



REPORT

Rome,
Italy,
16-20 May
1994

Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures First meeting



Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of the
United
Nations

**REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE
COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

Rome, Italy : 16-20 May 1994



1

The designations employed and presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner. Applications for such permission, with a statement of the purpose and extent of the reproduction, should be addressed to the Director, Publications Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.

© FAO 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. OPENING OF SESSION	1
2. INTRODUCTION	1
3. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN	1
4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	1
5. IPPC SECRETARIAT REPORT ON CURRENT WORK	1
6. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE CEPM	2
7. FRAMEWORK AND FORMAT OF INTERNATIONAL PHYTOSANITARY STANDARDS	3
8. REFERENCE STANDARD: Principles of Plant Quarantine as related to International Trade	4
9. REFERENCE STANDARD: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms	4
10. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE IMPORT AND RELEASE OF BIOLOGICAL CONTROL AGENTS	4
11. GUIDELINES FOR PEST RISK ANALYSIS (PRA)	5
12. STANDARD: Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free Areas	5
13. STANDARDS FOR PEST SURVEILLANCE	6
14. PRIORITIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS	6
15. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	6
16. IPPC SECRETARIAT STRATEGIC PLAN	6
17. IPPC LIAISON	7
18. POLICY AND GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES	7
19. CLOSURE	7

(ii)

- ANNEX I** Activity Chart
- ANNEX II** Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the CEPM
- ANNEX III** Reference Standard: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms
- ANNEX IV** Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of
Biological Control Agents
- ANNEX V** Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis
- ANNEX VI** Standard: Requirements for the Establishment of
Pest Free Areas
-
- APPENDIX I** Agenda
- APPENDIX II** List of Participants

1. OPENING OF SESSION

Dr H. de Haen, Assistant Director-General, Agriculture Department, opened the meeting by welcoming the participants and providing a background of the events that led to the establishment of the Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures (CEPM) as an interim mechanism for the establishment of standards in plant quarantine. He also referred to the vital role of the CEPM in making recommendations for the establishment of international standards which would not be challengeable in trade disputes in the GATT and that would enhance global plant protection while minimizing hidden barriers to trade. He stressed that while the experts were nominated by Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and some countries not directly represented by RPPOs, they were appointed by the Director-General of FAO and do not represent any organization or country in particular, but act in their own capacity as experts.

2. INTRODUCTION

Dr N.A. Van der Graaff, Chief, Plant Protection Service, provided an account of the origin of the activities which resulted in the initiation of a joint FAO/RPPO work programme on harmonization in plant quarantine and the establishment of the IPPC Secretariat and the CEPM. He referred to the work carried out to identify "Principles of Plant Quarantine as Related to International Trade", which have become the first endorsed international standard, and to the considerable work carried out with other proposed standards (Pest Risk Analysis, the Glossary, the Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of Biological Control Agents, and Pest-Free Areas). Dr Van der Graaff stressed to the CEPM that all efforts should be made to also approve these standards during this meeting so they may be considered for approval by the next FAO Conference in 1995.

3. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

Mr M. Vereecke was appointed Chairman and Mr F. Canale, Vice-Chairman for the period of the Session.

4. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted. (Appendix I)

5. IPPC SECRETARIAT REPORT ON CURRENT WORK

Dr J. Hedley, IPPC Coordinator, provided a summary of the work conducted by the IPPC Secretariat during the period January-March 1994, commenting on the *Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis (PRA)*, the *Glossary*, *PRA Development Plan*, *Pest Surveillance*, and the *Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of Biological Control*

Agents. He also referred to the approval by the Twenty-seventh FAO Conference of the document on *Principles of Plant Quarantine as Related to International Trade*. Besides the joint work programme on harmonization, the IPPC Secretariat had further developed the information management programme and continued efforts to assist in the establishment of additional RPPOs in the Near East and the Pacific. The provision of technical assistance had been arranged for developing countries in the strengthening of plant quarantine, through the formulation and backstopping of field projects funded by the FAO Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP), UNDP and Trust Funds.

The current and projected activities of the IPPC Secretariat, during the next three years, for the production of standards in plant quarantine were presented (Annex I). All proposed standards need to be recommended for approval by the CEPM the year preceding the FAO Conference so that they may be included in the Agenda of COAG, Council and Conference.

It was noted that proposals may be changed after the CEPM's review and changes may be made by the FAO Governing Bodies or proposed by the IPPC Secretariat as part of the negotiation process to reach a consensus. However, should fundamental changes be deemed necessary, the proposal would normally return to the CEPM to evaluate such changes. In the case of the Principles document, minor changes were effected without informing the CEPM. It was agreed that in the future, the IPPC Secretariat would highlight even minor alterations and notify members of the CEPM accordingly so that they were aware of changes in documents submitted to the FAO Governing Bodies.

6. TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE CEPM

Terms of Reference

Dr Hedley introduced the document. (Annex II, as amended by the meeting). The meeting was informed that changes in the Terms of Reference and the Rules of Procedure fell within the scope of authority of the Director-General of FAO and that the CEPM may wish to make recommendations for amendments to the Director-General. It was noted that the CEPM could take initiatives to propose standards.

