THE VIEWS OF REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS (rppoS) ON THEIR ROLE IN THE PEST OUTBREAK ALERT AND RESPONSE SYSTEM (poars) - FOR DISCUSSION AT THE 2022 october STRATEGIC PLANNING GROUP (SPG) MEETING

(*Summarized by NAPPO on behalf of IAPSC, APPPC, PPPO, CAHFSA, CAN, COSAVE, EPPO, NEPPO, OIRSA and NAPPO*)

The Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Focus Group included, in their Draft Recommendations for an Effective POARS (dated March 2022) and available here - <https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/mediakitdocument/en/2022/03/POARS_All_Recommendations.pdf>, a series of suggested actions that might be undertaken by the Regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs).

As stated in Article IX of the International Plant Protection Convention, Regional plant protection organizations shall function as the coordinating bodies, shall participate in various activities to achieve the objectives of this Convention and, where appropriate, shall gather and disseminate information. Regional plant protection organizations shall promote the development and use of relevant international standards for phytosanitary measures and encourage inter-regional cooperation in promoting harmonized phytosanitary measures for controlling pests and in preventing their spread and/or introduction.

For reference, the acronyms and names of the ten RPPOs can be found here - <https://www.ippc.int/en/external-cooperation/regional-plant-protection-organizations/>

The RPPOs recently analyzed the list of actions suggested in the POARS FG draft report and commented on the ability of their individual organizations to uptake and accomplish the suggested deliverables.

This document summarizes the opinions of all RPPOs in Table 1. Table 2 provides the individual comments from the RPPOs.

In general, there was consensus on several of the action points suggested by the POARS FG draft report. However, some important differences between RPPOs surfaced. In addition, some suggested edits to the description of the actions were also provided.

As plans of action for the implementation of other Development Agendas of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 are rolled out, it would be important to seek early input from the RPPOs on specific activities and deliverables where they can make a significant and positive contribution.

The SPG is requested to review, discuss, and comment on the document and on the suggested way forward.

