Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

International Plant Protection Convention

REPORT

IPPC Regional Workshop for the Europe and Central Asia

Baku, Azerbaijan, and Paris, France
05-07 September 2022

IPPC Secretariat

Table of Contents

1. Opening of the session

[1] Mr. Elkhan MIKAYILOV, Apparatus chief of Food Safety Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan, facilitated the opening ceremony. He welcomed the participants and noted that the IPPC Regional Workshop is the first one held in Azerbaijan and it has been jointly organized by FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia, European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO), and Food Safety Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan. He then introduced the opening ceremony speakers, including Mr. Osama EL-LISSY (the IPPC Secretary), Mr. Nico HORN (the Director-General of EPPO), Mr. Inam KARIMOV (the Minister of Agriculture of Azerbaijan), Mr. Goshgar TAHMAZLI (the Chairman of the Food Safety Agency of Azerbaijan), and Ms. Melek CAKMAK (the FAO Representative in Azerbaijan).

[2] Mr. Elkhan MIKAYILOV proceeded to briefly illustrate the workshop held at the same time also in Paris, France, with a video connection between the two locations and outlined some of the main points of the agenda including emerging pests, pest outbreaks alert and response system, requirements for establishment of pest free areas, the IPPC ePhyto Solution and analysis of draft ISPMs. He then invited participants to share their opinions and experiences at regional level and wished all the success to the workshop. He concluded his intervention giving technical information regarding interpretation during the workshop.

1.1 Host country opening statement

[3] Mr. Goshgar TAHMAZLI, Chairman of Food Safety Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan, delivered his welcoming speech, welcoming the participants on behalf of the Food Safety Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan. Mr. TAHMAZLI stated the increasing importance of plant health on a global scale in the regards of eliminating food shortages and hunger and the spreading of new harmful organisms as a result of globalization, trade development and climate change. In this field, the work of FAO and IPPC Secretariat and EPPO, including the development of standards and guidelines for plant protection, is extremely important for reducing poverty as well as increasing awareness of the world's population about biodiversity and environmental protection.

[4] Mr. Goshgar TAHMAZLI then illustrated the significant results of Azerbaijan in the field of plant health: improvement of legal framework, strengthening of the control system, creation of laboratory infrastructure, establishment of an electronic information system and the implementation of many other important measures For example, phytosanitary certificates can be obtained in full electronic form and soon the Agency's Automated Food Safety Information System (AFSIS) will be integrated to the electronic systems for import-export operation, as well as connecting to the ePhyto system. All this lead to the creation of a foundation for the rise of agriculture and food industry and to the creation of a food safety system in the country, in fact, a new draft law "On Plant Health" is also being prepared.

[5] Mr. Goshgar TAHMAZLI thanked for attention and is confident that this event will contribute to ensure plant health and food security on a regional scale.

[6] Mr. Inam KARIMOV, the Minister of agriculture of the Republic of Azerbaijan gave his welcoming speech. Speaking at the event, Minister of Agriculture said that Azerbaijan actively contributes to the global fight against the COVID-19 pandemic in close cooperation with its international partners. The Government of Azerbaijan has taken prompt and necessary measures to minimize the impact of the pandemic on the agricultural sector and the welfare of farmers. In 2020, Azerbaijan's agricultural sector increased by 2 percent.

[7] Mr. Inam KARIMOV highlighted that the agricultural sector in Azerbaijan will be developed based on the concept of smart agriculture, which includes the best technologies and practices for plant protection. Azerbaijan is closely cooperation with FAO Country office to join other strategic initiatives, supports effective cooperation on international platforms such as IPPC.

1.2 Co-organizers' openings

[8] Mr. Osama EL-LISSY, the IPPC Secretary, thanked the Chairman of Food Safety Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan, the Ministry of Agriculture of Azerbaijan, the Representative of FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (REU) and the Director General of EPPO as well as the participants to the 2022 IPPC Regional Workshop hosted by Food Safety Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan (AFSA), and organized by REU, EPPO and the IPPC Secretariat. Mr. Osama EL-LISSY acknowledged that, despite all difficulties that the COVID-19 pandemic brought, "*we learnt to be resilient, to collaborate in innovative ways and to look ahead*".