It was recommended that Appendix 2 (p.8) of the Conference document (C93/25-Rev.1) be appended to the Terms of Reference of the CEPM.

In relation to the **Scope**, it was suggested that the term "guideline" should be better defined to avoid confusion with the term "standard". The basic differences between the two terms were indicated in Steps 7 and 8 of the standard setting procedure. However, it was noted that the use of these terms may be at variance with internationally accepted use and it was requested that the IPPC Secretariat seek the harmonization of those terms through consultation with the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the International Standards Organization (ISO).

Whatever the outcome of these Consultations, it should be clear in the development of standards that there are two levels of acceptance, a recommendation by

the CEPM and an endorsement by FAO Governing Bodies. (Note by the Secretariat: According to the App. 2 document, Step 9 includes a further level, i.e. official acceptance by individual members.)

The Committee recommended that the "Functions" of the CEPM should refer to the GATT Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement in line with the *Principles* document which mentions both agreements.

In connection with the appointment of CEPM members, it was noted that the present duration was purposely chosen to allow for possible modifications when experience is gained with the operation of the CEPM. The duration of tenure should be discussed at the next Session with the aim to ensure continuity, given the projected work on standards presented in the chart prepared by the IPPC Secretariat.

It was agreed to add the 'Functions' statement, first indent, to the phrase "and where appropriate, make recommendations.....".

Rules of Procedure

Membership: The CEPM recommended removing the reference to particular countries which are not members of RPPOs, by ending the sentence after "RPPOs".

The Secretariat informed the Committee that the duration of the Chairmanship of the CEPM was one year, during which contact between the Secretariat and the Chairman could be made regarding the work programme on Standards if necessary.

Rule 4: The Secretariat indicated that individual CEPM members may be consulted by E-mail to accelerate the approval procedure. It was suggested that the IPPC Secretariat assess the availability of electronic communication facilities in order to determine the feasibility of using this medium. Some participants noted that this medium of communication was not critical and that regular mail would suffice to maintain contacts with the IPPC Secretariat.

In connection with the definitions, an error noted in the definition of the term "phytosanitary measures" was corrected to read: "Any legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent"

7. FRAMEWORK AND FORMAT OF INTERNATIONAL PHYTOSANITARY STANDARDS

Dr Hedley introduced a brief paper discussing the form of standards and the subject area that may be covered by Phytosanitary standards. There was further discussion on the definition of the term "standard". The ISO definition was chosen as the appropriate definition to be included in the *Glossary*.

8. REFERENCE STANDARD: Principles of Plant Quarantine as related to International Trade

The *Principles* document was used as an example of the appropriate format for the international standards. Some members suggested that the introductory part (Review, Endorsement, etc.) be moved to the end. It was recommended that the "Principles" be in larger type to highlight their importance.

9. REFERENCE STANDARD: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms

Dr Hedley referred to the development of the *Glossary*, which included the involvement of RPPOs in particular NAPPO and EPPO. A Working Group had reviewed the *Glossary* and had recommended the inclusion of additional terms, the removal of some and the modification of a number of terms.

Individual terms were discussed however, a comprehensive review of the terms was beyond the scope of the CEPM and it was agreed the Committee listed the changes it accepted while the remaining changes would be considered by another Working Group Session. (For points noted by the Secretariat, see Annex III.)

10. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE IMPORT AND RELEASE OF BIOLOGICAL CONTROL AGENTS

The IPPC Secretariat provided an introduction to the above document which was drafted and discussed during an Expert Consultation in 1991.

The document was circulated for comments to FAO Members by the IPPC Secretariat in 1993 with the aim of producing a standard.

Dr G. Schulten, Senior Officer, Integrated Pest Management Group, Plant Protection Service, provided an overview of the comments received from FAO members, RPPOs and various organizations and individuals.

The IPPC Secretariat presented a table containing the comments, the proposing organization or individual and the recommendations of the IPPC Secretariat. In addition, various sections of the original document were rearranged and the document was prepared in "standard" format. It was noted, however, that there were very limited changes in substance from the original version of the document. The Secretariat then outlined the intended procedure for this draft standard: the CEPM consider the comments received; the Secretariat amend the document as required and resubmit it to FAO members, RPPOs and others for additional comments; the next draft be resubmitted by mail to the CEPM before December 1994.

The document was discussed according to the comments received on the various provisions. (For points noted by the Secretariat, see Annex IV)

A discussion of late comments received from the U.K. followed. These proposals addressed most sections of the Code.

This discussion concluded with the request to the CEPM to meet the deadline of December 1994 for completion of the revision of the document in order to ensure its consideration as a Standard by the Twenty-seventh FAO Conference in November 1995.

11. GUIDELINES FOR PEST RISK ANALYSIS (PRA)

Three documents were discussed:

- Document N°94/8 - Guidelines for PRA (in standard format).
- Document N°94/8/1 - Table of Comments, specific and general, as received from countries
- Document N°94/8/2 - Annotated text of original PRA document

In the discussion attention was called to the terms which were not included in the *Glossary* (spread, establishment and entry potential). There was some discussion as to whether specific definition pertaining to PRA should be included in the *Glossary*. The meeting decided to include all definitions in both the *Glossary* and the PRA standard. (For points noted by the Secretariat, see Annex V)

12. STANDARD: Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free Areas

Dr Hedley provided a brief introduction to the document and briefly reviewed its provisions, in particular the various options in the Outline part and a reference to the terms "known not to occur" and "not known to occur".