**TABLE 1 – Summary of views from the ten RPPOs on specific actions suggested by the POARS FG in their March 2022 Draft Report for an effective POARS.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Specific actions may include** | **ANALYSIS** |
| Maintaining continuous communication and coordination with the POARS Steering Committee (SC). | RPPOs agree on the importance of maintaining communication with the POARS SC; the approach should be practical and timely. Need clarity on what is meant by coordination. |
| Aligning with the POARS operating guidelines and working in close collaboration with the POARS | General agreement on collaboration. Questions about the operating guidelines; suggestion to harmonize these with those of the RPPOs. |
| Incorporating at regional level the elements of the surveillance and response system to support actions against emerging pest when required. This should include:   * + Collecting and disseminating to NPPOs information on emerging pest problems for the region, including lists of official pest reports.   + Facilitating response by providing clear guidance to its Member States on general and specific surveillance and emergency response protocols available on the IPPC Global Framework (POARS) and on the RPPOs for emerging pests of regional concern.   + Fostering international networks to support emergency response in Member States through mechanisms for collaboration that may include MOUs, Cooperative Agreements, Practical Arrangements, and other means. | All agree that surveillance and response actions are the responsibility of NPPOs. RPPOs mainly serve the communication function including helping with NRO reporting in their regions. |
| Coordinating with NPPOs to enable the POARS in the event of an imminent emerging pest threat or a pest outbreak. | This is only possible if NPPOs of the member countries make a commitment for timely communication (on relevant) emerging pests or pest outbreaks to their RPPO. |
| Setting up a regional expert group that could technically assist in case of a regional outbreak. | RPPOs support this; some already have actions in this respect; our role should be more clearly stated – see suggested edits to the goal. |
| Establishing intervention teams (phytosanitary commandos) by identifying groups of subject matter experts for specific pests that can operate on site. | Some differing regional views on this suggested role and its ease of implementation globally. Some think that lists of experts would suffice. Costs need to be considered. |
| Creating and activating communications channels and contact lists of officials to be contacted in emergency situations. | Some RPPOs think the IPPC Contact point is sufficient, but others feel that a more comprehensive and **always current** list of officials would be of benefit. |
| Assisting NPPOs with the characterization of the emerging pest problem through setting up interviews with stakeholders including farmers and general public. | RPPOs feel this role should be for the NPPOs as these are national issues. |
| Securing funds for intervention in case of an emergency. | Suggested edits to this role. Most RPPOs do not have a way to do this unless their member country NPPOs endorse and make available the resource. |
| Maintaining, in a strategic location, a minimum stock of the necessary materials and equipment for pest surveillance and control ready for use during the emergencies. | RPPOs differ in their opinion of their availability to meet this goal, indicating that NPPOs should do this. A couple of RPPOs (PPPO and OIRSA) do this. |
| Conducting regional simulation exercises to prepare for possible outbreaks of pests of interest by RPPOs and to test contingency plans. | RPPOs agree on this role; some are already doing it; some mention the need to secure funding; some have funding already identified. |
| Creating and maintaining regional databases and geographical information systems of emerging pest surveillance networks in support of a rapid response in case of a pest incursions, outbreak or introduction. | Differing opinions concerning this goal. Some RPPOs can only do this for specific pests; some do this routinely for their region; some propose integration/harmonization of NPPO databases for regional use. |
| Conducting and/or facilitating emerging pests' upstream surveillance (horizon scanning) and Pest Risk Analyses/Assessment (PRA). | Most RPPOs agree with and are already meeting this goal. |
| Identifying through general surveillance or horizon scanning, regional emerging pests to be included in the POARS and in coordination with the IPPC Secretariat. | Some RPPOs agree that they can and are already meeting this goal; others agree that the data needs to come from NPPOs for RPPOs to develop the lists to share with the POARS and the IPPC Sect. |
| Actively engaging with NPPOs in their NRO and encouraging them to meet their obligations in a timely manner. | All RPPOs already engaging with their member countries on this. |
| Actively supporting capacity building in Member States to facilitate NRO, including training and setting up an effective pest reporting system. | Most RPPOs agree that this is a goal where they can have an impact – through workshops or other activities, many already have it in their workplans. |
| Inspection and accreditation of Reference Laboratories with regional capacity to provide diagnostic services and assess the epidemiological situation in a country. Regional Reference Laboratories will complement the capacities of national diagnostic laboratories, especially in those cases where the capacity is not available in a country. | RPPOs would like to clarify their specific role in this goal – may express concerns about being able to meet this goal |
| Supporting the drafting of regional protocols and contingency plans for specific quarantine pests of interest for the region (including protocols on pest diagnostic, survey and control). | Most RPPOs already fulfilling this goal; NAPPO would require some internal procedural processes to be followed in order to do this. |
| Supporting Member Countries of the RPPOs to implement public information and education programmes, including communication material templates to prevent and/or overcome public resistance to pest eradication interventions. | RPPOs could collaborate on this and progress it through coordinated work among RPPOs. Could be a standing Agenda item for the TC-RPPO meeting. |
| Supporting Member Countries of the RPPOs to implement programmes to educate the public at large so that they become ‘community scientists’ and help identify and report suspected pests, essentially becoming part of the global pest alert system. | RPPOs could collaborate on this and progress it through coordinated work among RPPOs. Could be a standing Agenda item for the TC-RPPO meeting. |
| Collaborating with NPPOs and international organizations such as FAO in applied research to identify baseline information and technology gaps and develop comprehensive easy-to-use tools to support countries to respond quickly and effectively to emerging pest outbreaks. | Most RPPOs agree with this goal. |

**EXCERPT - Draft Recommendations for an Effective POARS (dated March 2022)**

**4.3.3 – Role of RPPOs**

At the regional level, the IPPC encourages CPs to cooperate on topics of interest about common serious plant pest risks. This is done by establishing RPPOs which function as coordinating bodies in plant protection matters among the Member States that conform the regions. Other regional institutions include FAO sub-regional and regional offices. In general terms, the role of the RPPOs and other regional organizations and institutions should be to guide, support, coordinate and link the NPPOs with POARS.

