

**REPORT OF THE 19th APPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON REVIEW
OF DRAFT ISPMS
10-14 September, 2018
Seoul, Republic of Korea**

Summary

Participants from the eighteen countries represented were welcomed by Mr Suyon Roh, the Director-General of the Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency (APQ). The meeting then went on to examine comments on the four draft standards out for consultation for the first time: Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002); Revision of ISPM 8 determination of pest status in an area (2009-005); Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006); and Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001) and the two out for consultation for the second time: Requirements for the use of fumigation treatments as a phytosanitary measure and Amendments to ISPM 5 (2017): Glossary of phytosanitary terms.

With the draft on the Authorization of entities concern was expressed that the standard should be robust enough to clearly deal with a number of matters including conflicts of interest, non-conformity, the eligibility of entities, the authorization process and the degree of NPPO delegation of responsibility. The pest status revision reduced the categories to two types, presence and absence, with the following categories: present: not widely distributed; present: not widely distributed and not under official control; present: not widely distributed and under official control; present: at low prevalence; present: except in specified pest free areas; present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites; present: not expected to establish (transient). The categories of the absent status include: absent: pest not recorded; absent: pest free area (entire country); absent: pest records invalid; absent: pest no longer present; absent: pest eradicated. Some NPPOs preferred to retain the category of transient.

Appendix 1 of this draft ISPM provides guidance on the levels of pest record reliability. The modified atmosphere treatment draft standard is the third of five standards describing types of treatments. The ISPM provides requirements and ensures that treatments are applied effectively. It was noted that verification is essential for proper application of the treatments. There was little discussion on the amendments to ISPM 5.

Regarding the draft standards out for consultation for the second time - with the fumigation treatments draft, the safety and health issues were removed. Treatment providers were added and the appendix on research guidelines also being removed. This will be included later in a manual. Formulas for fumigant and CT calculations were moved to new appendices. The monitoring and auditing sections were combined. Discussion on this draft was limited. There were few matters to discuss with the amendments to ISPM 5. All regional comments on six

draft ISPMs were made to the OCS and the compiled tables were distributed immediately to all participants for their additional reference to the finalization of country comments after the workshop.

Updates were provided on CPM 13, the APPPC work programme and the work of the implementation and capacity development committee. A report of the work of the Sea Container Task Force noted the completion of a survey guide form to be sent out to all IPPC members. A number of participant NPPOs mentioned the difficulties they have will be dealing with sea container contamination.

Other matters considered included: participants worked with the APPPC SC members to produce material for the Focus group on Commodity standards; the system for the selection of ISPMs and manuals from the call for topics was outlined; an International Seed Federation seed health manager reported on the work of the ISF as it related to ISPM 38; an update on the development of the Strategic Framework was presented; each country participant provided a summary of the situation in their countries regarding emerging pests; and an update on the fall army worm movement in South East Asia was presented, Dr. Piao reminded to take necessary proactive preparedness for responding to FAW in consideration of potential risk of spreading to countries by highlighting possible actions.

The meeting Chair led the participants in their thanks to Dr Piao Yongfan for his leadership of the APPPC as Executive Secretary. The AQS agency has indicated that the Korean government will again host the APPPC regional workshop next year. The tentative dates for the meeting are 2-6 September 2019 and the venue - Seoul.



Report

1. Opening of session

1.1 Welcome address

Dr Piao introduced Mr Suyon Roh, the Director-General of the Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency (APQ) and Mr Young-Gu Lee, Director of International Cooperation and Export Management Division. Dr Piao expressed his appreciation of the funding support for the hosting of the workshop for this year and earlier since 2006. The workshop has been a great training exercise for NPPO officials in the development and understanding of international standards for phytosanitary measures. Dr Piao described some the APPPC projects that have assisted with the development of the work of the IPPC and noted that officials from Korea and Australia, from the APPPC, have led the CPM for the past four years.

Mr Suyon Roh, APQ Director General, welcomed all participants to the meeting. He noted the increased risk of pest movement resulting from increased trade and the effects of climate change. The APQ agency is working on the eradication of fire blight and the incursions of red imported fire ant found in port areas. He stated that emerging pests can be managed through information exchange and cooperation between countries. Mr Roh then noted that APPPC can be an effective forum for the control of emerging pests in the region. He wished participants a rewarding stay in Korea.

1.2 Opening remarks

The participants introduced themselves. Eighteen countries were represented.

2. Adoption of agenda

2.1 Election of Chair

Dr Yim was elected as Chair.

2.2 Election of rapporteur

Dr Hedley was elected as rapporteur with Ms Yap Mei Lai dealing with the OCS reporting.

3. Review and discussion of draft ISPMs - 1st Consultation

3.1 Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)

The draft was introduced by Mr Bruce Hancocks. The reason for the standard was the need by NPPOs to share the workload with industry. The entities involved with the ISPM were defined – individuals, organization, businesses. Private versus other government bodies were considered. The eligibility of entities was described. Conflicts of interest were considered, and identified and managed in the draft. The authorization of entities was described with all the criteria included. The audit section is limited in this ISPM as there will be a standard to

cover this area. It was noted that audit is supposed to be at least annual occurrence. Potential implementation issues were noted. Quality systems were discussed.

General comments

APPPC agreed to the following general comments on the draft:

1. The implementation and guidance material to supplement the ISPM will be critical for the development of systems with integrity. Such material should underscore the need for culture change, the challenges of dealing with conflicts of interest. It should also include a number of case studies to demonstrate how a delegated system and its elements can be established.
2. It should be mentioned that NPPO is accountable for phytosanitary actions conducted by authorized entities.
3. Suggest to include a recognized transition phase for the establishment of any new entity which specifies how non-conformities will be managed.
4. Suggest a Performance Based Verification (PBV) system which is performance and outcome based.