[9] He then stated that in 2021, CPM-15 approved the new IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 defining challenges for the IPPC community for the current decade. Moreover, initiatives in IPPC Strategic Framework and Development Agenda include climate change, pest outbreaks and response systems, and implementation of ISPMs (to safeguard from invasive pests, facilitate safe trade and ensure food safety for all). Being the sole standard setting organization for plant health, the work of IPPC Community continues to be highly relevant to protect the environment and biodiversity, to combat climate change while facilitating safe trade.

[10] Mr. Osama EL-LISSY invited all participants to join the IPPC conference hosted by UK that was going to take place in UK from 21 to 23 September 2023as another opportunity to share ideas, concerns, enhance cooperation and work together to strengthen plant health in the region and beyond. Mr. Osama EL-LISSY concluded wishing all a successful workshop.

[11] Mr. Nico HORN, EPPO Director-General, thanked the organizers and the guests, and stated that EPPO is glad to be one of the co-organizers of the workshop. He also stated that supporting plant health contributes to enhancing food security, affordability of food for everyone and facilitating safe trade. Since pests do not stop at borders, he stated that "*we have to collaborate and work on the standardization of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) in order to understand each other better and to better understand issues in our regions*". Mr. Nico HORN concluded that he would be glad to contribute to the success of the workshop and wished all a good meeting.

[12] Ms. Melek CAKMAK, the FAO Representative in Azerbaijan, welcomed the participants to the IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia and appreciated the cooperation among the Secretariat of the IPPC, the host country, EPPO and the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia to organize this workshop. She congratulated again Mr. Osama EL-LISSY for his appointment as IPPC Secretary.

[13] Ms. Melek CAKMAK wished the workshop to be a good platform for discussion, capacity building and for establishing contacts between different experts in the region. She continued stating that science-based standards are necessary to harmonize efforts to stop spread of pests, support the people and contribute to achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals, and expressed appreciation for the activities undertaken by the contracting parties to the IPPC in the development of globally agreed ISPMs that make sure that international trade of plants is safe and does not move dangerous pests. Ms. Melek CAKMAK concluded her remarks stating that the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia is ready to support countries in the area in developing their capacities to address plant health-related challenges.

2. Meeting Arrangements

[14] The IPPC Secretariat representative gave an overview of the meeting's arrangements and proceeded to the election of the Chairperson.

2.1 Election of the Chair

[15] Mr. Ringolds ARNĪTIS was elected as Chairperson. Due to his participation in the EPPO Panel on Global Phytosanitary Affairs held partly in parallel to the Workshop, the Chairperson asked to elect a Vice-

Chairperson for the last day of the workshop. Mr. Taleh SHAMIYEV (Azerbaijan) was elected as Vice-Chairperson.

2.2 Election of the Rapporteur

[16] Mr. Shahriyar ORUCZADE was elected as Rapporteur.

2.3 Adoption of the Agenda

[17] The participants adopted the agenda as presented in Annex 1 to this report.

3. Administrative matters

3.1 Participants List

[18] The Chairperson invited participants to review their personal information reported in the list of participants and provide corrections if needed.

3.2 Documents and presentations list

[19] The Chairperson stated that participants received the list of documents and presentations, for reference.

4. Updates on Governance and Strategic Issues

4.1 Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)

[20] Mr. Samuel BISHOP, Representative of Europe in the CPM Bureau gave an overview of the IPPC Governance and Strategy. He illustrated to the participants the brief history of the IPPC Secretariat, its vision, mission and objectives as well as its core activities and its governance structure. He then proceeded to update the participants regarding the CPM-16 (2022), the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems Steering Group (POARS), the revision of the IPPC dispute settlement procedure, and the first International Plant Health Conference in London that would be held later in September. Mr. Samuel BISHOP concluded its presentation by showing the future plans of the IPPC Secretariat. No comments or questions were reported.

