



REPORT

2021 IPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA (ECA)

2021 THEME: INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF PLANT HEALTH (IYPH) LEGACY

**Virtual meeting
6-8 September 2021**

IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Report on the 2021 International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia (ECA) 6-8 September 2021*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). 18 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2021



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the Session.....	4
2. Meeting arrangements	4
2.1 Election of the Chairperson	4
2.2 Election of the Rapporteur.....	4
2.3 Review and adoption of the agenda.....	4
3. Administrative matters	4
3.1 Participants list	4
4. Updates on Governance and Strategic issues	4
4.1 Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau).....	4
4.2 Update from the Standards Committee (SC).....	4
4.3 Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).....	5
5. Discussions on substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations.....	5
5.1 Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002) ...	5
5.2 Use of specific import authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006)	6
5.3 Revision of ISPM 18 (Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure) (2014-007).....	7
5.4 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001).....	8
5.5 Focused Revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011).....	9
5.6 Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008).....	10
5.7 Audits in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014).....	11
5.8 Draft 2019-2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	11
5.9 Draft CPM Recommendation: Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods (2019-002).....	11
6. Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/RPPOs	12
6.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities and topics of interest of the region.....	12
6.2 Update on Fall Army Worm-related activities	12
6.3 EPPO (RPPO) activities	12
7. Moving together from ideas to action	14
7.1 International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) Legacy	14
7.3 ePhyto solutions.....	14
7.5 National Reporting Obligation (NRO) – Focused session on pest reporting.....	14
7.6 Sea Containers: procedure and requirement for inspection	15
8. Date and type of the next RW	15
9. Any other business	15
10. Evaluation of the RW.....	15
11. Close of the meeting.....	15
Appendix 1: Agenda.....	16
Appendix 2: Participants list	18

1. Opening of the Session

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat, FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (FAO REU), and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) opened the 2021 Regional Workshop of the IPPC/FAO for Europe and Central Asia and welcomed all participants.

2. Meeting arrangements

- [2] The Workshop presentations in English and Russian (if available) can be found at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/regional-ippc-workshops/2021-ippc-regional-workshop/>.

2.1 Election of the Chairperson

- [3] Mr Ringolds ARNITIS was elected as Chairperson.
- [4] Mr Thorwald GEUZE was elected as Vice-Chairperson.

2.2 Election of the Rapporteur

- [5] Ms Khayala DADASHOVA was elected as Rapporteur.

2.3 Review and adoption of the agenda

- [6] The Agenda (Appendix 1) was adopted with some modifications.

3. Administrative matters

3.1 Participants list

- [7] The IPPC Secretariat introduced the participants list (Appendix 3). The Secretariat invited participants to notify of any information that required updating in the participants list or was missing from it.

4. Updates on Governance and Strategic issues

4.1 Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)

- [8] Mr Arop DENG updated the participants on the IPPC Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau).¹ He provided an overview of the IPPC, listed the IPPC Governance and strategy 2021 achievements, and outlined the IPPC's plans.
- [9] No questions were raised on this topic.

4.2 Update from the Standards Committee (SC)

- [10] Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC updated the participants on the SC activities.² She provided background information on 2020-2021 SC virtual meetings, indicated the SC membership changes and its current state, outlined the 2020-2021 Standard Setting in numbers, described the situation with the IPPC first and second country consultations of draft ISPMs, highlighted the approved specifications, noted 2021 expert working groups, informed the participants on the collaboration of the SC with different IPPC stakeholders and finally specified the SC's future work.
- [11] Mr Nico HORN noted that Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA resigned from the SC and was replaced by Mr Harry ARIJS (European Commission, Belgium).

¹ Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89941/>

² SC Update: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/90046/>

4.3 Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)

- [12] The Chairperson, on behalf of the IC Chairperson, delivered an update on the IC activities.³ He provided background information on the IC and its current membership, updated on 2020-2021 IC virtual meetings, outlined the present IC sub-groups and teams, informed on the progress in the IC List of Topics, highlighted the IPPC guides and training materials, described the Phytosanitary System component pages, indicated the progress on the IC Programmes (including NRO, PCE, SCTF, e-Commerce, Pest Surveillance, and IRSS), and finally specified the IC's next steps.
- [13] No questions had been raised on this topic.

