Submissions for topics for Standards and Implementation

1. General information

Submission number	2021-012
Title of Proposal	Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid
Submitted by	Regional Plant Protection Organization (RPPO) Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)
Submission supported by	• American Samoa • Australia • Cook Islands • Fiji • French Polynesia • Guam • Kiribati • Marshall Islands • Micronesia • Nauru • New Caledonia • New Zealand • Niue • Northern Mariana Islands • Palau • Papua New Guinea • Pitcairn • Samoa • Solomon Islands • Tokelau • Tonga • Tuvalu • Vanuatu • Wallis and Futuna Islands This submission also has the support of the following RPPOs and NPPOs: • Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) • Near East Plant Protection Organisation (NEPPO) • NPPOs: Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica

2. Contact information

Name	Visoni Timote
Position and organization	Executive Secretary of the Pacific Plant Protection Organisation
Mailing address	Pacific Community, Land Resources Division, Private Mail Bag, Suva FIJI
Phone	+679 3370733 Ext: 35231
Email	visonit@spc.int

3. Summary of proposal

Summary of justification for the proposal	The IPPC recognises the necessity for international co-operation to prevent the global spread of plant pests. In emergency crisis situations, affected countries can be temporarily constrained in their ability to implement their phytosanitary responsibilities. Contracting parties that are donors of aid do have capacity at that time and thus their commitment to comply with Article IV becomes more critical. During an emergency situation conditions at borders can be very abnormal. Treatment and processing infrastructure may be damaged or inaccessible; water, electricity, manpower and other services are often cut and roads and ports are often destroyed, preventing the use of dedicated facilities and requiring activities to occur outside of declared ports of entry. Staff may be unable to travel to work or may be diverted to emergency tasks; and other government agencies and officials frequently urge the NPPO to release goods to people in need without going through due process. Thus, unless appropriately prepared to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of the recipient country prior to export, the provided aid can, in itself, cause long-term damage to vulnerable people and communities. No international standard currently exists to guide NPPOs on the safe movement of aid during the unique pressures and logistical constraints of emergency situations. Given the predicted increase in frequency of natural disasters, potential man-made disasters and the historical incidence of pest introductions through humanitarian aid, it is timely that an international standard is developed to address this gap in robust phytosanitary processes.
Expected outcome of standard / implementation resource	The proposed standard will provide aid recipients and donors with guidance on phytosanitary requirements of humanitarian aid and associated phytosanitary risk so that risk may be mitigated.
Contribution to filling gaps in the Framework for Standards and Implementation	This proposal addresses the gap in key result area A6 pest risk prevention is integrated throughout the production, processing and trade chain of plants and plant products by addressing the implementation of phytosanitary processes and requirements which harmonize common and effective action to prevent the introduction and spread of pests during emergency scenarios. Emergency situations involve many complex considerations and unique pathway pressures (including the potential for diversion from intended use of the donated commodities), the implications of which are not addressed in guidance through existing standards.

4. Type of proposed material

Proposed material	Standards
Type	New ISPM or component to an existing ISPM ISPM

5. Literature review

Literature review	The FAO has long recognised the link between the inflow of food aid and military activity to a country and the introduction of plant pests (FAO 2001; FAO 2009). Such circumstances precipitate conditions which can facilitate biological invasions through increased movement of people and goods and often the breakdown of in-country systems to prevent pest introduction (FAO 2009). The FAO's State of Food and Agriculture report 2001 identifies the introduction of the larger grain borer into Tanzania as a result of food aid shipments; and the introduction of the corn rootworm (Diabrotica virgifera) first into Yugoslavia and then Europe as a result of military movements (FAO 2001). The introduction of Strawberry Latent Ringspot Virus into Timor-Leste is another example of a serious exotic disease introduced into a country through aid consignments. There is also the potential of phytosanitary risks associated with seeds (propagation materials) given as aid. Relief starter seed packs come in 100 – 500g seed lots which are distributed to farmers and households. Vegetable seeds may be sourced from countries for which no risk analysis has been conducted and distribution of unscreened seed packs creates the potential for viruses and other seed borne pathogens to become established (Bhat and Rao 2020). The impact of pests is not limited to production agriculture. The weed known as giant mimosa (Mimosa diplotricha) was introduced into the Vava'u Islands (Tonga) with sand from Tahiti as

