE)  
Bangladesh

### **CAMBODIA**

Mr. Ker Monthivuth  
Director of Department of Plant Protection  
Sanitary and Phytosanitary  
Cambodia

### **CHINA**

Ms. Li xiaonan  
National Agro-Technical Extension  
Service Centre(NATESC)  
No. 20 Maizidian Street, Chaoyang  
District, Beijing, China

### **INDONESIA**

Dr. Aulia Nusantara  
Assistant Deputy Director  
Plant Quarantine Export and Inter-area  
Agricultural Quarantine Agency  
Indonesia

### **JAPAN**

1.Mr. Masahiro SAI  
Senior Researcher  
Risk Analysis Division  
Yokohama Plant Protection Station

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and  
Fisheries (MAFF)

2.Ms. Natsumi YAMADA  
Section Chief  
Plant Protection Division  
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and  
Fisheries (MAFF)

3.Mr. Tatsuya INOUE  
Senior Researcher  
Research Division  
Yokohama Plant Protection Station  
Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and  
Fisheries (MAFF)

### **LAO**

1.Mr.Siriphonh Phithaksoun  
Director of Plant Protection Center  
DOA, MAF, Lao PDR  
IPPC Official Contact Point

2.Mr Sitthiphone Phommasak  
Deputy Director of PPC  
DOA, MAF, Lao PDR  
IPPC Official Contact Point

### **MALAYSIA**

Ms. Laila Jumaiyah Binti Saleh Huddin  
Senior Assistant Director  
Entomology Unit  
Plant Biosecurity Division  
Department of Agriculture Malaysia  
Jalan Sultan Salahuddin  
50632 Kuala Lumpur

### **MONGOLIA**

1.Erdenetsetseg Gunchinjav  
Senior Officer of Crop Production Policy  
Implementation  
And Coordination Department  
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Light  
Industry

Government Building #9 A, Enkhajvan  
Avenue 16A  
Ulaanbaatar 13381, Mongolia

2. Mrs. Byambasuren Mijidsuren  
Director, Plant Protection Research  
Institute of Mongolia

### **MYANMAR**

1. Ms. Than Than Htay  
Assistant Director  
Department of Agriculture

2. Mrs. Shwe Khaye Phu  
Staff Officer  
Department of Agriculture

### **NEPAL**

Dr. Dilli Ram Sharma  
Director of DOA  
National IPM Programme  
Govt. of Nepal  
Ministry of Agriculture Development  
Department of Agriculture  
Plant Protection Directorate  
Head of NPPO, Nepal as well as Contact  
Point of IPPC/APPPC

### **NEW ZEALAND**

1. Dr. Lihong Zhu  
Portfolio Manager for IPPC (International  
Plant Protection Convention)  
International Standards Organisations |  
International Policy Directorate  
Policy & Trade Branch  
Ministry for Primary Industries  
Pastoral House 25 The Terrace  
Wellington 6140 | New Zealand

2. Joanne Wilson  
Principal Adviser  
Plants and Pathways  
Ministry for Primary Industries  
Wellington, New Zealand

### **PAKISTAN**

Dr. Falak Naz  
Advisor/Director General  
Department of Plant Protection,  
Ministry of National Food Security and  
Research  
Karachi, Pakistan

### **PHILIPPINES**

1. Mr. Joseph Banasihan  
Senior Agriculturist  
Bureau of Plant Industry  
National Plant Quarantine Services  
Division (NPQSD)  
692 San Andres Street Malate, Manila  
Philippines 1004

2. Ms. Lolita F. Masana  
Supervising Agriculturist  
Bureau of Plant Industry  
National Plant Quarantine Services  
Division (NPQSD)  
692 San Andres Street Malate, Manila  
Philippines 1004

### **REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

1. Dr. Kyu-Ock YIM  
Senior Researcher  
Export Management Division  
Department of Plant Quarantine  
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency  
(APQA)  
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural  
Affairs (MAFRA)  
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si  
Gyeongsangbuk-do, Rep. of Korea

2. Ms. Sun-Joo HWANG  
Assistant Director  
Export Management Division  
Department of Plant Quarantine  
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency  
(APQA)  
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural  
Affairs (MAFRA)  
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si  
Gyeongsangbuk-do, Rep. of Korea

3.Mr. Min-Goo PARK  
Deputy Director  
Department of Plant Quarantine  
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency  
(APQA)  
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural  
Affairs (MAFRA)

4.Dr. Jung-Hoon HWANG  
Assistant Researcher  
Pest Risk Management Division  
Department of Plant Quarantine  
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency  
(APQA)  
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural  
Affairs (MAFRA)  
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si  
Gyeongsangbuk-do, Rep. of Korea

5.Mr. Chang-Bae JUNG  
Assistant Director  
Plant Control Division  
Department of Plant Quarantine  
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency  
(APQA)  
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural  
Affairs (MAFRA)  
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si  
Gyeongsangbuk-do, Rep. of Korea

### **SINGAPORE**

Ms Yap Mei Lai  
Director, Plant Health Laboratory  
Department  
Agri-Food & Veterinary Authority  
Animal & Plant Health Centre  
No 6 Perahu Road  
718827 Singapore

### **SRI LANKA**

Ms. W.L.C. Wijayasundera  
Assistant Director of Agriculture  
(Development)  
National Plant Quarantine Service,  
Katunayake  
Sri Lanka

### **THAILAND**

1.Ms. Preyapan Pongsapich  
Senior Agriculture Research Officer,  
Plant Quarantine Research Group,  
Plant Protection Research and  
Development Office,  
Department of Agriculture (DOA).  
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao,  
Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900. Thailand