It was noted that discussion of the document would concentrate on:

- the various categories of pest-free areas;
- the elements within those categories.

The Committee discussed some general comments on the document, amongst which were the following:

- The document "failed" to provide all the basic global requirements for pest free areas, as the one outlined referred mainly to bilateral agreements.
- There were problems with the practical implementation of the guidelines as the "pest-free" issue was "not clear" in the document.

- The document did not provide "sufficient details" on the requirements for pest-free areas. However, during the discussions, many concepts were clarified, in particular the various categories of pest-free areas: The specific provisions of the document were discussed. (For points noted by Secretariat see Annex VI)

13. STANDARDS FOR PEST SURVEILLANCE

The setting up of a Working Group to discuss standards for surveillance was noted. It was to be held in the Washington DC area, facilitated by the USDA.

14. PRIORITIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS

This subject was discussed in relation to the Activity plan presented earlier. Considerable effort was to be made in drafting subsidiary standards to support the PRA Guidelines Standard.

15. INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

The world agricultural information centre was briefly described - being the consolidation of some 40 databases operated by FAO which will be on line to users as well as on floppy disks and CD-ROM.

The status of the FAO Global Plant Quarantine Information System was discussed. Geographic distribution data had been reviewed and references for over 100 key quarantine pests had been added. the database was thought to be ready for distribution.

The report of the IPPC Working Group on the feasibility of a database for Import Regulations, which met in Villahermosa after the October 1993 NAPPO meeting, was outlined. The use of internet on a CD-ROM system was described. New Zealand MAF and Agriculture Canada were to continue to develop prototypes.

Mr R. Ivess, MAF, New Zealand described the databases being developed regarding import and export information - in particular lists of quarantine and non quarantine pests.

16. IPPC SECRETARIAT STRATEGIC PLAN

This was introduced by the Coordinator and described the present position, the aims and the future programme of the Secretariat.

17. IPPC LIAISON

The activities of the Secretariat in keep contact with relevant organizations (eg. RPPOs, GATT) were noted.

18. POLICY AND GUIDELINES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

This draft internal standard for the Secretariat's operation, was presented.

19. CLOSURE

The meeting was closed at 15.30 on Friday 20 May 1994.

ACTIVITY CHART

	1994			1995		1996		1997		
	May			May	Nov	May		May	Nov	
Principles of Plant Quarantine in Relation to International Trade	Endorsed by 1993 Conference	Publication								
Guidelines to Pest Risk Analysis	Consultation phase	Considered by CEPM		Approval phase					Publication	
Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms	IPPC Working Group	Considered by CEPM		Publication						
Code of Conduct for Import & Release of Biological Control Agents	Consultation phase	Considered by CEPM	2nd Consultation	Considered by CEPM		Approval phase			Publication	
Pest Free Areas	Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase	Considered by CEPM	Withdrawn Approval phase <i>Second 29/2/95</i>					Publication	
Surveillance		IPPC Working Group		Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase or 2nd Working Group		Considered by CEPM	Approval phase		
Inspection			IPPC Working Group	Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase		Considered by CEPM	Approval phase		
Certification Administration			IPPC Working Group	Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase or 2nd Working Group		Considered by CEPM	Approval phase		
PRA: Pest Categorization & Pest Risk Definitions			IPPC Working Group	Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase		Considered by CEPM	Approval phase	Publication	
PRA: Pest Risk Assessment, Economic			IPPC Working Group	Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase		Considered by CEPM	Approval phase	Publication	
PRA: Pest Risk Assessment, Biological			IPPC Working Group	Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase		Considered by CEPM	Approval phase	Publication	
PRA: Pest Management			IPPC Working Group	Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase		Considered by CEPM	Approval phase	Publication	
Specific Pest Free Area Standards		<i>Recommendation of PFA Leads 29/2/95</i>			IPPC Working Group		Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase	Considered by CEPM	Approval phase 1998-99
Specific Surveillance Standards					IPPC Working Group		Considered by CEPM	Consultation phase	Considered by CEPM	Approval phase 1998-99

IPPC SECRETARIAT POLICIES AND STANDARDS

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

TERMS OF REFERENCE

RULES OF PROCEDURE



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Rome, Italy 1994

CONTENTS

Review

Endorsement

Distribution

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

REFERENCES

DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES (CEPM)

1. Establishment of the Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures
2. Scope of the CEPM
3. Functions of the CEPM
4. Relations with other Organizations
5. Structure of the CEPM
6. The IPPC Secretariat
7. Recommendations of the CEPM

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Rule 1	Membership
Rule 2	Period of membership
Rule 3	Chairperson and Vice-chairperson
Rule 4	Sessions
Rule 5	Observers
Rule 6	Reports
Rule 7	Language
Rule 8	Amendments

APPENDIX C93/256-Rev.1, Appendix 2 (p.7) of document “Programme for Global Harmonization of Plant Quarantine” presented at the Twenty-seventh FAO Conference, November 1993.