In terms of managing non-conformity, suggest to also include a requirement for increased audits as an option.

5. Potential implementation issue:

Define and manage conflict of interest. In implementing a system, it will be important to articulate potential conflicts of interest and how they are managed. Conflicts of interest may include conflicts with other Government Agencies with the same potential implementation issue.

6. Section 2 “Criteria for Eligibility of Entities” is key to the integrity of any systems developed according to this ISPM. The text is reasonable and flexible but how countries choose to operate and implement the system is where concern potentially lies.
7. Development of an authorization process/programme is required - this can be done at NPPO level to ensure fit for purpose within its own regulatory system.
8. Clarification is needed for NPPO delegation of responsibility, how far it can delegate? how many levels - if NPPO delegate to one organization and the organization delegates to another agency - how far does this go?
9. It is important that the standard is robust so that all entities taking phytosanitary actions can deliver the same outcome, and all countries can meet the same level of integrity for their exported commodities. Therefore, the standard should be the same any entities (private or public).
10. The overall objective of the ISPM should be to deliver a high standard of plant health that results in phytosanitary systems which consistently approve safe compliant plant products. This standard should be met by achieving outcomes. The integrity of any systems established

under this ISPM must be based on all parties demonstrating compliance (i.e. meeting the requirements) and which are transparently demonstrated to the confidence of the regulatory body.

New Zealand – commented on the need for implementation guidance to supplement the standard. There may need a culture change and to deal with conflicts of interest. The accountability is still ultimately that of the NPPO.

Suggest a transition period for establishment of new entities. There were a number of other comments re conflict of interest with commercial bodies or other governmental departments, and a review wording of verification and audit and the use of bodies such as Jasan and ISTA. Then issue of eligibility of entities needs further consideration and more assistance will be required. The levels of delegation needs clarification.

Para 1 – Japan suggests guidance for authorization for entities to perform phytosanitary activities

APPPC suggested entities be defined. But the term has more than one meaning.

Para 28 – Suggested to retain the term “framework” in the scope.

China suggested – “In principle, phytosanitary actions should be implemented by NPPOs.” Suggested to add piece to para 38. ..so that NPPOs remain accountable for phytosanitary actions.

Para 29 – APPPC agreed to change to “... issued by the NPPO only...”

Para 42 – need a section heading for the first four paras – Basic understanding of authorization

Para 44 – Add ... NPPO has responsibilities to decide which phytosanitary action can be conducted as an authorization programme and which elements need to include in the programme depend on its country’s situation.

At end of para “...phytosanitary security, testing, surveillance, treatment, Post entry quarantine, destruction, supervisory auditing. Under an authorization programme, entities may perform phytosanitary actions....” not agreed.

Para 38 – APPPC agreed to add .. “...aligns with the principles of the IPPC in that the NPPO remains accountable for phytosanitary actions.”

Para 44 – APPPC agreed to modify to read - “An NPPO has responsibilities to decide which phytosanitary action can be conducted as an authorization programme and which elements need to be included in the programme depend on its country's situation. An NPPO should determine whether to authorize entities to perform phytosanitary actions. Examples of phytosanitary actions that an NPPO may authorize an entity to perform on its behalf include monitoring, sampling, inspection, testing, surveillance, treatment, post-entry quarantine, destruction, supervision and auditing. Under an authorization programme, entities may perform phytosanitary actions within a phytosanitary regulatory system (import, domestic or export) for a defined period of time.”

Para 45 – Suggested “...authorizing entities carrying out phytosanitary actions which may include private entities or other government departments...” or leave as is.

Para 55 – APPPC agreed to “....including audit checklists, audit report template comprising forms for corrective action and preventive actions requests for nonconformities.”

An additional indent as suggested – to develop a process to publicize and update the list of authorized entities.

Para 66 – Japan suggested large text alteration “.....documented system or equivalent documented information. The documented quality management system includes quality manual and standard operating procedures (standard operating procedures how specific”).

Para 67 – suggested that “.....phytosanitary action it undertakes particularly for supervision and auditing.” Not regional comment.

Para 78 – APPPC agreed a new dashpoint – “to implement the processes for the entity to voluntarily withdraw from the authorization programme”.

New dashpoint – China - to establish a system that identifies actions undertaken on specific consignments by authorized entities to facilitate trace-back – no agreement.

Para 80 – Additional APPPC agreed indent “ – to ensure that the documented information of authorized entities is adequately protected from loss of confidentiality or improper use....”.

New Zealand suggested that corrective action dealt with separately from performance criteria – country comment.

New Zealand would like an interpretation of quality management system – as noted earlier.

Para 85 – regrouping under – quality manual, standard operation procedure, and records. New Zealand suggested that internal audit should be a separate point as it is so important. Other countries wanted any reference to quality systems removed.

Para 102 – Japan wanted to delete point re confidentiality.

Para 112 – “..should be conducted at least once a year” Japan suggested “may..” New Zealand noted the authorization is critical – and should be audited once a year.

Suggested “....the entity’s system may be conducted at appropriate times as necessary....” Because of seasonal requirements ... country comment only.

Para 114 – APPPC agreed “....specified by the NPPO or their own documented information, this should be considered as a nonconformity.”

Para 115 – APPPC agreed “.... investigations, records from authorized entities, or through....”

Para 124 – Suggested chapeau “...In the context of this standards, three types of authorization status change are as follows....” country comment.