4.2 Updates from the SC

[21] Ms. Mariangela CIAMPITTI, a Standards Committee (SC) Member presented the updates from the SC. She noted the election of the new Standards Committee Chairperson, Ms. Sophie PETERSON (Australia), who succeeded Mr. Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina). She expressed the appreciation of the work of Mr. FERRO and the qualities of the new SC Chairperson.

[22] She noted that Mr. Matías Gonzalez BUTTERA (Argentina) will be replacing Mr. FERRO as new SC member as well as the selection of Mr. David KAMANGIRA (Malawi), Ms. Chonticha RAKKRAI (Thailand), Ms. Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy), Mr. André Felipe C. P. da SILVA (Brazil) and Ms. Joanne WILSON (New Zealand). as new SC members.

[23] She then proceeded to illustrate the development of the work of the SC:

- Review of the IPPC List Of Topics: four new Phytosanitary Treatments (PTs) were added, reaching 88 topics in total;
- Approval of the following draft Specifications for ISPMs for consultation: Revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies* (Tephritidae)) (2021-010), International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit (Annex to ISPM 46) (2021-011), and *Field inspection* (including growing-season inspection) (Annex to ISPM 23) (2021-018);

- Approval of draft standards for the first consultation: *Criteria for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies based on available information* (2018-011) (Draft Annex to ISPM 37: *Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies* (Tephritidae)), Draft 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001), Draft DP: *Mononychelus tanajoa* (2018-006), Draft DP: *Genus Ceratitis* (2016-001);
- Approval of draft ISPMs for the second consultation: Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002), Draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001), Draft Annex to ISPM 20: *Use of specific import authorizations* (2008-006), Revision of ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) (2014-007), Draft PT: Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi* (2017-027);
- Development of the draft on Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (Annex to ISPM 38: *International movement of seeds*) (2018-009): the SC formed a working group and will present the revised version for the discussion to the SC November 2022 meeting.

[24] The SC Member also updated the participants about the new Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS), which had its first meeting on 31 May 2022 and discussed the draft specification for ISPM: International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit (Annex to ISPM 46) (2021-011).

[25] SC Member highlighted the important work of the two Expert Working Groups (EWGs) in 2022: the EWG on the Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) Annex to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*) (Specification 69), which met in Canada in June 2022, and the EWG on Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001) (Specification 72) would be held in Italy in November 2022.

[26] One proposal was raised by EPPO to the IPPC Secretariat and supported by participants: to align the deadline for consultation of draft Specifications with the deadline for consultation of draft ISPMs (30 September), in order to enable their discussion at the IPPC Regional Workshops.

4.3 2022 update of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)

[27] The Chairperson, in his role as IC member, updated the participants regarding the IC and its activities in the past few months: overseeing the development of IPPC guides, training materials, projects, the implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs by contracting parties, the National Reporting Obligations processes, the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation tool, and moved forward on implementation issues through IC Subgroups and Teams.

[28] The Chairperson noted that CPM-16 adopted the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the IC, which brought several important changes: the IC is composed of 14 members (seven Regional representatives of each seven FAO regions, five experts without regional representation, one SC representative and one RPPO representative). The incoming call for the IC members, open from 10 October to 30 November 2022, is to nominate the seven Regional representatives and the experts as well as the replacement members (maximum two for each region). NPPOs and RPPOs will nominate the IC members to the CPM Bureau and the nominations selected will be presented to CPM-17 (2023) for confirmation. Moreover, the Dispute Settlement Oversight Body has been moved to CPM Bureau, while the IC maintains under its mandate the Dispute Avoidance, and the IC Subgroup on Dispute Avoidance and Settlement (DAS) will be recommended to dissolution to CPM-17 (2023)

[29] In addition, updates included the following:

- implementation issues regarding: Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) became IPPC Observatory after CPM-16's approval, explaining also its functions, and Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) continued activities to advance the PCE strategy 2020-2030;

- Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS): CPM-16 agreed that a POARS Steering Group be established, and its focus is on quarantine pest and potential quarantine pests. The POARS Steering Group might be composed of 9 experts;

- Emerging pests: draft prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for *Fusarium oxyporum* TR4 and *Spodoptera frugiperda*, Fall Armyworm (FAW), and related monitoring and evaluation activities (under development);

- List of Implementation and Capacity Development (ICD) Topics: there are currently 21 topics, out of which seven will be completed in 2022; CPM-16 added two new topics: Audits in the phytosanitary context (a new guide) (2021-009) and National Reporting Obligations (NROs) (revision of and existing guide) (2021-026);

[30] The Chairperson reminded the participants that support and contributions are essential and that this workshop is a great opportunity to share experiences and exchange views. No comments or suggestions were made.

5. Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations

5.1 Draft Annex to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies* (Tephritidae)): *Criteria for the evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies* (2018-011)

[31] An SC member presented the draft Annex to ISPM 37 and explained that the reason for the revision is the inconsistency in the host status interpretation from the published information which can lead to disputes between NPPOs, since nearly 30 terms describing host status can be found in the literature.

[32] Following EPPO's proposal, the title of the standard was changed from "*Criteria for the determination of host status of fruit flies based on available information*" to "*Criteria for the evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies"* in order to underline that only available information should be used and discussed.

[33] The SC Member illustrated the major drafting issues:

- Understanding the specifics of analysing information obtained from literature sources vs from experiments;

- Alignment of new definitions with ISPM 37: limitations of ISPM 37 definitions when assessing literature for determination of host status: this affects host status categories proposed in the Annex;

- Information and uncertainty: role of uncertainty due to different levels of reliability and applicability of information and its effect on the determinations oh host status.

- Application of host status of fruit to fruit flies by NPPOs considering its relevance to many NNPO activities; the draft focuses on its application in PRA.

[34] EWG suggested a focused revision of ISPM 37 to align the definition "conditional host" with Annex. It is a questionable point due to the fact that EWG can't propose the revision and it is one of the main problems of this draft Annex. If we maintain ISPM 37 definitions we cannot use the definition of draft Annex, because the two definitions are not aligned.

[35] The SC Member reported that there are several comments requesting alignment of the definitions in the draft Annex to the text of ISPM 37 from paragraph 31 to paragraph 38, and stated that, according to her,

the main point to discuss is that the EWG didn't use the definition of "conditional host" from ISPM 37, as stated in the report.

[36] One comment: "These terms refer only to fruit flies? There are many terms referring to hosts, now there are three new categories related only to fruit flies?" and "Is host status included in the Glossary or not?"

[37] One TPG member attending the workshop explained that "Host status in not defined in the Glossary. But there is no need to define everything in the Glossary". She continued that: "Several terms are defined in ISPM 37 which is about determination of host of fruit to fruit flies and you can define terms in an ISPM and this applies to this ISPM only. Host status of fruit to fruit flies is defined as «classification of plant species or cultivar as being natural host, conditional host or non-host for a fruit fly species». Clearly ISPM 37 is about fruit flies and the terms refer to fruit flies as well as Annexes. Thus, there is no need to define terms elsewhere for the moment".

[38] One participant informed that she commented through OCS for EPPO that "this Annex doesn't respect the definitions of ISPM 37, which we adopted few years ago. It is surprising because the Specification was very clear. When the Specification was discussed in the SC, one member tried to change the definition of conditional host and we did not accept it in the Specification. We were very clear that the EWG would have to follow the definitions of ISPM 37. It is very surprising. It is not ISPM 37 that has to be revised, it is the opposite. It was not in their mandate".

[39] An SC member stated that, for clarity, there is an important addition for the definition of conditional host: "In paragraph 43 it is stated that «a conditional host is a plant species of cultivar that shows evidence of infestation under semi natural» and this part is aligned with ISPM 37" but there is also the addition of "«or certain clearly described natural conditions including field trials» and this is the part that it is not aligned to ISPM 37".

[40] It was agreed to include into the OCS general comments from EPPO to request the alignment of the draft Annex to the definitions in ISPM 37". In addition, "there are a lot of comments from paragraph 41 to 48 where there are a sort of new definitions of the three categories and we have to decide now if we can maintain and amend all the paragraphs and I think we can accept the comments from France and from UK or propose to delete this part. It is up to us to discuss and decide".