Review

The Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure are subject to review and amendment.

Reviews may take place at meetings of the Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures

Amendments will be approved by the Director-General

Endorsement

These Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure were agreed to by the Director-General of FAO (Reference: ODG/94/297 of 05.IV.1994 from M. Savini, Directeur de Cabinet a.i., ODG)

Distribution

The document describing Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the CEPM is held by the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

This document includes the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures. In these documents the scope and function of the CEPM, the membership and operating procedures are outlined.

REFERENCES

- Report of the Twelfth Session of the Committee on Agriculture, Rome, 26 April - 04 May 1993, CL 103/9 June 1993, paragraphs 145 and 146.
- Report of the Council of FAO, Hundred and Third Session, Rome, 14-25 June 1993, CL 103/REP, paragraph 43.
- Report of the Conference of FAO, Twenty-seventh Session, Rome, 06-24 November 1993, C93/REP, paragraphs 215-216.

DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Harmonization	Development, recognition and application by different countries of phytosanitary measures, based on common standards,
Phytosanitary measure	Legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests.
Standard	Document established by consensus and approved by a recognized body, that provides, for common and repeated use, rules, guidelines or characteristics for activities and their results, aimed at the achievement of the optimum degree of order within a given context (International Organization for Standardization Guide 2:1991 definition)

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

1. Establishment of the Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures

The Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures (CEPM) was established by the Twenty seventh Session of FAO Conference (November, 1993) under Article VI.2 of the FAO Constitution.

2. Scope of the CEPM

The CEPM shall serve as an interim measure for the development of international guidelines and standards.

The CEPM shall make recommendations on the development and acceptability of proposals for harmonized guidelines and standards at various stages of their development and recommend them for acceptance by the Committee on Agriculture (COAG) and Council and Conference as appropriate.

(Cf. Report of the Twelfth Session of the Committee on Agriculture, Rome, 26 April - 4 May 1993, CL 103 June 1993, paragraphs 145 and 146.)

3. Functions of the CEPM

The CEPM shall serve as a forum for the presentation of technical viewpoints on the construction of international standards for phytosanitary measures and facilitate the process of the development of those standards by:

- examining, and where appropriate, recommending new proposals for standard construction and recommending priorities;
- examining draft standards and recommending amendments, if necessary, and recommending when the standards are in a satisfactory state to be sent out to FAO Members for comments;
- considering FAO Members' proposals on the draft standards, recommending amendments thereto, if necessary, recommending when the standards are in a satisfactory state to be sent to COAG, Council and Conference for approval;
- considering FAO Members' comments and subsequently recommending amendments;
- reconsidering standards not approved by COAG, Council and Conference and referred back to the CEPM.

The function of the CEPM in the process of harmonization shall be carried out in conformance with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the SPS Agreement of GATT (NB. to be replaced by the World Trade Organization).

The steps in the development of harmonized international standards are set out in Appendix A.

4. Relations with other Organizations

In order that the standards meet the requirements of GATT, the CEPM shall ensure that GATT requirements are considered in the production of these standards. The IPPC Secretariat shall ensure coordination with the GATT Sanitary and Phytosanitary Section as appropriate.

The CEPM shall ensure that the definitions, systems and general norms of the international standards are aligned with those of other standard producing organizations, in particular, the International Organization for Standardization.

5. Structure of the CEPM

The CEPM shall consist of experts appointed by the Director-General on the basis of nominations by the Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and a limited number of experts nominated by FAO Members not directly represented by RPPOs. The membership of the CEPM shall take into account the size of the RPPO.

Appointees shall serve on the CEPM for a minimum of two years except where an RPPO has two members. In this case, one of the two positions may be of an annual tenure if the RPPO prefers this.

When required, FAO may appoint experts to take part in meetings of the CEPM to assist discussions on specific topics.

The CEPM shall meet once a year unless FAO decides otherwise. CEPM members will be expected to examine and comment upon documents on phytosanitary issues at the request of the IPPC Secretariat.

6. The IPPC Secretariat

The Secretariat of the IPPC, as appointed by the Director-General of FAO, shall provide the administrative requirements of the CEPM including reporting services.

7. Recommendations of the CEPM

Recommendations shall be adopted by consensus. Where this is not possible, if appropriate, the IPPC Secretariat may, nevertheless, prepare a draft recommendation for submission to the Director-General of FAO for approval.

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Rule 1 Membership

The CEPM shall consist of experts appointed by the Director-General of FAO. Nominations of experts shall be submitted to the Director-General, for his consideration, by Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) including:

Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)
Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)
Comité Regional de Sanidad Vegetal para el Cono Sur (COSAVE)
European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)
Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)
Junta del Acuerdo de Cartagena (JUNAC)
North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)
Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)

APPPC and EPPO shall have two members each on the Committee. All other organizations shall have one member.

The Director-General of FAO may appoint other members of the Committee from FAO Members not directly represented by RPPOs.