5. Discussions on substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations

5.1 Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002)

- [14] Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI updated the participants on the progress on the draft Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002).⁴ She provided background information on the ISPM's development, indicated the general considerations and the reasons for the revision, described the scope of this draft ISPM and its outline of requirements, pointed out the highlights of the revision, indicated the major drafting issues, and finally described other relevant information and potential implementation issues. She also presented and addressed the comments that EPPO Secretariat received from the EPPO countries.
- [15] One point of discussion was about a new term that appears in the draft, demarcated outbreak risk area, which is not defined in the glossary and not in common use in the region.
- [16] Also, a comment was raised during the consultations on paragraph 66 relating to one of the elements that should be considered to ensure that the pest free area (PFA) achieves its objectives. One national plant protection organization (NPPO) asked what support is expected from relevant stakeholders such as domestic industries and local regulatory bodies. The same NPPO raised the concern about paragraph 96:

When the pest status is confirmed as absent (according to ISPM 8), or eradication of the pest from the prospective PFA is achieved for the first time (according to ISPM 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*)), the NPPO should make a national declaration that the area is free from the pest.

- [17] This NPPO asked for information on the format to use and other aspects of this kind of declaration.
- [18] In response to the comment on paragraph 96, one participant confirmed that the use of the word "declaration" raises a lot of questions, such as what is an "official declaration" or a "national declaration". Since the NPPO officially declares the PFA, he suggested using "officially declare" because that leaves more flexibility for the countries to implement it as they are used to, either by a declaration or another way.
- [19] The Chairperson agreed that this specific paragraph could be improved by replacing "national" with "official". This better explained that the establishment of a PFA is done nationally and that NPPO plays a significant role.
- [20] One participant reminded that definition of the term "official" in ISPM 5:

official	Established, authorized or performed by a national plant protection organization [FAO, 1990]
-----------------	---

³ Update from IC: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89961/>

⁴ Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89949/>

- [23] Hence, it is sufficient to say that the PFA should be officially declared. A declaration may give the impression that it's an act or an official document. At the same time, there should be a freedom that NPPOs can declare on their website, for instance.
- [24] Another participant proposed modifying the text starting with the title of Section 2, "Establishment of the pest free area", which contains elements that are done before the actual establishment of the PFA and describes actions that should be conducted after establishing PFA for its maintenance. However, when it comes to the act of establishment itself, the title somehow reads the national declaration of PFA, which is not clear that this is about the act of establishment of the PFA. Hence, he proposed that the section's title could read "The process for the establishment of pest free area", while the title of section 2.4 could read "The establishment of the PFA" or "The act of establishment of pest free area".
- [25] As per paragraph 96, he noted that it mentions two situations, either confirmation that the pest is absent or that it was eradicated in the area. Then, it says the NPPO should make a national declaration. If either of these conditions is met, then the NPPO may decide to establish a PFA. He proposed that the first sentence would say that "NPPO may decide to establish a pest free area," and the second sentence should say "how this should be done". The word "national" is not a good word because whenever a reference is made to actions or measures undertaken by either NPPOs or contracting parties, they are referred to as "official".
- [26] The EPPO Secretariat reminded everyone that the EPPO panel on global phytosanitary affairs would meet and take on board all the comments made at the regional workshop when formulating a common EPPO position. The agreed position will be shared with all EPPO countries, and EPPO countries can endorse these comments when submitting their position through the OCS.

[27] .

5.2 Use of specific import authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006)

- [28] Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC updated the participants on the progress on the draft ISPM on the Use of specific import authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006).⁵ She provided background information on the ISPM's development, indicated the general considerations, and described the draft ISPM's main sections, namely the elements of specific import authorizations (SIAs), possible use of SIAs, responsibilities, and general import authorizations. She also presented and addressed the comments that EPPO Secretariat received from the EPPO countries.
- [29] Workshop participants discussed the comments on paragraph 25, which say that SIAs (as referred to in this standard) provide official consent for the import of specific regulated articles and specify phytosanitary import requirements for those articles. SIA may be used when official consent for import is necessary or when phytosanitary import requirements have not been established, or when import would otherwise be prohibited. Hence, one NPPO proposed in the second sentence, to replace "phytosanitary import requirements" with "general phytosanitary import requirements", because in the first sentence, the NPPO is asked to set phytosanitary import requirements for the article, and then it says that the phytosanitary import requirements have not been established.
- [30] One member noted that it is a question of wording, and "general" does not fit because it can be understood as working for all commodities. She also explained that the EPPO Secretariat prepared the answer to the comment that phytosanitary import requirements are not prepared in advance for this commodity.