3.2 Revision of ISPM 8 determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)

The Power point presentation was shown to the participants by Dr Yim. It was noted that the standard needed updating with the pest records standard being available. The pest status is determined by the NPPO. The draft was to provide guidance on evaluating the reliability of information. The categories were simplified to two main categories. The standard is not concerned with reporting obligations. The two categories were presence and absence. It was noted that the number of status terms does not matter – there should be enough to describe the situations present. There was no point in one term having a multiplicity of meanings. This is confusing and has no clarity.

General comments

New Zealand made the general comment that they preferred to maintain “transient” for the situation that is found in New Zealand. Regarding PFA – they would like to add the definition of area so that parts of a country could be referred to. Also, this revision refers to surveillance but is not clear if this is active or passive surveillance.

Bangladesh noted their concern about GMOs. The Chair stated the two categories and more required and noted the use of passive surveillance.

Para 30 – Thailand suggested to delete – redundant.

Para 37 – New Zealand suggested a proper outline. Transience is added in brackets.

APPPC agreed :

Determination of pest status in an area is an important part of many IPPC activities including pest risk analysis, market access requests and establishing and complying with phytosanitary import regulations, planning national, regional or international pest management programmes and exchanging information as outlined in the IPPC.

Information from pest records and other sources should be used to determine the pest status categories listed below. Information is available from many sources and is of varying reliability. Appendix 1 provides guidance on the levels of pest record reliability. The categories of present status include: present: not widely distributed; present: not widely distributed and not under official control; present: not widely distributed and under official control; present: at low prevalence; present: except in specified pest free areas; present: except in specified pest free places of production or production sites; present: not expected to establish (transient). The categories of the absent status include: absent: pest not recorded; absent: pest free area (entire country); absent: pest records invalid; absent: pest no longer present; absent: pest eradicated.

Contracting parties have obligations under the IPPC (Article VIII 1. (a) to report “the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests” and should also provide to NPPOs pest records and supporting evidence when requested. Good practices should be used for this including the correct usage of pest status categories, the use of reliable information, the maintenance of pest records and updating other NPPOs and RPPOs of changes in pest status according to ISPM 17.

Para 42 – reworded – “The main source of such is that included in pest records.” APPPC agreed.

Para 47 – Japan suggested ... pest status in an area...and last sentence “Pest status is determined for each targeted area i.e. a country, a part of a country or all or parts of several countries.” APPPC agreed.

Para 48 – add to list “.... Establishing or updating list of regulated pests...” APPPC agreed.

Para 51 – add “.....pest surveillance and management programmes ...” APPPC agreed.
Nepal suggested extra bullet – planning for future action – not agreed.

Para 69 – add point – “unavailability of trained manpower in a particular area” – to be put elsewhere or directed to the IC.

Para 73 – Japan wants to add “...If a pest is introduced to an area, a certain period of time may be required to determine pest status” To end of 73 ...APPPC agreed.

Para 73 - Australia added to the fourth sentence “.....research purpose, or pests that are intercepted at the quarantine border, do not affect”.

Combine 73 and 124. :..or research, pest interceptions on imported consignments at points of entry so not affect.

So the first sentence of 124 removed to 73 ...APPPC agreed.

Transient – some discussion on the use of the term. Some countries believe the term is difficult to understand. Others believe that “presence” has some implication of permanence where this is not the case when a pest is under eradication. Thailand suggested that the definition is made clearer. The status term “present not expected to establish” – is the definition of transience

Para 74 – Thailand suggested to add “..or areas of low pest prevalence...” to 4th sentence. --- APPPC agreed.

Transient could be added.

Para 86 – change to make “area of low pest prevalence” – as prevalence is only used in this full term (see Annotated Glossary) – APPPC agreed.

Para 87 – Amended to read – “The pest is present at low levels in an area in accordance with ISPM 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*).” APPPC agreed.

Para 92 – add (transient) to end of term - APPPC agreed.

Could be a third category – for transience. This might require sub-categories and further consideration.

Para 93 – Japan added – “...or the pest is not expected to survive”. Some discussion on actionable and non-actionable. Some did not like “survive” ...because appropriate phytosanitary have been applied.

Amended “(...) or natural conditions do not allow the pest to establish” APPPC agreed.

Para 96 – “....closed structure (greenhouse)...” APPPC agreed.

Para 97 – suggest to remove “botanical gardens”... APPPC agreed.

Para 117 – add after perpetuation – “(e.g. the invasion of other competing species)”. APPPC agreed.

Para 123 – delete first sentence “... Surveillance records (where the target pest has not been found) provides knowledge and evidence about the absence of the pest. However, lack of information does not constitute a basis for determining pest absence...” APPPC agreed.

Para 124 – Pest interceptions at points of entry ... APPPC agreed – but was deleted – see next point.

Para 124 – deleted the first sentence as per 73.

Para 125 – Korea suggested – delete the second and the third sentence as already in 109. New Zealand did not like “undetermined” ... wanted more clarity. But concept supported.

Para 126 – New Zealand did not like the “shortened practices”.

Para 127 – report to trading partners before the world.

Japan suggested adding after “...different sources. If the status in the area is change (e.g. the eradication can be accomplished) the NPPO should report the status immediately.” Some of these points are in ISPM 17.

New Zealand suggested “It is the responsibility of an NPPO to correct erroneous records as soon as possible...” Inserted in the last sentence.

Para 129 – suggested that 4.1 should be 5. Or remove the title of 4.1. APPPC agreed.

Para 135 – wording should align with ISPM 17 “...correct erroneous records as soon as possible”.

Para 139 – Japan wanted to make the table more complicated could be amplified more in an implementation document.

Para 145 – add “voucher specimens” after “documented protocols” - APPPC agreed.