**Table 2 - Specific actions for RPPOs to undertake for an effective POARS may include:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Verbatim from the report** | **Suggested edits to specific actions** | **EPPO** | **NAPPO** | **NEPPO** | **COSAVE** | **APPPC** | **CAN** | **CAHFSA** | **PPPO** | **OIRSA** | **IAPSC** |
| Maintaining continuous communication and coordination with the POARS Steering Committee (SC). | NAPPO – Maintain continuous communication ~~and coordination~~ with the POARS SC. | Maintaining communication is doable, clarity needed on what communication we can expect from SC and what communication is expected from the RPPO.  Coordination point is not clear | Maintaining communication with the POARS SC is doable, but we are not yet certain that an SC will be formed?  Not sure I understand the coordination point | Maintain continuous communication with POARS SC | Maintaining continuous communication with POARS SC | Maintaining continuous communication with POARS SC | Maintain continuous coordination with the POARS Steering Committee (SC).  (Coordination involves communication) | Possible for CAHFSA to maintain continuous communication with the POARS SC once that committee is established. | Maintain continuous communication with the POARS SC | In agreement; looking for practical ways to simplify processes for quick and timely reaction | IAPSC would like to maintain continuous communication with POARS`s SC, but looks forward to seeing how effective the will be in terms of establishment, functionality,  coordination mechanism and sustainability. |
| Aligning with the POARS operating guidelines and working in close collaboration with the POARS | NAPPO – Collaborate with the POARS on pest issues relevant to your specific region.  EPPO: collaborate with POARS on specific aspects on pest issues relevant to region. | Operating guidelines are mainly for NPPOs, are these guidelines available? I could not find them on IPPC website | What is being aligned? Please see suggested edit to this action point | Not clear.  Agree with NAPPO and EPPO | “Aligning with the POARS operating guidelines” is not clear.  Agree with “Working in close collaboration with the POARS” | Working close collaboration with the POARS | Working close collaboration with the POARS | An idea of what the POARS operating guidelines are would help us agree to this. It might be possible.  Can work in close collaboration with the POARS | PPPO Agree to work in close collaboration with POARS on relevant pest issues to our region and pests threats in the horizon | Harmonize the operational guidelines of the RPPO with those of the POARS, since it depends on their own methodologies, availability of resources and time | IAPSC looks forward to understanding the alignment operation mechanisms, but does agree to work with POARS-SC |
| Incorporating at regional level the elements of the surveillance and response system to support actions against emerging pest when required. This should include:   * + Collecting and disseminating to NPPOs information on emerging pest problems for the region, including lists of official pest reports.   + Facilitating response by providing clear guidance to its Member States on general and specific surveillance and emergency response protocols available on the IPPC Global Framework (POARS) and on the RPPOs for emerging pests of regional concern.   + Fostering international networks to support emergency response in Member States through mechanisms for collaboration that may include MOUs, Cooperative Agreements, Practical Arrangements, and other means. | Note from NAPPO – please use **member countries** rather than member states. | We a system for collecting and disseminating information on emerging pests.  Gives guidance on surveillance, contingency planning where needed.  Possible to engage with countries from the region for international agreements, but only when desired by member countries.  Informal collaboration and information exchange is common practice for years already. | Surveillance and response are the responsibility of NPPOs.   * Our phytosanitary alert system (PAS) informs all NPPOs in the region concerning official pest reports. * The IPPC Global Framework would need to make available the emergency response protocols they have available so that RPPOs could liaise with their NPPOs as appropriate. * We have several letters of Understanding and Letters of Agreement with different organizations that facilitate collaboration. | Agree. Surveillance and response are the responsibility of NPPOs.  NEPPO shares information received from NPPOs. | COSAVE agrees with comments on this item. | Surveillance and responses are the responsibilities of NPPOs. APPPC communicates and shares the information received from NPPOs | OK, in a way, this is already being done. | Most of this already being done.  CAHFSA has an alert system to share information on emerging pests.  Working groups develop emergency response plans for pests and make available to all Members | In agreement and it is currently happening. At regional level PPPO supports its members in pest surveillance and response and also encourages its members on NRO.  