Experts shall be senior officials of a national plant protection organization or an RPPO and have experience in:

- a scientific biological discipline associated with quarantine;
- practical operation of a national or international plant quarantine system; dealing with the import or export of plants or plant products;
- administration of a national or international plant quarantine system, and
- aspects of trade issues concerned with quarantine with more than one country.

The Director-General may appoint additional experts to take part in meetings of the CEPM to assist discussions on specific topics.

Rule 2 Period of Membership

Appointees to the CEPM shall serve for a minimum of two years except where an RPPO has two members. In this case, one of the two positions may be of an annual tenure if the RPPO prefers this.

Rule 3 Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

The Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson shall be elected by the CEPM and serve for one year.

Rule 4 **Sessions**

The meetings of the CEPM shall normally be held at FAO Headquarters in Rome.

Regular Sessions

Unless decided otherwise by the Director-General, meetings shall be held once a year in the third week of May.

Extraordinary Sessions

The Director-General may call an Extraordinary Session of the Committee if business concerning standard preparation, consultation or approval so requires.

Accelerated Procedures

In order to expedite the preparation of recommendations, as required, the IPPC Secretariat may submit material by mail or electronic transfer to CEPM members for consideration and approval.

Rule 5 **Observers**

As the CEPM is a group of technical experts who are to advise the FAO on international standards for phytosanitary measures, meetings will, in principle, be open only to members of the Committee. However, the Director-General may exceptionally invite a person to attend as an observer if he considers that such attendance might be beneficial to the work of the Committee.

Rule 6 **Reports**

A record of the CEPM meetings shall be kept by the IPPC Secretariat. The report of the meetings shall include:

- recommendations of the CEPM regarding the FAO standards for phytosanitary measures;
- reasons for decisions regarding the priority of standards for construction;
- where amendments or additions to draft standards are recommended, a detailed explanation with reasons for the changes;
- reasons for not approving a standard when this occurs; and
- reasons for not accepting members' proposals for incorporation into standards.

The record shall be subject to approval by the CEPM at the end of the meeting.

Rule 7 **Language**

The business of the CEPM shall be conducted in the English language only.

Rule 8 **Amendments**

Amendments to the Rules of Procedures maybe promulgated by the Director-General. of FAO, as required.

STEPS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF HARMONIZED INTERNATIONAL
STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

Step 1

FAO members or Regional Plant Protection Organizations submit guidelines and procedures to the Secretariat of the IPPC as proposals for global harmonization.

Step 2

The Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures (CEPM) considers the proposals and their suitability for global harmonization. When appropriate, it recommends what action is required to achieve international acceptability. The CEPM may also recommend that the Secretariat of the IPPC develop new standards and guidelines.

Step 3

The IPPC Secretariat will, according to the recommendations of the CEPM, arrange for the processing of the proposal. A technical working group may be required; however, in other cases a consultant may be sufficient. Other possibilities include technical working groups in RPPOs, while further work by individual members could be an important contribution in kind to the programme.

Step 4

The CEPM will review progress in the development of individual proposals and will recommend to the IPPC Secretariat the timing of submissions to members for technical comment.

Step 5

The IPPC Secretariat will request comments by Members through RPPOs, where they exist and if they so wish, to allow for technical inputs, consolidated comments and consensus building at the regional level.

Step 6

Consolidation of the comments by the IPPC Secretariat and preparation of a final proposal for consideration by the CEPM (the same mechanisms will be used as in Step 3).

Step 7

Acceptance by the CEPM as a draft International Standard or Guideline, and recommendation whether submission to FAO governing bodies is required. If the CEPM recommends that consideration by the FAO governing bodies is not relevant, the final text may be published as an International Guideline.

Step 7a

Individual RPPOs may wish to approve the draft guideline/standard as a Regional Standard, which would have specific relevance to trade among the countries in the Region.

Step 8

Endorsement by COAG and, if so required, by the FAO Council and Conference. The endorsement will result in an International Standard, which will be published and which countries will be requested to accept.

Step 9

Official acceptance by individual members.

[Amended as per C93/25-Rev.1, of document "Programme for Global Harmonization of Plant Quarantine" presented at the Twenty-seventh FAO Conference, November 1993]

The following terms were put aside for future discussion:

Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms

A₁ and A₂ pests
 control (of a pest)
 consignment
 entry (of a pest)
 eradication
 equivalence
 establishment
 harmonization
 phytosanitary measure
 plants for planting
 protected area
 spread
 treatment
 strain
 biotype

The following terms were modified as a result of the discussions:

area

Put "country" first: "An officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries"

containment

"The application of phytosanitary measures in and around an infested area to prevent spread of a pest" (To match the definition of "suppression")

introduction

"Entry resulting in establishment and possible spread of a pest"

A modified definition recommended by the Working Group (entry resulting from human activities) was not supported by the above recommendation.

free from

Remove "appropriate" from the definition after "application" as it is redundant (implied with "phytosanitary measures:)

pest risk management

Replace "dealing" with "reducing" (In order to align it with the PRA document)

phytosanitary legislation

Basic laws granting legal authority to a national (A more accurate and correct wording)

ii.