Para 148 – it was requested that clarification be provided on “information management systems”.

Para 150 – quality management system should be described – or it might not be necessary.

Para 183 – remove 182 and 183. APPPC agreed.

Para 184 – Japan wanted to remove. Decided to leave databases and websites.

Para 209 – delete “other than NPPO” APPPC agreed.

Para 211 – remove “that has been documented by the NPPO” APPPC agreed.

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

The draft was introduced by Mr Sai. This is the third of five standards describing types of treatments. It was noted that this treatment is used for a number of other purposes. The verification is essential for the proper application of the treatment. It involves the increase of carbon dioxide content and reducing the oxygen content thus creating an atmosphere lethal to target pests.

Modification may take place by changing the proportion of O₂ and CO₂ by adding CO₂ or N₂, or converting O₂ to CO₂, using the respiration of the commodity to increase the level of CO₂, or suing a partial vacuum.

A treatment unit was described. The ISPM provides requirements and ensures the treatments are applied effectively. Treatment entities include the treatment providers and facilities.

General comments – China suggested the suspension of the draft as technology is immature when used as a phytosanitary treatment. However, New Zealand has a protocol with China using this treatment – so would like to see a standard produced. Malaysia supported the draft - it is used for tobacco. It was agreed to proceed with examination of the draft.

Para 34 – Thailand remove the second sentence and insert as part of first sentence “...involves altering ambient atmospheric gas concentration.” APPPC agreed.

Para 43 – “parties’ deleted – replaced – “entities (person or organisation)” APPPC agreed.

Para 45 – it was suggested that the purpose here be retained and that in the scope removed.

Para 46 – There were a number of changes suggested but none were agreed to.

Para 47 – a definition of modified atmosphere is suggested – with the TPG. This could go to the general comments.

Para 52 – add “target pest”. APPPC agreed.

Para 58 – it was stated that the effect of humidity should be added to later paragraphs. APPPC agreed.

Para 59 – “(atmospheric pressure)” added to dashpoint – APPPC agreed.

Para 60 – add at end “...when the gas concentration is not maintained ...” not necessary and not agreed.

Delete – “...typically for more than one day” end of the first sentence ... APPPC agreed.

Para 61 – “fabric of enclosures” added and amended “..... at structural connections or joins and entry points of enclosures where....” APPPC agreed.

Para 63 – remove “organism” and insert “pest”.

Add – “The procedure approved by the NPPO for the application of a treatment should be clearly described in a “treatment protocol”. These procedures should be designed to ensure that the critical parameters stated in the treatment schedules are achieved. They should also include contingency procedure and guidance on corrective action for treatment failures of problems with critical treatment parameters.” APPPC agreed.

Para 65 – 2nd dashpoint – add ... or react with other substances...leave for experts.

Para 68 – replace “organisms” with “pests”. APPPC agreed.

Para 72 – add – “An enclosure used as a modified atmosphere enclosure packaging is a protective atmosphere packaging which involves either actively or passively controlling or modifying the atmosphere surrounding the commodity within a package made of various types and or combination of films....” leave to experts.

Para 80 – China wanted to add a comment on the importance of pressure.

Para 82 – add “and recorded” after “measured” in the first sentence. APPPC agreed.

Para 86 – add to end - “...conditions to assess the error of margin/corrective factor for the temperature of the enclosure.” APPPC agreed.

Add new second para to section – “Temperature mapping should be conducted by the NPPO or an authorized entity (person or organization) of the country in which the treatment is initiated or conducted....” APPPC agreed.

Also align with ISPM 42.

Para 87 – China wants definition of temperature difference of the temperature detection point.

Para 89 – replace “regular” with “appropriate”. APPPC agreed.

Para 92 – add new para – “Quarantine certificate of modifying atmospheres treatment facilities”.

The requirements in design and construction of facilities for modified atmosphere treatment, such as site selection, safety assurance, and technical requirements especially key technical parameters including air tightness, thermal insulation performance and gas cycle capacity” ...country comment.

Para 97 – modify title to “Phytosanitary security”. APPC agreed.

Para 113 – modification – editorial – “..providers maintain documents of procedures and keep ...” Add – “The NPPO is also responsible for documentation related to NPPO procedures.” APPPC agreed.

Para 125 – change end to “...exporting country auditing and verification purpose or traceback.” APPPC agreed.

Par 134 – add extra dashpoints –
- equipment calibration records

- gas concentration, temperature of commodity, and atmosphere records (including humidity and pressure if required) other treatment parameters (if required).” APPPC agreed.

Para 141 – editorials entered. “...auditing the application of ...” and “...authorization of entities”. APPPC agreed.

3.4 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)

Mr Bruce Hancocks introduced the draft. Discussions were limited. Nepal wanted to use “...sowing” ...in seed definition in instead of “planting”. It was suggested that wood should include rattan in the list of materials. Some countries did not want to only refer to regulated pests in the definition of treatment and preferred to retain pests as in the original version.

4 Review and discussion of draft ISPMs – 2nd Consultation

4.1 Draft ISPM: Requirements for the use of fumigation treatments as a phytosanitary measure

Mr Sai introduced the draft ISPM. The safety and health issues were removed from the draft. Treatment providers were added. The appendix on research guidelines was removed and will be included in a manual. Formulas for fumigant and CT calculations were moved to new appendices. The monitoring and auditing sections were combined.

General comments – A general remark on safety was included in responsibilities. New Zealand commented on its systems. Discussions were brief because of the limited time available. Comments would be put forward by individual countries.

Para 44 – second sentence – this is discussed later in section 7.3.

Para 49 – Japan suggested an addition.