Agree with NAPPO on making necessary information available and RPPO’s that can liaise with relevant NPPO’s.  Agree with the need to foster ongoing international relations/networks to help in emergency response. Do have existing MOUs with registered laboratories in the region for pest ID and authentication. | In agreement. Surveillance and response are the responsibility of NPPOs.  OIRSA shares the information received from the NPPO, in addition to having economic funds to carry out these actions | Surveillance and pest reporting are core functions of NPPOs; however, IAPSC will cooperate with POARS for the harmonization and sharing of information.  Updated information requires capacity building of Member states and constant development of protocols.  IAPSC endeavor to collaborate with POARS-SC |
| Coordinating with NPPOs to enable the POARS in the event of an imminent emerging pest threat or a pest outbreak. |  |  | NAPPO could do this, but it would require early communication from each NPPO whenever a new pest incursion is detected. |  | COSAVE could do this. However, It requires the commitment of NPPOs to rapidly inform an imminent emerging pest threat or a pest outbreak **relevant pest** for that region. | APPPC coordinates with NPPOs on imminent emerging pest threat or pest outbreak is and communicates to POARS | In agreement. | This is possible | PPPO is in agreement in coordinating with NPPOs and collaborating with POARS in such pest outbreak events. | OIRSA could do this. However, It requires the commitment of NPPOs to promptly inform an imminent emerging pest threat or a pest outbreak **relevant pest** for the region. | IAPSC agrees with the statement. NPPOs must be committed to work with POARS and IAPSC simultaneously in case of any pest outbreak |
| Setting up a regional expert group that could technically assist in case of a regional outbreak. | NAPPO – Develop and maintain lists of regional experts that could be called-on during a specific pest outbreak | EPPO could set up a regional expert group for a specific emerging pest when the need is there. To be able to do this quickly a list of experts could be compiled. | Having up-to-date contact lists of regional subject matter experts on specific pests would be something that NAPPO could do. |  | COSAVE agrees with NAPPO on suggested edits, and with comments from EPPO and NAPPO. | APPPC agrees on this. | In agreement. | Already have a ‘Safeguarding Working Group” that includes a Sub-group on “Emergency Response” | Agree and fully supports this. | There are already national, regional and international technical groups with a manual of specific procedures, as well as a list of expert professionals in phytosanitary emergencies. | IAPSC will develop a list of experts in subject matters that could be called to help during specific outbreak in the region. Thus, agrees with the statement. |
| Establishing intervention teams (phytosanitary commandos) by identifying groups of subject matter experts for specific pests that can operate on site. |  | Intervention teams can only be set up if member countries wish to have such teams available. Up-to-date lists of experts on specific pests could be useful for all NPPOs. Maybe more a task for IPPC Secretariat because knowledge on emerging pests is mostly available in other regions than where the pest is emerging. | Having up-to-date contact lists of subject matter experts working on specific pests around the world would be something that all the RPPOs could collaborate on. | Hard to establish such an intervention team. It depends upon the willingness of the countries and their involvement | COSAVE Agrees with EPPO, NAPPO and NEPPO comments. COSAVE suggests that an alternative could be to include something about identifying experts that can operate on site in the previous item. | APPPC has practicing standing committee on pesticide, quarantine and IPM however has no experts for specific pests that can operate on site | Ok, the CAN is developing a regulation establishing the composition and functions of the Andean Community Regional Phytosanitary Command. | The NPPOs agreed to this in principle but more difficult in practice due to resource constraints. Now considering collaboration with other RPPOs to provide a wider pool of experts etc. | Agree in general. But have to consider costs to mobilize and attire such an expert team to operate on site in countries in the PPPO region. | OIRSA, with the consent of its member NPPOs, can convene experts under the figure of phytosanitary commands, which can be call in the event of specific pest problems. | Updated list of experts required but funding resources needed to render this group operational in case of any pest outbreak.  Effective collaboration needed. |