[41] One additional important point was raised by participants who commented about the new proposed definition of conditional host in paragraph 61 "because it changes the definition which comes out from EWG «evidence of the presence of the target fruit fly species under semi-natural or certain clearly described environmental conditions» but according to the context of ISPM 37, if there is evidence of the presence of target fruit flies species in fruit under certain natural conditions, the host should be categorized as natural host and not as conditional host. So, according to the participant who commented, "the text clearly describes environmental conditions – all text in paragraph 61 – and it should be moved to end of section 3.2 that is about the criteria for natural host".

[42] One participant noted that *"certain host species could be absent in the country of export but they could be present in the country of import and therefore, this could be relevant for the country of export. . Moreover, it should be clear that it are the natural hosts that are relevant. These aspects are important to emphasize but already clear when following the terminology of ISPM 37*".

5.2 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)

[43] Ms. Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC, a TPG member, illustrated the background of the 2022 amendments to ISPM5 and invited participants to check the latest version of the Glossary on the IPPC website since it was updated every year. She pointed out that there are proposals of revisions of the terms "phytosanitary action" and "phytosanitary procedure".

[44] The TPG member explained that the main issue is "the same for both terms: "phytosanitary" exclusively refers to regulated pests (i.e. quarantine pests, regulated non quarantine pests). As definitions of the terms both refer to phytosanitary measures, the terms can be used only for regulated pests. However, an NPPO can apply phytosanitary action and phytosanitary procedure against regulated pests in its own country but also in export situations to fulfil requirements for the issuance of phytosanitary certificates. In this case phytosanitary action and phytosanitary procedure is targeting pests that are regulated in importing country but these pests might not be regulated in the exporting country". Thus she added that "the aim of the revision is to make clear that also those pests are concerned".

[45] The TPG member reported that some EPPO countries commented in the OCS on the revision of the definition of the term «Phytosanitary action». It was proposed to add «how to ensure compliance with phytosanitary requirements of importing countries and carry out phytosanitary certification»".

[46] The TPG member explained that the proposed "«or to enable phytosanitary certification» is different from «how to ensure compliance with phytosanitary import requirements and to carry phytosanitary certification» because this covers a lot of actions and activities needed". Moreover, it was explained that "«to ensure» is a strong promising word compared to enable, which includes notion of conditionality. It is neutral regarding results and in the second part it does not take results for granted".

[47] The Chairperson stated that the term «phytosanitary regulations» may cause some confusion". The TPG member replied that during the next Call for Topics a proposal for the revision of the definition of the term «phytosanitary regulations»" can be submitted.

[48] The Chairperson concluded that the EPPO Panel on Global Phytosanitary Affairs may consider this during its meeting.

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

[49] Ms. Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC, a former SC member, illustrated the history of the draft revision and explained that the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) reviewed ISPM 18 in order to update and incorporate recent developments in irradiation technology and to align the ISPM with other adopted standards (ISPM 42, ISPM 43 and ISPM 44).

[50] The TPG member described the major changes proposed in the draft revision of the ISPM:

- consistency with other ISPMs, deletion of four paragraphs in the Outline of requirements,
- deletion of reference to retreatment as it is unknown whether an additive approach would be efficacious;
- deletion of paragraph on performing dosimetry as it raised a number of comments and better explained in other paragraphs ;
- responsibilities have been added in a number of paragraphs (108, 116, 150 and after 156): responsibility that consignment owner is responsible for prevention of infestation and contamination after irradiation and may cooperate with treatment provider on how to achieve this; treatment provider is responsible for labelling commodities and for keeping treatment records for at least one year and make it available for auditing and verification purposes.
- annex reworded to be specific for NPPO use;
- additional information was added to the appendix to further clarify the calculation.

[51] CPs, RPPOs and other relevant organizations are invited to comment and present possible implementation issues.

[52] The SC member explained that the EPPO Steward of this draft, Mr. David OPATOWSKI, selected one comment that is useful to discuss at the regional workshop. It was the comment regarding current paragraph 81 "The selection and use of specific dosimetry systems should be appropriate for both the dose range and the type of radiation. The influence of factors such as dose rates, the minimum level of uncertainty deemed to be acceptable should take into account (…)", It was questioned why levels higher than the minimum level of uncertainty were deemed to be acceptable, while actually the maximum level of uncertainty acceptable should be determined.".