	part of reconstruction assistance following Cyclone Waqa in 2002. Parthenium is another example of an invasive weed introduced first into Ethiopia through humanitarian grain shipments and has since spread throughout the country (Murphy and Cheesman 2006). Additional examples of pest introductions through humanitarian assistance can be found in Reaser et al. 2003. References: Bhat AI and Rao GP (2020). Transmission Through Seeds. In: Characterization of Plant Viruses. Springer Protocols Handbooks. Humana, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-0716-0334-5_10 FAO (2001). State of Food and Agriculture 2001. http://www.fao.org/3/x9800e/x9800e15.htm FAO (2009). Factors contributing to the introduction and spread of invasive species. http://www.fao.org/forestry/aliens/52519/en/ IPPC Secretariat. 2021. Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation. Commission on Phytosanitary Measures Recommendation No. 9. Rome. FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention. R-09_En_2021_CPM_Rec_Safe_Provision_of_Aid_2021-04-27_Post-CPM-15.pdf (ippc.int) Murphy ST and Cheesman OD (2006). The Aid Trade: International Assistance Programs as Pathways for the Introduction of Invasive Alien Species. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank, Washington, USA. Reaser JK, Yeager, BB, Phifer PR, Hancock AK & Gutierrez AT (2003). Environmental diplomacy and the global movement of invasive alien species: a US perspective. In Invasive Species: Vectors and Management Strategies (eds GM Ruiz & JT Carlton), pp.362-381. Island Press, Washington DC, USA. Other helpful resources: Huelma CC, Moody K and Mew TW (1996). Weed seeds in rice seed shipments: a case study. International Journal of Pest Management 42: 147-150. Center for Excellence in Disaster Management & Humanitarian Assistance (2021). Disaster Management Reference Handbooks. https://www.cfe-dmha.org/DMHA-Resources/Disaster-Management-Reference-Handbooks

6. Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics

6.1. Core criteria

Core Criteria	Information provided by Submitter
1. Contribution to the purpose of the IPPC as described in article I.1	This proposed standard will assist NPPOs to prevent the introduction and spread of plant pests via this pathway by ensuring a common understanding and awareness of the unique challenges faced by the recipient NPPO during an emergency situation, which may require a different approach to ensuring the proper application of international phytosanitary standards. This clarification in understanding will provide an opportunity for harmonised legislative, technical and administrative measures among NPPOs to allow for safer and more considered provision of assistance to vulnerable countries and communities during emergency situations and prevent unintentional plant pest introductions through this assistance.
2. Linkage to IPPC SOs and Organizational results demonstrated	The action to prevent the international movement of pests to countries requiring immediate humanitarian aid aligns with all three IPPC Strategic Objectives relevant to food security, environmental protection and facilitation of safe trade. The importance of this work in achieving Strategic Objective A has been recognised in CPM R-09. The proposed standard builds on this recommendation and provides aid receiving and aid donor countries with guidance to effectively implement appropriate phytosanitary measures under changed emergency conditions. This outcome links with Strategic Objectives A and B and specifically key result areas A6 (Pest risk prevention is integrated throughout the production, processing and trade chain of plants and plant products) and B2: (Contracting parties have mechanisms in place to control the spread of environmental contaminating pests on non-plant trade pathways (e.g. brown marmorated stink bug on vehicles and machinery, or gypsy moth egg masses on sea containers and vessels)) by addressing the movement of non-plant products and conveyances to recipient NPPOs in emergency situations.
3. Feasibility of implementation	Recommendation 09 was adopted by all contracting parties (CPs) at CPM 15 signifying the appetite of CPs to ensure that safe aid processes are followed. Following the adoption of this

Core Criteria	Information provided by Submitter
at the global level	recommendation it is expected that CPs will have begun reviewing their processes and looking to align practice more closely with it. This standard is proposed to support countries by clarifying the requirements as well as providing details to support all CPs involved in the movement of aid. In the case of an emergency scenario, the feasibility of the recipient NPPO implementing the international phytosanitary measures is reduced, but the capacity of the donor NPPO in applying the agreed phytosanitary measures remains the same. It follows then that the more feasible arrangement during an emergency situation is the implementation of safe aid practices in line with this proposed standard. Implementation of this proposed standard does not require any additional access to treatments, facilities or expertise that the NPPO does not already utilise through normal trade practices. Implementation challenges will not be technical but will relate to the development of information exchange, planning and preparedness processes, including processes for cooperation and understanding between the NPPO and other government and non-government agencies. Natural and man-made emergencies and disasters occur in all regions of the world. Global impact requires global solutions, and a practical standard that addresses the safe movement of humanitarian aid, will have global applications. Consequently, there is strong support for this standard from Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Jamaica, the PPPO countries and NEPPO.
4. Clear identification of the problems that need to be resolved through the development of the standard or implementation resource	There has been a significant increase in severe weather events, attributed to climate change, as well as other ongoing natural and man-made disasters that have precipitated the urgent need for food and other materials and equipment to ameliorate humanitarian crises. Guidance is required to facilitate the safe movement of urgently needed humanitarian aid into impacted areas, and particularly where normal regulatory risk management operations are compromised by the situation. Much of this aid is administered through processes and distribution networks that are outside of normal commercial trading pathways. The awareness of phytosanitary risks and the need to meet countries' importing conditions may not be well known or understood by aid providers. Additionlly, disaster or executive government demands may not allow for normal risk-based clearance processes to occur. Mixed consignments, which present a range of risks and strain resources, can experience delays as they require a full unpack to verify their phytosanitary status. Additionally, damaged infrastructure may prevent the application of phytosanitary treatments onshore, and re-export may not be an option either – leaving the recipient NPPO to deal with the risk. An international standard would allow low and high risk goods to be identified, along with risk management measures, so that risks could be addressed off-shore. It would enable aid and donor agencies to better plan their programs in consultation with NPPOs and standardise supply and distribution operations for multiple countries. This would increase efficiency and potentially reduce regulatory burden, expedite clearance and ensure aid is delivered swiftly and safely.
5. Availability of, or possibility to collect, information in support of the proposed standard or implementation resource	Many countries have experience in this area as both donors and receivers of aid and can help to formulate both the standard and implementation materials, enriched by experience. See Literature Review for a sample of other available resources.