| Creating and activating communications channels and contact lists of officials to be contacted in emergency situations. |  | Could be set up by EPPO, depending on what this list is going to be used for, for some purposes the list of official contact points may suffice. | Having up-to-date contact lists of persons responsible for emergency programs in each NPPO would be something that NAPPO could organize. | The focal contact points are and can be used for this | For COSAVE it is doable to do this. | Updated contact point is functional and it is doable | For CAN Member Countries, the Contact Points in case of phytosanitary emergencies are the Plant Health Directors and the Heads of Phytosanitary Surveillance and Quarantine. | Doable.  Plant Health Directors are designated the Official Contact Point in case of Phytosanitary emergencies. | Updated contact list of NPPOs and 2nd in Charge would be great. | OIRSA agrees, separating the official communication from the outreach, this one corresponds to the NPPO | It is doable for IAPSC  CPs NPPOs focal points to be sensitized for better communication among POARS-IAPSC and NPPOs |
| Assisting NPPOs with the characterization of the emerging pest problem through setting up interviews with stakeholders including farmers and general public. |  | Do not see the role for RPPOs, stakeholders should be contacted at national level because they differ too much per country. | ?? | ?? | COSAVE agrees with EPPO. We suggest this item to be included in NPPOs Role, if necessary. | Countries are adopting different practices specific to their countries. Common guidelines to NPPOs would be helpful. | In agreement with APPPC | Must be done at the national level, I think. Maybe RPPOs can provide some harmonized guidance | Agree with APPPC. Also a role for NPPOs. | OIRSA agrees. With close coordination and authorization with NPPOs is needed | Countries in the region have different practices. But IAPSC can coordinate and create awareness with member states government officials |
| Securing funds for intervention in case of an emergency. | COSAVE: **Considering availability** of funds for intervention in case of an emergency. | Can only be done by EPPO if member countries would like to have this and make funds available. | This would require endorsement by the NAPPO Executive Committee and dedicated funds from each NAPPO NPPO. | If the countries endorse it and make funds available | COSAVE: it could be possible only If it is endorsed by the Steering Committee and funds are available. Securing funds is not possible. See COSAVE **Suggested edits.** | Securing funds are not possible from the regional level, country needs allocating in the national budget. | In order to secure funds, we would need to have an approximate amount for emergency response and accordingly, identify other sources in addition to what could be allocated by Member Countries. | Not possible for CAHFSA. Could probably assist in developing concepts/proposals for funding by donors | Can be considered only if PPPO member do endorse to securing such a fund for emergency response and made available. | OIRSA has economic funds that are increased annually and can be for regional or national intervention. | If countries endorse the idea.  However, fund raising is the difficult issue to be tackled considering the economic levels of our Member states. |
| Maintaining, in a strategic location, a minimum stock of the necessary materials and equipment for pest surveillance and control ready for use during the emergencies. |  | Questionable whether this should be done regionally or nationally, in the EPPO region maybe subregional for some parts of the EPPO region, but for most countries nationally. | Conducting pest surveillance and control and having the necessary materials and equipment to support these activities are responsibilities of an NPPO. | NPPO | COSAVE: NPPOs | NPPOs | I do not agree with this, because it could be the case that an emergency does not occur in the next few years and the materials and equipment end up being discarded or outdated; it would be better to have agile policies within the countries that allow direct purchases to be made in the event of an emergency. | No. Have aided the NPPOs in procuring surveillance equipment and material but cannot keep stock. Just the cost of shipping such equipment and material to the required destination would be prohibitive. | PPPO secretaries does stockpile relevant materials and equipment’s for EWS and surveillance, and provide these on member requests. | OIRSA: In agreement, OIRSA provides specific Kits for rapid reaction and maintains them in the highest risk countries | This is questionable. Maybe it should be done at national level by NPPOs. IAPSC could better coordination the different actions |