⁵ Use of specific import authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89963/>

- [31] Another comment proposed that an official consent for import can also be provided, for example, for scientific purposes, if phytosanitary import requirements exist, but they are not fulfilled by the consignment, and this is not equivalent to when import would otherwise be prohibited.
- [32] It was replied that the EPPO Secretariat provided a possible solution for the second comment, it would be to allow import, e.g. for scientific purposes when import requirements cannot be fulfilled.
- [33] One participant noted that some countries issue import requirements/importer permits if there are no import requirements, which is somehow opening the possibilities to NPPOs not to establish import requirements. This is a weak point from the perspective of the IPPC obligations that contracting parties have, and the next sentence says that there are obligations for contracting parties.
- [34] Another participant noted that section 3 on possible uses of SIAs present a mixture of purposes and demands. For example, paragraphs 62 and 63 are not purposes of SIAs – it's the impact of the situation that raises the need for SIAs.
- [35] Workshop participants agreed with a proposal regarding paragraph 88 – to add a new indent in the responsibilities for the exporters, namely to add ‘safeguard transport according to the requirements of the importing country for safe transport’.
- [36] One participant highlighted that it is not relevant for a Standard whether there are import requirements in place, but whether there are requirements on export certification or not. And in case there are no requirements for export certification, it's an internal issue of the importing country, and there is no need for a standard for this..
- [37] One participant provided an example when some countries have in the legislation, the statement like “if no requirements are formulated in this legislation the product is prohibited”. These countries, which are a majority in the world, do not understand the legislation in the European region. In many countries, when there is no import requirement in the legislation, the product is prohibited. It should be reflected in this Standard, that having no import requirements, for one part of the world means the product is prohibited for other parts of the world that means it is possible to import the product without phytosanitary requirements. He also highlighted that an import permit is for communication between the importing country and the importer but this standard deals with the communication of import requirements between the importing country and exporting country. There are always difficulties for the NPPO of the exporting country to know what requirements to be fulfilled if there is an import permit involved which may not necessarily be aligned with the import requirements in the legislation.
- [38] The Chairperson concluded that this issue needs more clarification and understanding to avoid different interpretations.

5.3 Revision of ISPM 18 (Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure) (2014-007)

- [39] Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC updated the participants on the progress on the draft Revision of ISPM 18 (Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure) (2014-007).⁶ She provided background information on the ISPM's development and the reasons for the revision, indicated the general points for consultation, and outlined possible implementation considerations. She also presented and addressed the comments that EPPO Secretariat received from the EPPO countries.
- [40] One NPPO raised a question on paragraph 153 regarding live target pests that may be found after treatment. In their view, the assessment of the effectiveness of the irradiation treatment by the inspector at the place of destination of the product should include an additional sentence. That sentence should say that if mortality is not the claimed effect of irradiation treatment, in case of detection of living stages

⁶ Revision of ISPM 18 (Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure) (2014-007): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89950/>

of the pest, it is necessary to rear the pest in laboratory under the most optimal conditions to confirm the effect of the phytosanitary treatment declared in the phytosanitary certificate.

- [41] The EPPO steward for this specific standard replied that the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) assesses, before recommending any treatment for adoption, including irradiation treatments, whether research has been carried out on the most resistant stage of the pest that can occur in the consignment.
- [42] Another participant noted that NPPOs might accidentally trap an escaped insect, for instance, that comes out of the treated consignment and is harmless, but they're not able to recognize it as harmless, and it may have severe consequences for the reputation of exporting country.
- [43] Another member noted that irradiated commodities in the EU are not accepted. The importing country decides to accept irradiated commodities or not, and it will depend on, for example, food safety regulations or established PFAs.

5.4 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)

- [44] Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC updated the participants on the progress on the draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001).⁷ She provided background information on the ISPM's development, provided the list of proposed amendments, and described in detail the proposed additions, revisions, and deletions of terms. She also presented and addressed the comments that EPPO Secretariat received from the EPPO countries.
- [45] Regarding the definition of inspection and the comments received, the Steward explained that the objective of a detection survey is to determine whether a pest is present, meaning that presence and absence are equal outcomes. This is the reason why the focus is on the presence of pests.
- [46] One member questioned why the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) strictly focused on requirements.
- [47] The TPG Steward explained that if the wording "phytosanitary measures" is used, it is only linked to regulated pests. If a pest is regulated by the NPPO of the importing country, it may not be regulated by the one inspecting for export certification. That was why the TPG thought it was better not to use "phytosanitary measure" and not keep "phytosanitary regulations" and choose "phytosanitary requirements".
- [48] Another participant noted that in phytosanitary requirements are stated differently in the definitions of "inspection" and "test". The definition of "inspection" refers to conformity with phytosanitary requirements, while the definition of "test" refers to "conformity with specific phytosanitary requirements.". The participant was not clear on what role the word "specific" plays in this definition.
- [49] The TPG Steward explained that tests are specific if there is a need to look for something special, and NPPOs do not test everything. A test is in general performed against one specific pest. During inspections, there is a need to look for all the pests in plants, for example, in the consignment..
- [50] The workshop participants also discussed definitions of general and specific surveillance. One participant noted that the definition of "general surveillance" says that "data is collected", and the specific survey says the "information is obtained". He highlighted that the difference is that whatever is received during general surveillance needs to be analyzed and verified. The word "data" means something more specific than the word information. Information can be of different types and kinds, but if there is a need to obtain data, that means something structured and organized.
- [51] The TPG Steward explained that there is a significant difference between data and information in English. The idea was to make the difference between general and specific surveillance to show that