Suggested addition which was endorsed:

Standard: As defined in Document N°CEPM/94/3 - Terms of Reference/Rules of Procedure.

Further to discussions, it was agreed that the term "standard" would include "guidelines" as well and would be aligned with the International Organization for Standardization's definition of the term.

Area Endangered: See below

The following terms were revisited and modified as indicated:

harmonization

"The development (not "establishment"), recognition and application ..."
("Establishment" replaced to avoid confusion with "establishment" of a pest)

eradication

"The application of phytosanitary measures to eliminate a pest from an area"

phytosanitary regulations

Delete "establishment", as it is included in the term "introduction"

endangered area

Cross-reference with "area endangered" which should be added to the Glossary as a synonym. (Also bolding of 'Endangered' in the definition of "quarantine pest")

There was considerable discussion of the following terms, but the CEPMP decided not to modify them:

inspection (questioning of the word "visual")

prohibition

Insertion of word "quarantine" before "pests". (Considered redundant as it is included in "phytosanitary regulation")

consignment

Objection raised on the use of "phytosanitary certificate" as this is not a requirement for all consignments. The use of "bill of lading" or "Customs document" was also proposed but it was finally agreed to leave the term as it is until further consideration by a working group.

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE IMPORT AND RELEASE OF BIOLOGICAL CONTROL AGENTS

Points noted by the Secretariat.

- Title, Scope and related provisions
Add "exotic" - Not endorsed
- Scope and related provisions
Add "pollinating agents" - Not endorsed
- Definitions
Add "Authority": "The National Plant Protection Organization, entity or person designated by the Government to deal with matters arising from the responsibilities set forth in this Code." ("National Plant Protection Organization" added to the original definition of the IPPC Secretariat)
- Eco-Region: Eco-Area suggested (this will be considered again)

Other terms used in the definitions part of this proposal standard will be submitted to a working group on the Glossary.

A general review of the comments was undertaken and some provisions were discussed in detail. These included:

- Section 1.1 Queries were raised on the use of the term "voluntary" to describe the nature of the Code. It was expressed that this might cause difficulties in its acceptance.
- Section 2.1 Designation of authority responsible: Rephrase text to include the National Plant Protection Organization (See definitions: Authority)
- Section 3.1.8 It was questioned whether the duty to inform or educate was within the responsibility of the National Plant Protection Organization. It was recommended that the IPPC Secretariat modifies the language of this Section.
- Section 3.1.9 Eco-region : (Refer to definitions part)
- Section 7.1.3 The responsibility of authority to monitor was questioned but it was decided to leave as is and let the countries decide.
- Section 10. Wording modified. "The Code should be applied in conformity with other relevant agreements (e.g. Convention of Biological Diversity)

GUIDELINES FOR PEST RISK ANALYSIS (PRA)

- Introduction (of a pest): "Entry of a pest resulting in its establishment" 'of a pest' added to differentiate from introduction of a biological control agent
- Pest risk management: The term will be discussed again.
- There was discussion of the other provisions of the document: other terms such as endangered area and area endangered to be revisited in relation to "quarantine pest" definition.
- The Pest Risk Analysis Process "reducing" in lieu of "dealing" - accepted
- Stage 1: Initiating the PRA Process "generally" for "broadly": accepted
- PRA Initiated by a Pathway. Delete 3rd indent: "A consignment of a normally prohibited commodity is intercepted" (covered by indent N°5)
- PRA Initiated by a Pest

An indent missing: to be added.

- A pest behaves differently in a new environment.
- 2nd indent: keep separated "interception" from "outbreak"
 - "An emergency arises on interception of a new pest on an imported commodity"
 - "An emergency arises on discovery of an infestation or outbreak of a new pest within the PRA area"

To list of indents, add:

- "A new treatment, system or process which impacts on an earlier decision" (as for last indent of PRA initiated by a pathway). This item took considerable time in discussion.

Other suggestions accepted as proposed:

- Stage 2 - Pest Risk Assessment: all proposals accepted as proposed (Footnotes 2 and 3 deleted)

- Geographical and Regulatory Criteria: proposals accepted, but there was considerable discussion of 3rd indent, 1st line with the insertion of "or consideration of future official control". Further to the discussions, the text was modified to read:

"If the pest is not widely distributed but is under consideration of future official control in the PRA area, then the PRA will determine whether the pest should be placed under official control. If the conclusion is reached that the pest should be subject to official control, then the pest satisfies this aspect of the definition of a quarantine pest."

In addition, a new indent (N°4) was added:

- "If the pest is not widely distributed but is not subject to official control or consideration of future official control, then the pest does not satisfy the definition of a quarantine pest."

Economic Importance criteria

- It was suggested to change the heading to: "Ecological and Epidemiological Criteria"
- 1st para., 2nd sentence. The proposal was modified by replacing "entered" for "introduction".

"Thus, the risk of a pest, if {entered}, becoming established and spreading must be characterized."

Establishment Potential

- The suggested addition of the indent "potential for adaptation of the pest" was endorsed.
- Addition of "reliable" to "biological information" to 1st paragraph was proposed and endorsed
- "Spread potential after establishment"

A missing indent needed to be added: Case histories....