| Conducting regional simulation exercises to prepare for possible outbreaks of pests of interest by RPPOs and to test contingency plans. |  | EPPO has organized several contingency planning workshops and is willing to organize more if needed. | NAPPO could certainly do this particularly if the suggestion for a simulation exercise to deal with the outbreak of a specific quarantine pest is submitted as a new project proposal for our region. | NEPPO could organize some workshops | COSAVE is already doing this. | Some workshop can be conducted. However, a proposal with some funding at the regional level implementation is proposed. | Agreed, it would also be important to include the sharing of the results of these simulations, including conclusions and recommendations to be taken into account by other RPPOs. | Can do. This is already being done. Support is also provided for the NPPOs to conduct national simulations. | Agree a very important exercise. Again, if funding can be identified, regional simulation exercises/ workshops will great. Learnings and recommendations will be a great take away from these regional simulations. | OIRSA agrees, OIRSA establishes in its work plans the performance of drills (simulation) at different levels, as well as the evaluation of the capacities to attend to declarations of emergencies | IAPSC could organize some training workshops with support from development partners and other institutions  This may be initiated to bring Member states to better prepare. |
| Creating and maintaining regional databases and geographical information systems of emerging pest surveillance networks in support of a rapid response in case of a pest incursions, outbreak or introduction. | Maintaining information on pest outbreaks is more important than maintaining information on systems, but good too.  COSAVE: Creating **or connecting** and maintaining regional databases and geographical information systems of emerging pest surveillance networks, in support of a rapid response in case of a pest incursions, outbreak or introduction. | Incorporating information from different systems in a central one is done already by EPPO. | Our RPPO only has 5 full-time staff. We do not have staff to create and maintain regional databases. Our member countries already do this. A better approach for our region would be to integrate and harmonize the NPPOs databases for regional use. | Hard for NEPPO | COSAVE agree with NAPPO. | Regional data are weak and APPPC proposes to develop a common platform to work with NPPOs. Sharing of information on need based and on requests are in practice however, regional data base is weak. | The CAN only has the Foc R4T and HLB surveillance database, because there are regulations that oblige member countries to share this information internally. | The region is developing a platform to collect information on pest surveillance activities on regional priority pests that are being carried out by the NPPOs. The information is entered by the NPPOs, and so a lot depends on their willingness to provide the information. | Currently the PPPO is maintaining a regional Pest List Database for all its members.  Very much linked to the pest surveillance in collaboration with PPPO members. | OIRSA agrees and there are technological platforms to speed up decision-making | Loadable initiative but very difficult to be materialized.  Urge resources needed to accomplish; though a very few countries have initiated the development of pest database. |
| Conducting and/or facilitating emerging pests' upstream surveillance (horizon scanning) and Pest Risk Analyses/Assessment (PRA). |  | EPPO does horizon scanning and performs PRAs. In the EPPO region EFSA is also active in both areas and EPPO collaborates with EFSA. | Horizon scanning would fit well within our current NAPPO PAS. However, to conduct more aggressive horizon scanning a regional expert group dedicated to this task would be needed.  To conduct PRAs in NAPPO, a dedicated expert group would be needed, and our member countries would need to agree on which pest would be the topic of the regional PRA. | NEPPO plan to set up a new focus group on PRA | COSAVE agree with this item. | APPPC agrees with it | In agreement. | CAHFSA is Ok with this as it is already a part of our work programme. | PPPO agrees and supports this item. | OIRSA agrees | Training on horizon scanning in the region has been initiated but requires funding for sustainability. PRA are ongoing but need to be consolidated. Thus, IAPSC agrees with the statement but needs support for consolidation of its action. |
| Identifying through general surveillance or horizon scanning, regional emerging pests to be included in the POARS and in coordination with the IPPC Secretariat. | A better system for pest reporting is needed at IPPC level. This includes automatic transfer of reports from NPPOs and RPPOs to IPPC Secretariat (e.g. XML transfer) and should allow analysis of reports, e.g. combine pest reports of emerging pests of different countries, in and beyond regions. | General surveillance is done by NPPOs. If the RPPOs receive this information, this could be combined to obtain information on the developments in the region. | General surveillance is conducted by NPPOs. A better approach would be to have timely communication on general surveillance results for each member country NPPO to allow identification of regionally emerging pests.  However, horizon scanning using digital means could be strengthened in NAPPO. | Same comments as NAPPO and EPPO. | COSAVE agrees with this item. COSAVE already does these activities through its technical groups. | Some are already in practice | In agreement. | Already has in place a regional working group for this. However, this process is conducted every two years. | PPPO agrees and supports this item, | Some are already in practice | General surveillance is one of the core activities of NPPOs. A better approach could be required with constant support. IAPSC endeavor to enhance the implementation of this activity by NPPOs though better coordination. |