⁷ 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001):
<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89951/>

what comes from general surveillance is raw data, which becomes useful information once the NPPO has verified and analyzed them. This is entirely different for specific surveillance because it is done through surveys, where there is a procedure to be followed, etc. It is possible to gather information from specific surveillance directly, and it is immediately usable.

[52] The Chairperson concluded that this issue would be discussed at the EPPO panel.

5.5 Focused Revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011)

[53] Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC updated the participants on the progress on the draft Focused Revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011).⁸ She provided background information on the ISPM's development and the reasons for the revision, outlined the major comments and changes, informed on minor comments and changes, and stressed the main points on the second consultation. She also presented and addressed the comments that EPPO Secretariat received from the EPPO countries.

[54] One NPPO raised a comment on paragraph 234, suggesting that the words “regulated pest” be replaced with the words “pest regulated by the importing country”.

[55] The Steward felt that it was a good idea to clarify that the consignment must be free from pests, but not all pests are regulated by the country of destination.

[56] She noted that this is a good topic for discussion at the EPPO panel, and proposed wording could be “when the consignment has not been infested or contaminated by pests regulated by the country of destination and meet the phytosanitary import requirements of that country”.

[57] One NPPO also commented on paragraph 89, saying that only the exporting country should be able to issue a certified copy of the original phytosanitary certificate for export.

[58] One participant noted that any NPPO could give certified copies, and it could also be for other reasons, it could be a transit country that issued a certified copy. Hence, there is no reason to restrict it only to the exporting country.

[59] Another member asked what happens if there is an issue on import, for instance, an NPPO rejects the original certificate, but then there would still be these certified copies circulating.

[60] The Steward pointed out a comment from one NPPO on paragraph 137, providing an additional new wording for clarity. The original sentence is:

For re-export of consignments, **the NPPO of the country of re-export may need** specific information from the country of origin ~~may be necessary~~; however, this may not be available on a phytosanitary certificate for export (...).

[61] The answer from the Steward suggested an addition:

For re-export of consignments, **the NPPO of the country of re-export may need** specific information from the country of origin in order to ensure compliance with the phytosanitary import requirements of the country of destination; however, this may not be available on a phytosanitary certificate for export (...).

[62] One participant commented on paragraphs 241-243 that if import requirements cannot be met and the re-exporting country cannot provide guarantees, it cannot issue the certificate. The importing country can only provide alternative guarantees. So once the importing country provides those alternative guarantees, they should be part of import requirements, and there is no need for any specific paragraph. If they are not part of import requirements, exporting or re-exporting country can decide that their action is the alternative from this text. And this should not be part of the standardized procedure.

[63] The Steward explained that the EWG that drafted the revised version of ISPM 12 had the same discussion what is considered equivalent in the current version of ISPM 12 that NPPO can issue a

⁸ Focused Revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89942/>

phytosanitary certificate for re-export provided that the consignment has not been exposed to infestation or contamination. In the revision, it is proposed to write in paragraph 245 “provided that it has not been not been exposed to infestation or contamination by pests regulated by the country of destination,” and the proposed change results from consultation comments. It is suggested for consistency with paragraphs 40 and 234, this sentence sets the criterion for the issuance of the phytosanitary certificate. The sentence that follows describes how the NPPO determines whether the criterion has been met.

- [64] One participant felt that before the proposed revision, paragraphs 239 and 240 were more straightforward in terms of what an inspector should do when receiving an application for a phytosanitary certificate for re-export, what has to check first, and although the proposed revision covered all aspects within the text, it makes challenging to extract clear guidance or instructions.
- [65] The Steward suggested that the EPPO panel may provide a proposal on how to improve the wording.