- Insertion of "reliable biological information" to first paragraph (as for "Establishment potential")
- A suggestion to add "potential for dispersal of the pest" was not endorsed (covered by first sentence ("In order to ...") - other proposals accepted as proposed.

Potential Economic Importance

- 2nd para., 1st sentence: Remove word "biological" after pest.

Introduction potential

- A suggestion to replace "introduction" with "pathway" was withdrawn. In addition "entry and establishment" was also withdrawn in favour of "introduction" potential.
- The second paragraph was modified by adding, after "introduction potential": "divided between those factors which may affect the likelihood of entry and those factors which may affect the likelihood of establishment"
- Under "Establishment" factors, 1st indent, change "timing" to "frequency"

Conclusion for Stage 2

It was proposed and accepted that the first paragraph reads as follows:

"If the pest satisfies the definition of quarantine pest, expert judgement should be used to review information collected during Stage 2 to decide whether the pest has sufficient economic importance and introduction potential; i.e. sufficient risk for determining a level of risk which justify phytosanitary measures." (Not used.)

Stage 3 - Pest Risk Management

Suggested addition to 1st paragraph: "Pest risk management (Fig. 3) to protect the endangered areas, should be proportional to the risk identified in the pest risk assessment. In most respects, it can be based on the information gathered in pest risk assessment.

Risk Management options

- On 1st paragraph, 1st line, replace "Needs" with "should be"
- List of indents:
On N°5, delete "processing"
- The last paragraph (They may also...) should be replaced by the statement in the original document. (Not used.)

Efficacy and Impact of the Options

- Indents N°3 (Social impact) was thoroughly discussed but it was retained.

- Second paragraph, 1st line: insert "it may be advisable to communicate" after

"appropriate"

- Sixth indent: Phytosanitary policy considerations was also thoroughly discussed and the use of "phytosanitary" questioned. However, it was retained.

Conclusion to Stage 3

- First paragraph, 2nd line: replace "identified" with "decided" and delete "for a proper PRA" from second sentence.

Documenting the PRA process

The addition of the phrase "taken or to be taken" at the end was endorsed by the CEPM.

Guidelines for Pest Risk Analyses (PRA)

- Discussion of Figures
- Figure 1

The comments provided were not endorsed by the CEPM.

- Figure 2

The comments received were not endorsed by the CEPM.

An amended diagram was presented which was considered to be aligned with the appendix text of the PRA document. This new version is appended to this report. (Please refer to Annex ..)

In addition "economic impact" was changed to "economic importance" and the adjective "potential" was added to "economic". This was done in order to harmonize the diagram with the text.

- Figure 3

No change

STANDARD: REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PEST FREE AREAS

Outline of Requirements

The IPPC version was preferred, and the categories modified to read:

- An entire country
- The uninfested part of a country in which a limited infested area is present
- An uninfested part of a country situated in a generally infested area

General Requirements for Pest-Free Areas

1. Geographical extent

The paragraph was modified as follows:

"relevant to the biology of the quarantine pest concerned. A PFA...

2. Pest-Free Areas for an entire country

The paragraph was modified to read as follows:

"On this instance, entire country freedom from a specific plant pest applies to a political entity for which an NPPO has responsibility. Two systems which can be used to provide assurances are:

2.1 Pest freedom as verified by an official detection survey

At the end of this section, a heading for the sub-section should be inserted:

"This should include:

2.1.1 was modified to read:

Surveys: An official detection survey should be undertaken in a manner that would detect the pest at a defined level optionally followed by monitoring surveys.

The first alternative preferred and

2.1.2 modified to read as follows:

Regulatory controls consisting of phytosanitary regulations undertaken by the country claiming pest freedom.

2.1.3 Audit/Documentation, including supporting evidence on official survey results, phytosanitary regulations..... information on the NPPOs and such information that might be required in support of statement (pest freedom) indicated: (See 2.2, below)

2.2 modified to read as follows:

Pest freedom as indicated by absence of official or published records

Also added at end:

, international distribution maps and database information.

3. Pest Free Areas where pest is present but is of limited distribution and being officially controlled changed to "Uninfested part of a country in which a limited infested area is present.

First paragraph rewritten to read: "In this instance, the distribution of the pest is limited to part of a country as determined by the NPPO. Official controls are applied to contain and suppress a pest population. Where the statement "Pest free Area" is supplied by a NPPO, its basis may be described further in bilateral discussions as requested by the importing country.

3.2 Regulatory Controls

Change "Restrictions" to Phytosanitary regulations"

3.3 Audit/Documentation

Modify to read:

Examples include supporting evidence describing official controls such as survey results, phytosanitary regulations and information on the NPPO.

4. Requirements for an area being officially protected from the pest but situated within a generally infested area - modified to read "Uninfested part of a country situated within a generally infested area"

Modify first paragraph to read:

This type of PFA applies to an area within a generally (or possibly) infested area in which....

Add a second paragraph: "In certain cases, a PFA may be established within an area whose infestation status has not been verified. Under these circumstances the surrounding area is, for practical purposes, considered infested."