[53] Mr. David OPATOWSKI explained that minimum level of uncertainty relates to how much uncertainty you are willing to accept in the accuracy of measurements. Therefore, the minimum level is appropriate but this could be understood in different ways. Perhaps it would be better to eliminate the word minimum and put «level of uncertainty deemed to be acceptable»",

[54] The Chairperson concluded to keep the text as it is and leave D_{min}.

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

[55] Ms. Stavroula IOANNIDOU – the EPPO Steward for this draft - illustrated the background and explained the main reasons for its revision:

- since the adoption of ISPM 4 in 1995, new information and guidance are available, including new ISPMs on pest free areas;
- the revision on ISPM 6 *Surveillance* and ISPM 8 *Determination of pest status in an area*. Both standards are related to ISPM 4 as they are referring to requirements on pest surveillance and information that we need to determine pest status;
- revised draft ISPM 4 describes specific requirements for establishment, maintenance of pest free areas, including surveillance and pest status termination.

[56] Ms. IOANNIDOU commented that "*it is the first time that pest free areas are described and are reviewed with the perspective that they are phytosanitary measures*".

[57] The scope of the standard is to describe the requirements for the establishment and use of pest free areas (PFAs) as a phytosanitary measure to:

- attain, maintain, and generally support, the pest freedom of an area;
- support phytosanitary certification of plants, plant products and other regulated articles that are exported from the PFA;
- support the scientific justification for phytosanitary measures required by importing country for protection of endangered area.

[58] Ms. IOANNIDOU reminded the participants that this standard doesn't cover pest free places of production or pest free production sites, the requirements for which can be found in ISPM 10. She also highlighted that it is very important to have the same perspective as a region of what it is a pest free area and what are the actions that to do if we find out that we had an outbreak in a PFA.

[59] The EPPO steward also explained the major challenges in this draft ISPM:

- Risk based: Import requirements should be based on the level of pest risk, e.g., considering actual likelihood of the pest association with specific trade pathways. "This is very important and it will allow us to secure an established pest free area or to establish safely a pest free area".

- Surveillance requirements: establishing a PFA is not required if surveillance demonstrates that the pest is already absent from an area. “We have many examples from the countries that they never had a pest of the question present in the area”.

- Buffer zones: Extent of the buffer zone is based on the ability of the pest to disperse in a particular area; surveillance of the pest population within buffer zones is required. ´A very important and challenging element here is what is in the case that the pest free area is the whole country, then how do we establish a buffer zone? A solution may be good communication with the neighboring countries”.

- Environmental issues: the revised draft should provide enough flexibility to take into account emerging technologies, new scientific evidence or environmental changes (i.e., climate change) that can affect pathways and the status of a PFA. “I think environmental issues are a major issue and I think that some would say that there is going to be a lot to discuss regarding the connection of One Health with phytosanitary issues and environment. It is a very important element of ISPM 4”.

[60] Other relevant comments and potential implementation issues:

- Including specific information in various sections in the draft: appropriate implementation materials is already available, i.e., Guide for Establishing and Maintaining Pest Free Areas (IPPC, 2019), which already contains such information, so NPPOs are encouraged to see if any revision is needed;
- Creating an overarching document describing requirements for PFAs, existing related ISPMs (e.g. ISPM 26) and potential future documents describing the requirements for PFAs for specific pests, which should be annexed to this revised ISPM 4: the Standard Committee didn't make any decision on this issue at this time. However, we have to bear in mind that ISPM 26 will be revised soon - the draft specification for this revision is currently open for consultation.

[61] One participant shared information about the improvement of PFA in his country. Four provinces in a county announced free from the Mediterranean fruit fly, so there are good results about PFA.