| Actively engaging with NPPOs in their NRO and encouraging them to meet their obligations in a timely manner. | Same as the suggestion below | EPPO encourages its members regularly and improvements is still needed. EPPO will organize a workshop on pest reporting 2023. | NAPPO already has the NAPPO PAS but reporting obligations could be improved by some of the NAPPO member countries. | It is done continuously and at every event | COSAVE agrees. COSAVE already does this. | Doing it and requesting to update and exchange the country information | Agreed, this activity is already being implemented. | Ok with this | PPPO continuously encourage its member on NRO. Agree with this item. | Doing it and requesting to update and exchange the country information | IAPSC agrees with the statement. This activity is done by the NPPOs but improvement is required.  Capacity building for NPPOs needed. |
| Actively supporting capacity building in Member States to facilitate NRO, including training and setting up an effective pest reporting system. | Actively supporting capacity building in Member ~~States~~ countries to facilitate NRO, including training and setting up an effective pest reporting system.  COSAVE: Actively supporting ~~capacity building in~~ Member ~~States~~ Countries to facilitate NRO. ~~, including training and setting up an effective pest reporting system.~~ | EPPO will organize a workshop on pest reporting 2023 and has a good pest reporting system. An automatic link with the IPPC system would avoid that countries have to report the same information twice or three times. | NAPPO already has the NAPPO PAS but reporting obligations could be improved by some of the NAPPO member countries. | It is planned to organize a training workshop on NRO in 2023 | NRO are obligations to NPPOs. COSAVE encourages member countries to comply with NRO. Setting up a pest reporting regional system is not for RPPOs.  With the suggested edits, this item is almost the same as the previous one. | In APPPC biennium work plan |  | Ok with this. CAHFSA has organized NRO training workshops and works with the Member States to improve pest reporting. | Agree with this item. Given the high turnover of NPPOs capacity building on NROs is important. | In APPPC biennium work plan | Agree with the statement. It needs to be more consolidated for effective CPs pest reporting.  Greater collaboration NPPOs-IAPSC and POARS needed. Workshops in view during IAPSC`s general assembly and steering committee. |
| Inspection and accreditation of Reference Laboratories with regional capacity to provide diagnostic services and assess the epidemiological situation in a country. Regional Reference Laboratories will complement the capacities of national diagnostic laboratories, especially in those cases where the capacity is not available in a country. | Inspection and accreditation of Reference Laboratories with regional capacity to provide diagnostic services and assess the epidemiological situation in a country. Regional Reference Laboratories will complement the capacities of national diagnostic laboratories, especially in those cases where the capacity is not available in a country.  COSAVE: Setting up a regional list of laboratories, including the diagnostic services that each laboratory provides and have a way for these laboratories to assist other member countries with particular diagnostic issues. | Part of the countries in our region have such a system already (EU). EPPO informally encourages collaboration by bringing experts from the region together in Panels and maintaining a database on diagnostic expertise. EPPO does not have the expertise nor the capacity to inspect and accredit laboratories. | Not sure what is meant by this suggestion – is it for RPPOs to have their own regional laboratories?  A more plausible approach would be for NAPPO to organize a list of laboratories in the region including the diagnostic services that each laboratory provides and have a way for these laboratories to assist other member countries with a particular diagnostic issue. | ?? | COSAVE agrees with NAPPO. See suggested edits to improve the clarity of this goal | Not functional but this area seems vital and APPPC would like to support | It is not a competence of the CAN to inspect or accredit laboratories, this is a direct competence of the NPPOs, rather it is suggested that the RPPOs have a list of registered or accredited laboratories in each of the Member Countries and a detail of the services they perform. | CAHFSA doesn’t have the capacity to inspect and accredit laboratories. However, work is undergoing to compile a list of accredited or otherwise recognized laboratories and the services they provide | Do have agreements and arrangements with regional accredited labs for this service. NPPOs are encouraged in taking lead in developing capacities at National level for their labs with the support from regional accredited laboratories. | As OIRSA it is preferable to analyze the text, since as an RPPO it participates, provides funds, technical support and only necessary cases require accreditation. On many occasions there are no times to perform this function. | It is vital activity but requires more resources to establish functional reference laboratories. some countries do have reference labs but with limited action for proper pest diagnostics  More need to be done in this area.  Strengthening capacity of NPPOs and RECs in terms of human, facilities and equipment.  IAPSC endeavors for advocacy and better coordination. |