Para 82 – Add “Sites, Enclosures”text suggested “5.1 Site conditions The fumigation sites should be a suitable location to perform the fumigation, It should be isolated from unprotected personnel shelters from high winds, well ventilated and provide electrical power supply or generator to run the require fumigation equipment. The fumigation floor should be impermeable to the fumigant or gas proof sheets should be laid on the floor (loose sheet fumigation) to act as a barrier. The fumigation floor must be flat and free of stone, debris or other sharp objects.”

Para 85 – last sentence amended – “Pervious or porous surfaces consisted of such as soil , sand, base rock, wood and paving (stones or blocks) are not a suitable floor for a tent enclosure.” APPPC agreed.

Para 96 – remove “electrical” replaced with - the correct type suitable for the fumigant and capable of ... APPPC agreed.

Para 97 – “moisture content” not essential – so could change “should” to “may” in second line.

Para 102 – “.....or inside the commodity, as appropriate,” and delete ref to 6.4 amend as –“.. temperature in the enclosure space, as appropriate, the external surfaces and or inside the commodity, as appropriate, before and during fumigation. The number of temperature sensors required depends on the size of the enclosure (see section 6.4).” APPPC agreed.

Para 116 – suggested to remove last three sentences.

Para 119 – new para - “Any covers used should be impermeable to the fumigant and if use frequently they should be numbered and tested regularly. They should not be sewn together be joined with tape or clamps and covering the commodity on a sealed area free of cracks and drains or other openings that will permit excessive leakage.”

Para 127 – suggested to remove second and third sentence. Country comment.
Add sentence. “The minimum measurements are at the start and finish.” APPPC agreed.

Para 150 – remove the third sentence “to prevent ” last sentence amended- “The following measures that may be applied include:” APPPC agreed.

Para 190 – add “...the NPPO of the exporting country or its authorized entity may” APPPC agreed.

App 2 – the formula was said to be incorrect by Korea. APPPC agreed.

App 4 – also errors.

It was suggested that the TPPT undertake an evaluation of the use of the standard to check on its helpfulness.

4.2 Amendments to ISPM 5 (2017): Glossary of phytosanitary terms

Mr Bruce Hancocks introduced the draft.

Survey - New Zealand - by the NPPO or an authorized entity (person or organization) is covered by definition of official.

5 Updates and discussions:

5.1 Update on CPM 13

Dr Yim provided an update from CPM 13. The new RPPO for the Caribbean region was endorsed by CPM.

The strategic framework was discussed and will be continued by the SPG for presentation to CPM next year.

The framework for standards and implementation was endorsed. The surveillance pilot programme was put on hold. The CPM recommendation on application of NGS for diagnostics was put under development.

The IC reported on the IRSS and the SCTF. The SC reported and presented 13 draft ISPMs and 1 draft specification. Ink amendments were agreed to.

Seven pilot countries involved in the hub development. The hub is now functional. The GeNS is under development. The Bureau was developing a strategy for the sustained operation of the e-Phytos solution with a 5 year implementation plan.

The IPPC work plan and budget were approved. Calls would be made for material for standards and implementation. For Commodity and Pathway standards, there will be a focus group meeting.

Regarding finance – the contribution system was simplified. There was a suggestion that FAO increase the IPPC budget. This will go to COAG. The Chair asked participants to discuss this matter with their FAO representatives.

APPPC report

ISPM 6 plan – China hosted a workshop recently. The 4th year workshop is coming up. The ISPM workshop for 2019 is hoped to be hosted by Korea. Other APPPC activities were discussed. The SALB workshop was postponed to December 2018. Except for irradiation treatments, all other items have been confirmed.

Re e-Phyto – there was an international meeting in January with 35 countries. The APPPC working group met at that meeting. Japan is interested in hosting a meeting – December 2018.

5.2 The new Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) of IPPC

This was presented by Dr Dilli Sharma from Nepal. The development of the IC was described. The composition of 12 members was noted. The scope of the committee includes capacity and capability, guiding and training, phytosanitary resources, with subgroups for dispute settlement, the IRSS and SCTF. The IC has oversight of the NRO.

There is a push for the IC to cooperate with the SC in many areas of work. There will be better coordination around capacity development projects.

5.3 Developments in sea container cleanliness programme

The recent developments of the Sea Container Task Force (SCTF) was described from material supplied by Dr Sina Waghorn, the APPPC/RPPO representative on the SCTF. A factsheet on sea container cleanliness has been published. A sea container guideline for survey and inspection has been developed and approved by the SCTF and is with the IPPC Secretariat for distribution to countries.

The assessment of existing documents has not yet been completed. USDA and CFIA officials have participated in North American industry forums. New Zealand and Australian SCTF members were invited to attend the Global Shippers forum in Australia in May 2108. New Zealand hosted officials from USDA and CFIA in May 2018. Shortly New Zealand will be hosting officials from Biosecurity Fiji.

The New Zealand and Australia Sea Container Hygiene System was outlined and the participants listed – Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Samoa, Tonga, Fiji and Vanuatu. New Zealand noted that the survey on empty sea containers had been undertaken (1121) sea containers over four ports. One thousand full containers will be inspected next year. The survey methodology aligns well with the SCTF survey guidelines. An example of the survey form used by New Zealand was provided.

Korea noted that sea containers were out of scope for a while. But last year the RIFA was found in a port area. The port was blocked and containers cleaned. This year three occurrences have been found – via sea containers. More attention is being paid to empty sea containers – which tend to be dirty. Other ministries are involved – environment etc. Hence, Korea is paying more attention to sea container contamination. They have a survey undertaken in ports.