5.6 Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)

- [66] Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC updated the participants on the progress on the draft ISPM Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008).⁹ She provided background information on the ISPM’s development, outlined the main concerns raised at the first consultation and the revision done by the SC-7, listed the outline of requirements and the scope, described the provided information on the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards, stressed six principles of the draft ISPM and its requirements. She also presented and addressed the comments that EPPO Secretariat received from the EPPO countries.
- [67] She explained the comment on the title of the standard and that the TPG thought the term “commodity-based standards” should not be used because it sounds like the standard is drawn from the commodity. The TPG also noted that in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 the term “commodity-specific standards” was used.
- [68] She noted that one comment on paragraph 52 proposed to change it to “they may support the development of harmonized phytosanitary import requirements”. Although it was a good suggestion, it would be impossible for all countries to have the exact phytosanitary import requirements, but more harmonized.
- [69] She also drew attention to the reaction of the Steward from EPPO on paragraph 96 because paragraph 96 uses the word “measure,” and the Steward suggested “phytosanitary measure”. The TPG discussed it because consultation comments proposed to change “measures” to “phytosanitary measures”, and the TPG noted that “measure” only becomes a phytosanitary measure in a particular country, when it is technically justified for regulated pest, and that the measures presented in commodity standards are therefore options of phytosanitary measures. They may include measures that in some countries have been specified as phytosanitary import requirements and measures that have been applied for domestic use but could have potential as a phytosanitary measure. Hence, the TPG agreed that using “measure” in several parts of the draft ISPM was appropriate. The correct reading is either “measure” or “options for phytosanitary measures”, but not just “phytosanitary measures”.
- [70] One participant raised the concern that it is challenging to consider what options are included in phytosanitary measures.
- [71] One participant explained that according to the IPPC Strategic Framework, the intention was not to develop standards for all the commodities but help contracting parties to develop their phytosanitary import requirements.

⁹ Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008):
<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89943/>

5.7 Audits in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014)

[72] Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI updated the participants on the progress on the draft ISPM on Audits in the phytosanitary context (2015-014).¹⁰ She provided background information on the ISPM's development, outlined the general considerations for the second consultation, described the general points for consultation, and informed on the possible implementation considerations.

[73] No questions were raised on this topic.

5.8 Draft 2019-2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)

[74] Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC updated the participants on the progress on the draft 2019-2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001).¹¹ She provided background information on the ISPM's development, provided the list of proposed amendments, and described in detail the proposed additions, revisions, and deletions of terms. She also highlighted the comments that EPPO Secretariat received from the EPPO country.

[75] One participant asked how the official operation differs from the phytosanitary procedure regarding the emergency action. He felt that in the current definition, emergency action is never used for quarantine pests.

[76] The TPG Steward explained that in the definition of emergency action, the TPG proposed to write a prompt official operation understood as any official method for implementing phytosanitary measures. Hence, it relates to regulated pests. She also explained that the term emergency action should be used for operations undertaken in a new or unexpected situation not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures, such as detection of a pest not previously assessed or not regulated for that particular host or pathway. It may be a quarantine pest, but it may also be a pest not regulated for the host or pathway.

5.9 Draft CPM Recommendation: Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods (2019-002)

[77] Mr Nico HORN updated the participants on the progress on the draft CPM Recommendation: Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods (2019-002).¹² He provided information on the main purposes of the CPM recommendations, listed the adopted CPM recommended actions, provided background information on the development of this recommendation, and highlighted the reason and purpose for it. He also presented and addressed the comments that EPPO Secretariat received from the EPPO country.

[78] The participants discussed a comment on the use of the words "regulated article" and "unregulated goods," proposing clarification and revision by changing the wording to "regulated and unregulated articles", and to adjust accordingly, the wording "to protect plant resources and facilitate safe trade", as it is also in the objectives of this recommendation.

[79] One participant reminded that the definition of regulated articles is provided in ISPM 5, and suggested that it was simpler to use the wording "regulated and unregulated articles". In addition, it covers not only commodities but also the packaging and storage places.

¹⁰ Audits in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89944/>

¹¹ Draft 2019-2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89952/>

¹² Draft CPM Recommendation: Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods (2019-002): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89964/>

6. Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/RPPOs

6.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities and topics of interest of the region

- [80] Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK delivered an update on phytosanitary capacity development activities carried out in the region by the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia, and on topics of interest of the region.¹³
- [81] One participant asked how Uzbekistan can receive additional information and support for integrated pest management (IPM) in rice.