2.Ms. Rachada Intarakumheng  
Senior Agricultural Research Officer,  
Plant Quarantine Research Group,  
Plant Protection Research and  
Development Office  
Department of Agriculture (DOA).  
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao,  
Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900. Thailand

3.Mr. Prateep Arayakittipong  
Standards Officer, Professional Level  
Office of Standard  
Development,  
National Bureau of Agricultural  
Commodity and Food Standards  
(ACFS).  
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak,  
Bangkok 10900, Thailand

4.Ms. Kunsiri Viengvisas  
Standards Officer, Professional Level  
Office of Standard  
Development,  
National Bureau of Agricultural  
Commodity and Food Standards  
(ACFS).  
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak,  
Bangkok 10900, Thailand

### **TIMOR-LESTE, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF**

Mr. Abel Ximenes  
Coordinator of Plant Quarantine  
Laboratory  
Manager Of Plant Quarantine Laboratory  
Service  
Department Plant Quarantine and Bio  
security

**VIET NAM**

Mrs. Ha Thanh Huong  
Standards Committee (SC) and SC-7  
member of IPPC  
Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine  
Division (PQD)  
Plant Protection Department (PPD)  
Ministry of Agriculture and rural  
Development (MARD)  
Viet Nam

**FAO (APPPC)**

1. Mr. Sridhar Dharmapuri  
Senior Food Safety and Nutrition Officer  
Ad Interim Executive Secretary of the  
APPPC  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the  
United Nations  
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific  
39 Maliwan Mansion, Pra Atit Road  
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

**FAO (IPPC)**

Ms. Adriana Moreira  
Standard Setting Officer  
Deputy Assistant to Unit Leader

**Facilitator**

Dr. John Hedley  
106 Inglis Str.,  
Seatoun, Wellington 6022, New Zealand

## Timetable

<b>Monday 2 Sept. 2019</b>		
<b>Morning Session: 08:15 - 11:30</b>		
<b>Time</b>		<b>Facilitator</b>
<b>08:15-09:00</b>	<b>Registration of the participants</b>	APQA
<b>09:00-09:40</b>	<b>Opening of the session</b>	
	• Welcoming remarks of the organizer and introduction to the workshop	FAO
	• Local and logistical information and arrangements	S.Hwang
	• Election of chair	FAO
	• Election of rapporteur	Chair
	• Adoption of the agenda	Chair
<b>09:40-10:10</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>	
<b>10:10-11:30</b>	• Update on CPM 14	K. Yim
	• IPPC strategic framework 2020-2030	A.Moreira
	• IYPH (International Year of Plant Health)	K.Yim
	• Ministerial statement for CPM14	L.Zhu
	• SC update	SC members
<b>12:00-14:00</b>	<b>Welcome Luncheon</b>	
	• <b>Open Remarks by hosting country</b>	APQA Commissioner
	• <b>Group photo</b>	
<b>Afternoon Session: 14:30 - 17:30</b>		
<b>14:30-16:00</b>	• IC update	D.Sharma
	• NRO	C.Dale
	• ePhyto	A.G.Moreira
<b>16:00-16:20</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>	
<b>16:20-17:30</b>	• Update on activities of APPPC	K. Yim
<b>Tuesday 3 Sept. 2019</b>		
<b>Morning Session: 09:00 – 12:30</b>		
<b>09:00-10:30</b>	• Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	SC members
<b>10:30-10:45</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>	
<b>10:45-12:30</b>	• Revision of ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in	SC members

	an area (2009-005)	
<b>12:30-14:00</b>	<b>Lunch break</b>	
<b>Afternoon Session: 14:00 – 17:30</b>		
<b>14:00-15:30</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)</li> </ul>	SC members
<b>15:30-15:50</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>	
<b>15:50-17:30</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)</li> </ul>	SC members
<b>Wednesday 4 Sept. 2019</b>		
<b>Morning Session: 09:00 – 12:30</b>		
<b>09:00-10:30</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief discussion on major concern on eight (8) phytosanitary treatments</li> <li>-Irradiation treatment for the genus <i>Anastrepha</i> (2017-031)</li> <li>-Irradiation treatment for <i>Carposina sasakii</i> (2017-026)</li> <li>-Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera tau</i> (2017-025)</li> <li>-Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> (2017-015)</li> </ul>	SC members
<b>10:30-10:45</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>	
<b>10:45-12:30</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i>, <i>Prunus domestica</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-022A)</li> <li>-Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Prunus avium</i>, <i>Prunus domestica</i> and <i>Prunus persica</i> (2017-022B)</li> <li>-Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023A)</li> <li>-Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Vitis vinifera</i> (2017-023B)</li> </ul>	SC members
<b>12:30-14:00</b>	<b>Lunch break</b>	
<b>Afternoon Session: 14:0 – 17:30</b>		
<b>14:00-15:30</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the draft CPM recommendation on Safe provision of food and other aid</li> </ul>	A.Moreira
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sea container cleanliness programme</li> </ul>	C.Dale
<b>15:30-15:50</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>	
<b>15:50-17:30</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus group on commodity &amp; pathway standard</li> </ul>	H. Huong
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of regional comments on draft ISPMs discussed</li> </ul>	Chair
<b>Thursday 5 Sept. 2019</b>		
	<b>Field trip</b> (Gyeongsangnam-do Agricultural Research & Extension Services)	APQA
<b>Friday 6 Sept. 2019</b>		
<b>09:00-10:00</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation feedback (IPPC)</li> </ul>	A.Moreira



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop assessment (Korea)</li> </ul>	Chair
<b>10:00-10:20</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>	
<b>10:20-12:00</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tentative date and venue of 2020 consultation</li> <li>• Any other business</li> <li>• Closure of the workshop</li> </ul>	Chair
<b>12:00-14:00</b>	Farewell lunch	APQA Director General