Viet Nam has found it difficult to deal with sea container contamination. Many other Pacific countries have had concerns with sea containers and contamination. Thailand, like other countries, has a scope that is too narrow to deal with sea containers and insufficient resources. Recent experience has shown that most sea containers are clean – and they are collecting information. Malaysia noted Theresa Morrissey (member of the SCTF) had spoken at a recent meeting on sea containers.

The early 2009 draft standard was discussed. Nepal asked about dry port containersand air containers. It was noted that the first IPPC discussions included all types of conveyances – trucks, trains, planes, barges etc. This was found to be beyond present capabilities and the conveyances for study was limited to sea containers.

5.4 Commodity standards: Update on development of APPPC RSPMs-commodity phytosanitary standards (seed and mangoes)

Explanatory document for APPPC regional standard for phytosanitary measures for mango fruit.

The APPPC recognizes the potential of community/pathway standards to provide member countries with a harmonized suite of tools to manage quarantine pests promote equivalence and support bilateral trade. As a result, the APPPC is currently drafting pathway standards for mango fruit and chilli seed.

The APPPC draft standard was presented to the group. The explanatory material and the draft RSPM were sent to the IPPC Secretariat to be part of the information resource available to the focus group on commodity standards.

5.5 Call for topics: standards and implementation

The system was outlined by Mr Chris Dale. The call has included standards and tools for implementation. Thirty five topics have been submitted. Proposals are reviewed by a task force. The recommendations will be presented to CPM after input from the IC and SC. Phytosanitary treatments were not included in this call.

The submissions are presented on special templates. The TFT will meet in October to discuss the submissions. The SC and IC can recommend topics in exceptional circumstances. The framework for standards and implementation is used in the evaluation process. The submissions include 2 terms, 10 DOPs, 22 new standards and implementation (14 for guidelines and 8 standards related topics).

5.6 International Seed Federation

This session was presented by Mr Dennis Johnson, Seed Health Manager, ISF, Nyons. The Federation has 58 ordinary members – country associations. Mr Johnson discussed the movement of vegetable seed. This may involve: breeding, seed production, seed processing, hybrid production seed processing, commercial packaging, final market. The seed sector aims to deliver quality seed in a timely manner. ISF collaborates with the IPPC with the IYPH, ePhyto and ISPM 38.

ISF has formulated a regulated pest list initiative – lists of pests regulated in countries which is updated every 2 years. Documentation is reviewed to see if seed is a pathway. Mr Johnson discussed access to this and presented an example pest list.

The Sector considerations or difficulties were outlined and included situations where market country was unknown or had different PIRs, seed treatments (not registered), and long term storage. Seed health tests were discussed - direct methods include grow out, seed plating and indirect method testing includes reaction with proteins. Molecular methods are usually much quicker for pre-screening for cleanliness. However, these indirect methods are costly for quarantine authorities to run and be prepared for.

A seed association list was provided.

5.7 Update on the IPPC strategic framework 2020-2030

The new framework needs to take account of more trade, structural changes, scientific developments and climate change. The draft was developed since 2014 and presented to CPM 13 in 2018. The new framework should be developed in 2020. The mission, vision and goal were noted. There are three strategic objectives and three core activities – standard setting, implementation and standard setting and information development.

The IPPC development agenda was listed - harmonisation of electronic data exchange, commodity and pathway specific standards.

5.8 Emerging issues in plant health

Bangladesh – a history of the quarantine service was provided. The structure was described. Initiatives and contingency plans were listed.

Cambodia – Cassava – 3rd most important crop. CMD caused by sDNA viruses – Indian CMV and Sri Lankan CMV. Transmitted by whitefly and infected cuttings. Action is needed to stop the spread of the disease. Movement of cassava seedlings is prohibited, other crops recommended, use of resistant cultivars, extension advice on eradication provided, finance for eradication programme requested, training for staff in surveillance and identification procedures, regional meetings to develop plan of control of CMD for 4 countries.

Japan – noted the inspection of plants for planting – for *Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum* and pospoviroids (Potato spindle tuber). Need harmonised inspection and diagnostic techniques.

Nepal – pest data base weak and risk of entry and establishment of IAS. All pesticides are imported, *Tuta absoluta* – leaf minor – damage in tomato, is being monitored. Coffee rust outbreak – all organic but can spray. Fall army worm – not in Nepal – have a task force, surveillance undertaken, and an awareness campaign.

Korea – eradication of *Erwinia amylovora*, RIFA with enhanced preventive measures.

Singapore – Agri-Food and Veterinary Authority of Singapore. AVA. Undergoing a restructure. Horticulture and Community Gardening Division has biosecurity.

China - three departments involved AMARA SFGA and GAC (General Administration of Customs). China is strengthening surveillance, improves the scientific management of pests, and accelerates the construction of phytosanitary systems.

Laos – the main tasks of the NPPO were described. Pest outbreaks included – Yellow Spined Bamboo Locust (*Cerakris giangsu*), Panama disease (*Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp (TR4), white backed plant hopper (*Sogatella furcifera*). Illustrations of the locust, panama disease and plant hopper were provided.

Thailand – Black head caterpillar outbreak in coconut plantations. Another emerging issue is e-commerce marketing – problem from movement of plants and plant products by post.

Myanmar – *Spodoptera frugiperda* – the NPPO is worried about the entry of fall army worm as it damages maize, rice, ground nut, vegetables, cotton and sugarcane. Other Spodoptera's are present. Also *Tuta absoluta* on tomato.

Sri Lanka – issues include – diversion from intended use – seed for consumption etc, fraud and illegal poaching forged PCs and other certificates, carrying in personal baggage. E-commerce is a problem.