6.2 Update on Fall Army Worm-related activities

- [82] Mr Valerio LUCCHESI and Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI delivered an update on Fall Army Worm-related activities.¹⁴ They informed the participants about the publication of the "Prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for *Spodoptera frugiperda*" and that the Russian version would be available soon. It was also agreed to require Russian interpretation of the three webinars planned by the end of the year to present the guidelines.
- [83] The Chairperson highlighted that this pest is causing huge problems in many countries.
- [84] The FAO Regional Office informed that FAO could organize a regional workshop dedicated to the Fall Army Worm, but only if countries wanted the FAO to do this.
- [85] Another participants asked if there is any information about the Tomato brown rugose fruit virus and on the Pepino mosaic virus, and stated that seminars on these pests will be beneficial.

6.3 EPPO (RPPO) activities

- [86] Mr Nico HORN delivered an update on EPPO activities. He focused on two main topics: the EPPO panel on global phytosanitary affairs in relation to the regional workshop and the EPPO representation in the IPPC bodies with some concerns in the continuity of representation. He highlighted that EPPO works with panels, panels are composed of experts nominated by the member countries, and one of the panels is the EPPO panel on global phytosanitary affairs. This panel has a lot of overlap with the items discussed during the regional workshop. The Panel meets three times a year in line with the deadlines and the way of working of the IPPC. Because this panel supports the work of the IPPC, formulates positions, supports the SC, IC, and Bureau members, it is a platform to communicate between the experts and the country representative. This panel is also working on the IPPC country consultation. The panel goes through all the standards discussed at the regional workshop, takes the workshop's input, and formulates the EPPO position on draft standards. This position is shared with all member countries, and they can use this as a basis for their reaction to the IPPC before 30 September each year. The countries are also free to add comments, delete a comment or change it.
- [87] This panel also coordinates the nominations for IPPC bodies (SC, IC, and CPM Bureau). When there is a call from the IPPC, the EPPO Secretariat distributes the call to the contact points of all EPPO member countries and the nominations can be sent to the EPPO Secretariat. The nominations will be assessed by the panel members, and they will be forwarded to the IPPC Secretariat before the deadline. He stressed that Europe and Central Asia are among the largest importers and exporters of agricultural products, and has a great interest in protecting plant resources, biodiversity, but also to promote and facilitate safe trade. It is essential to bring this specific situation of the region, into the IPPC discussions and to work on it. Representation in IPPC bodies depends on a limited number of countries and some experts. The panel is concerned about the continuity of the work because some of these experts have retired recently or will soon retire..

¹³ Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities and topics of interest of the region: presentation.

¹⁴ Update on Fall Army Worm-related activities: presentation.

- [88] The Chairperson also added that it is vital that there is sustainability for all international organizations, EPPO or IPPC, and only countries can ensure that.
- [89] One participant highlighted that it is worthwhile for the Central Asian and the Balkan countries of EPPO to get more involved in the IPPC affairs because sitting in working, expert and focus groups introduces the regional experiences into the different topics in the standard setting in the development of a subject and let experts grow and develop in the future. It also gives the possibility to create a network, which, helps to deal with other countries when there are trade difficulties. It also provides the region a strong voice, and that standard and other material developed by the IPPC reflect the region's needs. There is a possibility to get resources, contacts, experience, the arguments of others, and a new horizon by working in the IPPC framework, and it is possible to develop systems better if there is a broad horizon, how plant health is operating in other parts of the world.
- [90] One participant raised the concern that sometimes, nationally, it takes work and effort to get an expert nominated and coordinate with department heads and talk about time, budget, etc. And then, when the files are sent, there is no feedback. Sometimes the expert will hear something when he is selected. But there is no response if you're not selected.
- [91] One participant asked the IPPC Secretariat to send the feedback on the result of selection to the regional plant protection organization (RPPO) that is coordinating the nomination of experts.
- [92] The IPPC Secretariat explained that the process is that Secretariat notifies experts that were selected and copying submitters, either NPPO or RPPO.
- [93] One participant informed that at the last SC meeting, the IPPC Secretariat noted that, according to the SC rules, the responsibility of transmitting the result of the nomination rests with the SC representatives.
- [94] One participant suggested that the next CPM should consider information flow between RPPOs, the IPPC Secretariat, CPM, and NPPOs in both directions. The current situation is that the NPPOs should always inform the IPPC Secretariat. The participant proposed to have more guidance on what has to be done in the case of nominations, who shall be informed about the nomination. This workshop could make such a recommendation because the recommendations from regional workshops are reported to the CPM.
- [95] One participant requested that additional information on the role of SC representatives from the region be shared. When the provision that SC members should communicate with the countries and inform them about developments in terms of memberships was introduced in the procedure manual, the background for this was to enhance communications between the countries in the region and the SC members from the region.
- [96] The IPPC Secretariat explained that the current process is reflected in the procedure manual, and this needs to be changed if the SC feels necessary.
- [97] Concerning the reasons why a specific nomination was not selected, it is more complex to communicate this since the SC does not produce such a report, and selection is made by voting based on information provided by the submitter. The IPPC Secretariat invites the SC members to review all candidates and their CVs, and indicate whom they prefer in a panel or in an EWG.
- [98] The Chairperson suggested that the Director-General of EPPO should contact the IPPC Secretariat to discuss this issue.