[62] Another participant commented that in his experience, an area where for 40 or 50 years never any potatoes were grown, general surveillance would be sufficient for the establishment of a pest free area for a pest that is specific to potatoes. This is also reflected in the draft, the decision on whether general surveillance is sufficient or specific surveillance is needed should be based on the risk of the pest entry in the area where the PFA is to be established and should also depends on the biology of the pest, the relevant entry pathways and the characteristics of the PFA. Although this is for maintenance of PFAs, the same can be applied for their establishment. It should be noted, however that relying on general surveillance only is rather exceptional and in most cases specific surveillance is needed.

[63] The Chairperson suggested “to have one simple sentence so that pest free area may be also established based on general surveillance. Otherwise, this can create problems in Europe, for the future. It was also in some countries that were establishing pest free areas according to importing countries’ requests based just on general surveillance results, without carrying out specific surveys”.

[64] Another participant commented that according to the draft, general surveillance may be sufficient in cases where the pest has never been introduced into the pest free area, nor in the surrounding areas, and there have been no records of the pest’s presence in the pest free area, which makes it clear.

[65] One member replied that this is only in the section on maintenance, and would expect a similar sentence in the section on establishment of the pest free area. For instance, paragraph 77 reads «Once the pest has been

specified and the area identified, the NPPO should determine the pest status by conducting surveillance» and it is not specified whether general surveillance could be sufficient. It could be helpful to add sentence or half sentence "in specific cases general surveillance may be sufficient".

[66] One participant reminded the participants of their comments on the draft revision of ISPM 26 stating that, in the future, ISPM 26 could become an annex to ISPM 4. Regarding the issue of the outbreak in a pest free area, it is very important to be able to detect it very quickly and to exclude the infested area and the buffer zone around it from the PFA so to avoid export commodities presenting the risk of being infested and that's addressed in the standard. Moreover, "in ISPM 26, there is an annex, which is a prescriptive part of standard, about corrective action plans and an annex on control measures for an outbreak of fruit flies within pest free area. So it would be very inconsistent to adopt a different approach where, in case of an outbreak in a restricted part of the PFA, the whole PFA is suspended, and NPPOs are able to delimit and address completely the risk in the infested area".

[67] One participant raised a concern that draft annex will require from each country to draw up an official list of host plants, a sort of official 'pest status' for the plant species that each country officially declares as host to the different species of Tephritidae.

[68] The EPPO steward replied that in the case of importing and exporting countries, e-communication can be established with a transparent way on this issue, that will address the concerns of these countries and it would be enough to add a sentence in the same paragraph that will underline the transparency in case that we have an outbreak.

[69] The Chairperson concluded that the majority of the group agrees with the suggested changes and actually with the draft.

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

[70] Mr. Samuel BISHOP, an SC member, presented the history of the draft annex and illustrated the current difficulties with specific import authorizations (SIAs):

- SIAs do not replace the obligation of the NPPO of the importing country to communicate the phytosanitary import requirements. SC member commented: "*Obligations will always exist. Does SIA replace them to achieve the phytosanitary import requirements? You can use SIA to do that, but you can't use SIA as an excuse to not to do it. There are very different visions about it*".
- SIAs may be used when: (1) official consent for import is necessary, (2) import would otherwise be prohibited for phytosanitary reasons, and (3) phytosanitary import requirements for the particular purpose, articles or situations have not beet yet established.
- Elements of SIAs:
    - Minimum information:
        - Name of the NPPO and name of the importing country
        - Identification code or SIA number
        - Importer's information; date of issuance; description of the consignment; country of origin and country of export or re-export; intended use of the commodity; phytosanitary import requirements; period of validity
    - Other information that may also be included:
        - Quantity of the consignment;

- whether the authorization for an individual or a series of consignments;
- means of conveyance,
- point of entry;
- name of the issuing officer;
- name of the exporter;
- location to which consignments are to be directed;
- name of the treatment provider.

[71] The SC member briefly described the responsibilities of NPPOs of importing and exporting countries, and those of importers and exporters.

[72] Participants suggested that in paragraph 84 – as well as in other paragraphs - the word «may» be changed to «should». The point is "to harmonize how to use SIAs" commented the SC member.