Climate change is a big issue – *Belmisia tabacci* and BPH (*Nilapavata lugens*). PRAs need revision. There are natural niche expansions and adaptations – e.g. forest litter degradation, and invasive threats for biodiversity – Pinus and mycorrhizae and *Clusia rosea*. Caribbean Pine is invading grasslands.

Problems also arise from FTAs, tariff releases and requirements for industry developments. There are concerns with Fall armyworm.

Advances include – use of DNA barcodes, molecular biological diagnostic laboratory, pilot with ePhyto. Pest surveillance has now a National Committee.

Philippines – There are 20 regional plant health station and 8 substations. Issues include Cassava witches broom disease (*Phytoplasma candidatus*) been there some time but with extension of industry has become a problem. Others include – ePhyto, decreased financial resources, increased port interceptions, increased volume of trade.

Pakistan – a breakdown of the phytosanitary authority was provided.

5.9 Other matters

Fall army worm

This update was presented by Dr Piao. Detected in India in research station in July-August. FAW originated in Latin America and now causes great problems in Africa. Spread has occurred to four provinces. There are 80 host plants. FAW has the capacity for long distance migration. Adjacent countries have been informed as well as SE Asia. The pest can be spread by trade but once is in a region, migration is more important. IPM and classical biological control is being encouraged. Short term measures include monitoring, field surveys. Countries should report the pest if found. See FAMEWS. Video links to scouting and control videos were noted. There is to be a FAW conference in Africa shortly. CABI is very active. FAO has published a number of references, selected papers have been prepared in a folder (FAW) in the meeting document disk (USB) to be distributed to all participants at the end of the workshop.

The review of comments on the draft ISPMs are there to be shared. NPPOs should remember the contributions must be finalised by end of September.

The meeting evaluation material was circulated to participants.

Organization of future regional workshops on draft ISPMs

Tentative date and venue of 2019 consultation.

Possibly Seoul, September 12-17 is a difficult time. It would be better to have a meeting earlier – first week of September 2-6 September could be suitable. The time for the field trip could be amended.

Funding strategy and action plan

The Korean Government is willing to support the meeting but the funding is likely to decrease. Some countries are asked to support themselves.

6 Close of workshop

Mr Young-Gu Lee presented the closing address of Dr Bong-Kyun Park, Commissioner of the Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency. Dr Park said that he was pleased that the Republic of Korea was able to contribute to the activities of the APPPC and the IPPC. The Korean NPPO is well aware of the importance of emerging pests and the Commissioner expressed the hope that countries would be able to work together to respond to emerging pests to affect effective and practical approaches.

He thanked Dr Piao for his contributions to the workshops since 2006. Dr Piao's experience and knowledge have been a great asset to the APPPC and IPPC. His leadership over the years has been invaluable. The Commissioner wished all participants a safe trip to their home countries.

Annex 1

APPPC regional comments on draft ISPMs
(due to super size of the volume and file size, Annex 1 is attached in a separate zip file)

Timetable

| Monday 10 September 2018 | | |
|---|--|--------------------|
| Morning Session: 8:30 – 12:00 | | |
| Time | | Facilitator |
| 8:30-9:00 | Registration of the participants | |
| 9:00-9:40 | Opening of the session - Welcoming remarks of the organizer and introduction to the workshop - Host country opening statement - Local and logistical information and arrangements - election of Chair - election of rapporteur - adoption of the agenda | Dr. Piao |
| 9:40-10:10 | Coffee break | |
| 10:10-10:30 | Update on CPM13 | Dr. Yim |
| 10:30-10:40 | Update on activities of APPPC | Dr. Piao |
| | | |
| Review and discussion on draft ISPMs (for the 1st consultation) | | |
| 10:40-12:00 | Revision of ISPM 8 determination of pest status in an area (2009-005) | Dr. Yim |
| 12:00-14:00 | Group photo <i>Welcome Luncheon hosted by Commissioner of APQA</i> | APQA |
| Afternoon Session: 14:00 – 17:30 | | |
| 14:00-15:30 | Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002) | Mr. Hancocks |
| 15:30-15:45 | Coffee break | |
| 15:45-17:30 | Continue | SC members |
| Tuesday 11 September 2018 | | |
| 9:00-10:30 | Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006) | Mr. Sai |
| 10:30-10:45 | Coffee Break | |
| 10:45-12:30 | Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) | Mr. Hancocks |
| 12:00-14:00 | Lunch break | |
| Afternoon Session: 14:00 – 17:30 | | |
| Discussion on draft ISPMs (for the 2nd consultation) | | |
| 14:00-15:30 | Requirements for the use of fumigation treatments as a phytosanitary measure | Mr. Sai |
| 15:30-15:45 | Coffee break | |

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| 15:45-17:30 | Continue Amendments to ISPM 5 (2017): Glossary of phytosanitary terms | Mr. Hancocks |
| Wednesday 12 September 2018 | | |
| Other subjects of IPPC | | |
| 9:00-10:30 | Commodity standards: Update on development of APPPC RSPMs-commodity phytosanitary standards (seed and mangoes) Discussion | Mr. Hancocks |
| 10:30-10:45 | Coffee break | |
| 10:45-12:30 | Developments in sea container cleanliness programme | Dr. Stephen |
| 12:30-14:00 | Lunch break | |
| 14:00-15:30 | The new Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) of IPPC Call for topics: standards and implementation | Dr. Sharma/ Mr. Dale Mr. Dale |
| 15:30-15:45 | Coffee break | |
| 15:45-17:30 | ISPM38 Update on the IPPC strategic framework 2020-2030 | Mr. Johnson (ISF) Dr. Stephen |
| Thursday 13 September 2018 | | |
| | Field trip Pear export orchard (Gyeonggi-do) Nami Island (Gangwon-do) | APQA |
| Friday 14 September 2018 | | |
| 9:00-10:00 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerging issues in plant health (country brief report and conclusions for the region) • Discussion | Chair |
| 10:00-10:20 | Coffee break | |
| 10:20-12:30 | Review of regional comments on draft ISPMs discussed | |
| 12:30-14:00 | <i>Farewell Luncheon hosted by Director General of APQA</i> | APQA |
| 14:00-15:00 | Evaluation feedback (IPPC) Workshop assessment (Rep. of Korea) | Dr. Piao APQA |
| 15:00-15:30 | Tentative date and venue of 2019 consultation Any other business Closure of the workshop | Chair/ Dr. Piao |