7. Moving together from ideas to action

7.1 International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) Legacy

- [99] Mr Riccardo MAZZUCHELLI delivered an update on the IYPH Legacy.¹⁵ He described the IYPH objectives, noted the extension of IYPH to 2021, listed the IYPH key initiatives, specified the IYPH global activities, referred to the IYPH communications, highlighted the IYPH national and regional initiatives, specified the IYPH legacy, and explained how to contribute to the IYPH activities.
- [100] The Director-General of EPPO noted that another European representative in the technical advisory group for the International Day of Plant Health is needed to get this activity going on and continue European or EPPO involvement in it.

7.3 ePhyto solutions

- [101] Mr Craig FEDCHOCK delivered an update on the ePhyto solutions.¹⁶ He provided background information on the IPPC ePhyto Solution, justified the need for ePhyto, described its main components and how they work, explained the ePhyto, highlighted the country participation in 2021, provided the statistics of the usage of ePhyto, noted the continuing collaboration with the external stakeholders, referred to the features of channel delegation and forwarding, listed the necessary functionalities to use ePhyto Hub and how to join it, and highlighted the next plans for ePhyto.
- [102] The Chairperson asked how countries could join the ePhyto system.
- [103] The IPPC Secretariat explained that the best way to make that decision is to look at www.ephytoexchange.org. If a country wants to join by using the web-based system, there is a step-by-step guide to joining that has a checklist, additional documentation, etc on the Generic ePhyto National System (GeNS) web page. If a county wants to join the Hub directly with its national system, they have the prerequisites, they go through a step by step and register things of that nature. There's a lot of detailed documentation in three languages. It includes software requirements, web service, authentication, it's a detailed document. If the country sends an email to ippc-ephyto@fao.org, the IPPC will start the process from there. It 's good for a country to think through how they want to join – do they want to join the web-based system, or do they want to go ahead and link their national system to the ePhyto Hub. The IPPC will help with that, and other organizations are also willing to help with that, such as the Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation and the World Bank.

7.5 National Reporting Obligations (NRO) – Focused session on pest reporting

- [104] The Chairperson delivered an update on the NRO.¹⁷ He provided a general review of NROs, demonstrated NROs new web pages, and highlighted NROs work plan in 2021.
- [105] The Director-General of EPPO reminded that EPPO has its draft work program for 2022, which includes the organization of a workshop on pest reporting. Hence, it will be beneficial to link up with the activities that the IPPC is developing.
- [106] He noted that one of the difficulties was that there were many pest reporting obligations that countries had to report to the RPPO and to the IPPC Secretariat, and EU countries have to do it also to the European Commission. Hence, EPPO is looking into the possibilities to streamline this and is working with the European Commission on whether reports submitted to the European Commission can be passed on to EPPO, and then this message can be passed on to the IPPC. This needs alignment of the software and the information included in the reports.

¹⁵ IYPH Legacy: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89948/>

¹⁶ ePhyto solutions: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/90029/>

¹⁷ National Reporting Obligation (NRO) – Focused session on pest reporting: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89962/>

[107] One member asked if EPPO compared the figures and the number of reports to the IPPC.

[108] It was replied that there that the IPPC represented low numbers of reports from the European region, especially from EU countries. It is another signal that many countries have to report to two or three different places on the same pest occurrences, and it has to be solved because it is reported to EPPO but not to the IPPC Secretariat. It is possible to work on this with the IPPC Secretariat.

7.6 Sea Containers: procedure and requirements for inspections

[109] The Secretariat delivered an update on the Sea Containers work: procedure and requirements for inspection.¹⁸ They described the risks associated with the movement of sea containers and their cargoes, provided the historical background of the development of a draft ISPM and the CPM Recommendation on this topic, highlighted the history of the work of the Sea Containers Task Force (SCTF), and on what has been done in the last 5 years, stressed the outputs of the work of the SCTF to help address the pest risks associated with cargo transport units, noted the additional guidance from CPM-15 (2021), presented the SCTF final work plan and outlined the expected decisions from CPM-16 (2022).