Section 4.1 - This should include two types of surveys:

delimiting - to establish the boundaries of the PFA
monitoring - to ensure successful maintenance of the PFA

4.2 Place the following heading

"This may also include":

Use same statement as for 3.3 above.

4.3 Audit/Documentation

As for 3.3 (Supporting evidence..)
Additional section to be added

5. Additional section added which included parts of 2.4.1 and 2.4.2

**FIRST MEETING OF THE
COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**
Rome, Italy : 16-20 May 1994

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Opening of Session
2. Introduction
3. Election of Chairman
4. Adoption of the Agenda
5. IPPC Secretariat report on current work
6. Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the CEPM
7. Framework and format of International Phytosanitary Standards
8. Reference Standard: Principles of Plant quarantine as related to International Trade
9. Reference Standard: FAO Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms
10. Reference Standard: Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of Biological Control Agents
11. Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis: recommendation to proceed to approval phase.
12. Standard for Pest-Free Areas: recommendation to proceed to consultation phase.
13. Standards for Pest Surveillance: consideration of proposed working group.
14. Priorities for the development of standards.
15. Information management: Report of the Working Group on the feasibility of a database for import regulations/update on the status of the FAO Global Plant quarantine Information System
16. IPPC Secretariat Strategic Plan
17. IPPC Liaison
18. Other business
19. Closure

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

List of Participants

Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)

Songlin LIU

Director-General
General Station of Plant Protection
Ministry of Agriculture
N° 11 Nong Zhan Guan Nan Li
Chao Yang District 100026
Beijing China
Telephone: 86 5003366-4040
Fax: 86 5002448, 5025146

R.G. IVESS

Chief Plants Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
P.O. Box 2526
Wellington New Zealand
Telephone: 64 4 472 0367
Fax: 64 4 474 4240
E-mail: ivessr@polra.mafqual.govt.nz

Comité Regional de Sanidad Vegetal para el Cono Sur (COSAVE)

Felipe CANALE

Plant Health Director
Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca
Servicio de Protección Agrícola
Avenida Millán 4703
Montevideo Uruguay
Telephone: 598-2-398.720
Fax: 598-2-396.508

Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)**L.W. SMALL**

Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer
 (Crops, Research & Development)
 Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
 Graeme Hall
 Christ Church Barbados
 Telephone: 809 428 4150
 Fax: 809 420 8444

European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)**I.M. SMITH**

Director General
 European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization
 1, rue Le Nôtre
 75016 Paris France
 Telephone: 33 1 45 20 77 94
 Fax: 33 1 42 24 89 43
 E-mail: hq@epo.fr

J. RAUTAPÄÄ

Head of Plant Protection Service
 Plant Production Inspection Centre
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 Vilhonvuorenkatu 11 C
 Box 42
 SF-00501 Helsinki Finland
 Telephone: 358 0 134 21 402
 Fax: 358 0 134 21 499

Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)**Gias M. LALLMAHOMED**

Principal Agricultural Officer
 Agricultural Services (Plant Protection)
 Ministry of Agriculture & Natural Resources
 Réduit Mauritius
 Telephone: 230 454 5365
 Fax: 230 464 8749

Junta del Acuerdo de Cartagena (JUNAC)**César A. WANDEMBERG**

Funcionario Internacional del Sistema Andino
de Sanidad Vegetal

Junta del Acuerdo de Cartagena

Paseo de la República 3895

Lima 27 Perú

Teléfono: 414212

Fax: 420911

North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)**Bruce E. HOPPER**

Executive Secretary

North American Plant Protection Organization

C/o Plant Protection Division

Ottawa Ontario K1A 0C6 Canada

Telephone: 613 952 8000 Ext. 4321

Fax: 613 990.5136

Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)**G.H. BERG**

Technical Adviser in Plant Quarantine/Plant Protection

Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria

Aptdo. Postal (01)61

San Salvador El Salvador

Telephone: 503 23-2391 or 23 8934

Fax: 503 98 2119

European Economic Community (EEC)**Marc VEREECKE**

Principal Administrator

Commission of European Communities

Rue de La Loi 200

B-1049 Bruxelles Belgium

Telephone: 32 2 296 32 60

Fax: 32 2 296 59 63

Japan

Hiroshi AKIYAMA

Deputy Director

Plant Protection Division

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries

1-2-1 Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-ku

Tokyo Japan

Telephone: 81 3 3502 8111 Ext. 4153

Fax: 81 3 3591 6640

Morocco

Ahmed DLIOU

Inspecteur de la Protection des végétaux

Inspection régionale de la Protection

des Végétaux d'Agadir

B.P. 108

Inezgane Morocco

Telephone: 212 8 24 16 85

Fax: 212 8 24 16 85 or 212 7 77 25 53

IPPC Secretariat

N.A. VAN DER GRAAFF

Secretary

Chief, Plant Protection Service

Plant Production & Protection Division

J. HEDLEY

Coordinator

Plant Protection Service

Plant Production & Protection Division

E. FELIU

Plant Quarantine Officer

Plant Protection Service

Plant Production & Protection Division

I. DEBORHEGYI

Information Officer (Plant Protection)

Plant Protection Service

Plant Production & Protection Division