List of Participants

Australia

1. Mr Bruce Hancocks
Assistant Director
International Plant Health
Department of Agriculture and Water
Resources
GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601,
Australia

2. Mr Chris Dale
Assistant Director
International Plant Health Surveillance
Programme, Plant Division
Department of Agriculture and Water
Resources
7 London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601,
Australia

Bangladesh

Mrs. Hosneara
Additional Deputy Director
Plant Quarantine Wing
Department of Agricultural Extension
Dhaka, Bangladesh

Cambodia

Mr. Hean Sereivuth
Vice Chief Office of Plant Quarantine
Office
Department of Plant Protection, Sanitary
and Phyto-sanitary, GDA
Cambodia

China

Ms. QIN Meng
Agronomist
National Agro-Tech Extension and Service
Centre
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs,
P.R. China

No.20 Mai Zi Dian
Street, Beijing,100125, China

Japan

1. Mr Masahiro SAI
Senior Researcher (Section Chief)
Risk Analysis Division
Yokohama Plant Protection Station
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and
Fisheries (MAFF) of JAPAN

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

Lao, PDR

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

Malaysia

Mr. Abdullah Fauzi bin Samsudin
Assistant Director
Accreditation and Export Facilitation
Section
Plant Biosecurity Division
Department of Agriculture, Malaysia

Mongolia

Mrs. Erdenetsetseg Gunchinjav
Senior Officer of Crop Production Policy
Implementation and Coordination
Department
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Light
Industry
Government Building # 9A, Enkhtaivan
Avenue 16A

Ulaanbaatar 13381, Mongolia

Myanmar

Mrs. Hla Hla Soe
Assistant Director
Plant Protection Division,
Department of Agriculture, Myanmar

Nepal

Dr. Dilli Ram Sharma
Chief & Head of NPPO
Plant Quarantine and Pesticide
Management Centre
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
Development
Nepal

New Zealand

1. Dr. Stephen Butcher
Manager, Plant Imports
Plants and Pathways Directorate
Regulation and Assurance Branch
Ministry for Primary Industries
New Zealand
2. Dr. Joanne Wilson
Principal Adviser, Plant Imports, Plants &
Pathways Directorate, Ministry for
Primary Industries, New Zealand
3. Dr. Lihong Zhu
Portfolio Manager for IPPC
International Standards Organisations,
International Policy
Policy & Trade, Ministry for Primary
Industries
New Zealand
4. Dr. John Hedley
Tel: (+64) 4 388 5070 (home)
New Zealand

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
Republic of Korea

2. Ms. Hongsook PARK
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
Republic of Korea

3. Mr. Min-Goo PARK
Deputy Director
Plant Pest 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
Republic of Korea

4. Dr. Sun-Joo HWANG
Assistant Director
Plant Pest 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
Republic of Korea

Pakistan

Mr. Akhlaque Hussain
Entomologist Quarantine

Department of Plant Protection (NPPO)
Ministry of National Food Security and
Research
Government of Pakistan

Philippines

Mr. Gerald Glenn Panganiban
Senior Agriculturist/Assistant Division
Chief
National Plant Quarantine Services
Division (NPQSD)
Bureau of Plant Industry
692 San Andres Street, Malate
Manila, Philippines

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. Jayani Nimanthika
Assistant Director of Agriculture
(Research)
National Plant Quarantine Service,
Katunayake
Sri Lanka

Thailand

1. Ms. Preyapan Pongsapich
Agricultural Technical Officer, Senior
Professional Level
Plant Protection Research and
Development Office
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperative
(MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900. Thailand

2. Ms. Nuttima Kositcharoenkul
Plant Pathologist, Senior Professional Level
Plant Protection research and

Development office
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand

3. Ms. Chortip Salyapongse
Agricultural Technical Officer, Senior
Professional Level
Agricultural Regulatory Office
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperative
(MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900. Thailand

4. Mr. Prateep Arayakittipong
Standards Officer, Professional level
Office of Standard Development
National Bureau of Agricultural
Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Rd., Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand

5. Ms. Somrudee Mongkol
Standard Officer, Professional level
Office of Standard Development
National Bureau of Agricultural
Commodity and Food Standard (ACFS)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperative
(MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand

Viet Nam

Dr. Nguyen Tuan Anh
Plant Quarantine Official, Plant
Quarantine Division
Vice director of Plant Quarantine
Diagnostic Center
Plant Protection Department
Ministry of Agricultural and Rural
Development (MARD)
149, HoDacDi str, DongDa dist. Hanoi,
Viet Nam

International Seed Federation (ISF)

Mr. Dennis Johnson
Seed Health Manager
Reposoir 7, 1260 Nyon
Switzerland

FAO

Dr. Yongfan Piao
Senior Plant Protection Officer
Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations
39 Pra Atit Road, Maliwan Mansion
Bangkok 10200, Thailand

©FAO 2018