[110] One participant highlighted that it is essential to have at least the opportunity to have regional representations from all FAO regions in the Focus Group that will be established. There is a difference of opinions within Europe on proceeding with this subject. Other regions, such as North America, Australia, and New Zealand are active, which urges to have a position also from the European region. For these regions, pests as defined by the IPPC is the problem, but the concerns are there also broader in the scope of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), like snails that are more in the CBD scope. Also, several countries are asking for a standard to be developed, but the difficulty with the previous draft standard was that some regions were not against the standard as such, but more against its rapid adoption because of the feasibility for implementation and whether it was addressing the problem in the right place.

8. Date and type of the next regional workshop

[111] The next regional workshop is preliminarily scheduled for 5–7 September 2022.

9. Any other business

[112] One participant shared the opinion that it would be helpful to have at least the presentation on the draft standards (e.g., with the explanation of the changes) at the beginning of the consultation period rather than towards the end. It would help to organize better quality of reactions nationally.

10. Evaluation of the workshop

[113] The Chairperson encouraged all the participants to complete the evaluation of the workshop at the meeting via the link provided by an email.

11. Close of the meeting

[114] The Chairperson thanked all participants for their active contributions and closed the meeting.

¹⁸ Sea Containers: procedure and requirement for inspection: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89966/>

Appendix 1: Agenda

N	Agenda item	Document number / link	Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support
1.	Opening of the Session, welcome remarks		
	By the IPPC Secretariat	–	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN, OiC IPPC Secretary (video)
	By the FAO REU	–	Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK on behalf of Mr Vladimir RAKHMANIN, ADG-RR
	By the EPPO	–	Mr Nico HORN, Director-General of EPPO
2.	Meeting Arrangements		
2.1.	Election of the Chairperson	–	Participants
2.2.	Election of the Rapporteur	–	Chairperson
2.3.	Review and adoption of the agenda	Appendix 1	Chairperson
3.	Administrative Matters		
3.1.	Participants list	Appendix 2	IPPC Secretariat
4.	Updates on Governance and Strategic issues		
4.1.	Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)	Presentation	Mr Arop DENG (IPPC Secretariat)
4.2.	Update from the Standards Committee (SC)	Presentation	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC
4.3.	Update from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)	Presentation	Mr Ringolds ARNITIS
5.	Discussions on substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations		
5.1.	Revision of ISPM 4 (<i>Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas</i>) (2009-002)	Presentation	Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI (SC)
5.2.	<i>Use of specific import authorizations</i> (Annex to ISPM 20: <i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>) (2008-006)	Presentation	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC
5.3.	Revision of ISPM 18 (<i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i>) (2014-007)	Presentation	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC
5.4.	2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001)	Presentation	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC
5.5.	Focused Revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011)	Presentation	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC
5.6.	<i>Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures</i> (2019-008)	Presentation	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC
5.7.	<i>Audits in the phytosanitary context</i> (2015-014)	Presentation	Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI (SC)
5.8.	Draft 2019-2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (<i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1994-001)	Presentation	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC

N	Agenda item	Document number / link	Presenter / IPPC Secretariat support
5.9.	Draft CPM Recommendation: <i>Facilitating safe trade by reducing the incidence of contaminating pests associated with traded goods</i> (2019-002)	Presentation	Mr Nico HORN (EPPO)
6.	Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/RPPOs		
6.1.	Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities and topics of interest of the region	Presentation	Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK (FAO REU)
6.2.	Update on Fall Army Worm-related activities	Presentation	Mr Valerio LUCCHESI (EPPO) / Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI (SC)
6.3.	EPPO (RPPO) activities	–	Mr Nico HORN (EPPO)
7.	Moving together from ideas to action		
7.1.	International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) Legacy	Presentation	Mr Riccardo MAZZUCHELLI (IPPC Secretariat)
7.2.	ePhyto Solutions	Presentation	Mr Craig FEDCHOCK (IPPC Secretariat)
7.3.	National Reporting Obligation (NRO) – Focused session on pest reporting	Presentation	Mr Ringolds ARNITIS (IC)
7.4.	Sea Containers: procedure and requirement for inspection	Presentation	Mr Artur SHAMILOV (IPPC Secretariat)
8.	Date and type of the next RW	–	Chairperson
9.	Any other business	–	Chairperson
10.	Evaluation of the RW	–	Chairperson
11.	Close of the meeting	–	Chairperson

Appendix 2: Participants list

IPPC Secretariat	
Mr Artur SHAMILOV Standard Setting Officer	Artur.Shamilov@fao.org
Ms Alejandra JIMENEZ TABARES Implementation Facilitation Officer	Alejandra.JimenezTabares@fao.org