6.2.Supporting criteria

Supporting Criteria	Information provided by Submitter
Practical	The CPM recommendation Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (R-09) provides guidance as to the requirements of this proposed standard and the appetite of contracting parties for this standard of practice. In addition, the PPPO is currently developing a Regional Standard on Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM) to address this topic. The outputs of this work will be published and can be shared with the IPPC Secretariat and Expert Working Group.

Supporting Criteria	Information provided by Submitter
	A key area of expertise required for the development of this standard is on-ground experience in the logistical, political and humanitarian conditions and considerations faced by NPPO's donating and receiving aid during an emergency situation. There is much first-hand experience of this situation among the contracting parties to the IPPC, including technical and logistical expertise related to problem solving under the unique pressures of such emergencies. The IPPC, is also rich in stakeholder engagement expertise and working with third parties to understand the importance of phytosanitary considerations for human and environmental health.
Economic	Many of the affected people and communities are subsistence farmers, meaning that the impact of crop losses to livelihoods is far greater than the monetary value of the crop or sector. Prevention is invariably more cost effective than the alternatives of maintaining long-term control, containment, eradication or, in the worst case, the consequences of unchecked impact.
Environmental	Many plant pests are polyphagous and impact production as well as environmental/wild flora. Additionally, many of the pests that may be contaminant pests on humanitarian aid and conveyances could be invasive species with greater impact on unmanaged areas, fauna and ecosystems and so threaten natural as well as agricultural biodiversity.
Strategic	1) Extent of support for the proposed standard and/or implementation resource (e.g. one or more NPPOs or RPPOs have requested it, or one or more RPPOs have adopted a standard on the same topic). See Part 3. 2) Frequency with which the issue to be addressed, as identified in the submission emerges as a source of trade disruption (e.g. disputes or need for repeated bilateral discussions, number of times per year trade is disrupted). See Part 10. 3) Relevance and utility to developing countries. See Parts 10-12, 16 and 19. 4) Coverage (application to a wide range of countries/pests/commodities). See Parts 10-12, 16 and 19. 5) Complements other standards and/or implementation resources (e.g. potential for the standard to be used as part of a systems approach for one pest, complement treatments for other pests). This proposed ISPM complements and supports CPM R 09. 6) Conceptual standard and/or implementation resource to address fundamental concepts (e.g. treatment efficacy, inspection methodology). 7) Urgent need for the standard and/or implementation resource. The proposal submitted by the PPPO in the last Call for Topics round (2018) on this issue highlighted the urgent need for this ISPM. The CPM recommendation (R 09) that was developed goes some way to address the urgent need for this guidance but, as per the written and verbal interventions by the PPPO at CPM15, countries receiving aid consider the development of agreed guidance, delivered through an ISPM, urgent and critical to the South West Pacific region and others around the globe.

7. Financial/in-kind resources

Commitment for financial/in-kind resources to support the development of the proposed standards or implementation resource	The PPPO Secretariat and a number of PPPO and CAFSA member countries including Australia, New Zealand and Jamaica are committed to providing in-kind resources for the coordination of, and participation in, the Expert Working Group and the provision of other support as necessary. Potential collaborators include FAO, UN Food Programme, UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), International Red Cross, Oxfam, World Vision, various faith based and other international non-government organisations for example, the Australian Council for International Development (ACFID) Humanitarian Reference Group or the Consortium of International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).