| Supporting the drafting of regional protocols and contingency plans for specific quarantine pests of interest for the region (including protocols on pest diagnostic, survey and control). |  | EPPO has produced and is producing many diagnostic protocols and updating them regularly. EPPO also has regional standards on contingency planning, both general and for specific pests. | NAPPO could certainly do this particularly if the documents needed for specific quarantine pests are submitted as new project proposals for our region. | NEPPO is encouraging the member state to do at regional level | COSAVE agrees with this item. COSAVE already does this. | APPPC does it and agrees for further work | CAN already does this, at the request of the Member Countries. | Already part of the work programme | PPPO fully supports this item. | OIRSA Agrees, since they are necessary elements for a timely intervention | IAPSC supports this action.  Several initiatives exist and are ongoing but need to be enhanced.  Bottleneck is lack of resources.  IAPSC to create awareness and consolidate partnerships |
| Supporting Member Countries of the RPPOs to implement public information and education programmes, including communication material templates to prevent and/or overcome public resistance to pest eradication interventions. |  | EPPO has recently launched a database to share awareness raising communication material. EPPO also has developed posters and templates for communication. | This is an interesting idea that might become a collaborative effort among all RPPOs. In other words, all RPPOs could work together to develop materials to be used by all RPPOs to prevent/overcome public resistance to eradication programs. | Agree with NAPPO. NEPPO can contribute | COSAVE agrees with NAPPO. COSAVE already does this, through the region and in GICSV. | APPPC working in some area | In agreement, it would be important to identify the mechanisms | Supports NAPPOs comments on this. | PPPO Agree and supports potential collaboration in this item. Given regional Pest Alerts are targeted to NPPO’s and how to we tailor it to suit public and gain their support and buy-in. | OIRSA agrees. | IAPSC agrees; but there is lot of disparity among member states.  Effort is required for harmonization and common action for success. |
| Supporting Member Countries of the RPPOs to implement programmes to educate the public at large so that they become ‘community scientists’ and help identify and report suspected pests, essentially becoming part of the global pest alert system. |  | EPPO has recently launched a database to share awareness raising communication material. EPPO also has developed posters and templates for communication. | This is an interesting idea that might become a collaborative effort among all RPPOs. In other words, all RPPOs could work together to develop materials to be used by all RPPOs to compel the public to become community scientists. | Same | COSAVE agrees with NAPPO. | APPPC agrees with other region | In accordance with the activity | As above | PPPO agrees and supports this important item. Very much similar to the previous item. | OIRSA agrees. | IAPSC agrees with other regions. But proper collaboration, coordination and partnership are needed among Member states NPPOs, IAPSC and POARS.  Political will of member states needed |
| Collaborating with NPPOs and international organizations such as FAO in applied research to identify baseline information and technology gaps and develop comprehensive easy-to-use tools to support countries to respond quickly and effectively to emerging pest outbreaks. |  | EPPO encourages this via the research coordination network Euphresco. Could be strengthened by focusing even more on applied research. | Our RPPO only has 5 full-time staff. Any applied research with the stated objectives would need to be conducted by NAPPO expert groups. |  | COSAVE agrees with this item. | APPPC agrees on it | In accordance with the activity | Already being done, including under several Letters of Agreement with FAO and MoUs with other international organizations. | PPPO agrees and supports this item. | OIRSA in Agreement, in addition to FAO, with other reference organizations. | Several instantiates exist with different partners.  But consolidation of partnership with different research institutions and organizations solicited for proper success and sustainability.  IAPSC supports the statements and suggests its enlargements not only with the FAO but with others. |

**Proposed framework for the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System (POARS)**