[73] One participant pointed out section "4.4 NPPO of the exporting country" and she commented that SIA is about responsibilities of the NPPO of exporting country and that the only responsibility of the NPPO of exporting country is when there is a request for phytosanitary import requirements and request for phytosanitary certification. She proposed some changes in the paragraphs to read: "« […] when a request for phytosanitary certification is accompanied by a SIA, the NPPO of exporting country should certify the compliance of the plant product and other regulated articles with the phytosanitary import requirements specified in the SIA issued by the NPPO of the country of import» because it is said in the text that to certify you have to know phytosanitary import requirements".

[74] An SC member suggested to split "may" and "should" and maintain "may" in obtaining the SIA because some NPPOs do not appreciate that importers get SIA themselves. Moreover, the SC member stated that it is not needed to have a "much stronger obligation saying the importing country should certify that the conditions specified in the SIA have been met".

[75] Chairperson stated that "there's no role of exporting country in obtaining this import permits" and suggested to the proposing participant to "combine the two points to clearly indicate that exporting NPPO may certify these consignments only on request of the exporter and if the exporter presents these import permit documents. So there is no active role of exporting NPPO in obtaining import permits and also importing countries actually do not issue these permits for exporting country but for importers which later on contact their trading partners or exporters".

[76] The SC member explained that the same discussion took place during EWG and that there is no one way that this operates: some countries' NPPO will only use specific import authorizations they have requested from a country prior to export, so they will not accept that one of their exporters provided it to them. Whereas in other countries it is the other way around: the NPPOs agree for an exporter to present them with an SIA that it has been obtained from the NPPO of the importing country. "So the use of the word «may» is there to try and reflect those two different approaches".

[77] The SC member continued saying that, during the EWG, "SIA work very differently in different countries: some SIA will include a request for phytosanitary certificate to be issued which certifies that the conditions in the SIA have been met while another SIA don't require that. So there are two approaches to how to respond to an SIA and how to reflect these binary approaches in understanding what SIA is and should be doing".

[78] The Chairperson concluded that that there is no active role of exporting NPPO in this process and probably this is what should be reflected here, since the responsibility of the NPPO is already significant. Moreover, some countries issue certificates based on SIA and some countries issue SIA, and this is what should also be reflected in the proposal.

5.6 Draft 2021 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) – second consultation

[79] Ms. Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC, a TPG member, illustrated the background of the draft 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 and the amendments in it that go in "packages":

- Identity (of a consignment), integrity (of a consignment) and phytosanitary security (of a consignment);
- General surveillance, specific surveillance and surveillance;
- Emergency measure and provisional measure;
- Inspection, test, compliance procedure (for a consignment), release (of a consignment) and clearance (of a consignment); and
- Germplasm.

[80] **"Identity** (of a **consignment**)": was not changed after the first consultation. The objective of the "identity check" is to reassure that *exactly those* plants etc. to be imported *are exclusively those that have been certified*. Thus, "identity" of consignment is: its *components* (being the core material content) and its *origin* (being at the core non-material characteristic). *Components* correspond to the phytosanitary certificate's sections which are "N*ame of produce and quantity declared*" and "*Botanical name of plants*", and "*Place of origin*" is the wording and concept explained in ISPM 12. While the packaging, seals, etc. are not elements of the consignment (as defined) and not elements of the consignment's identity.

[81] **"Integrity** (of a **consignment**)**":** was revised following the comments from the first consultation and the Steward explained the changes: by referring to "*its identity unchanged*", the relationship between the two concepts identity and integrity is clarified and simplified and the core phytosanitary concern is emphasized, namely: that exactly those plants etc. that are about to be imported are exclusively those that have been certified. The concern that "*its packaging is undamaged and it shows no other signs of tampering*" is considered important element of integrity. The introductory wording "*State of*" is added to emphasize that integrity is a (desirable) state of a consignment. "*So it's not an action, it's a state*" commented the TPG member.

[82] "**Phytosanitary security** (of a **consignment**)": was unchanged from the first consultation. The revision, without changing the substantial meaning, aims at providing the correct grammar, simplification, and consistency with definitions of identity and integrity. So "*maintenance of the integrity*" has been replaced with "*State…when…integrity has been maintained*" to reflect that phytosanitary security is a state and not an action. The word "*appropriate*" is suggested to be deleted because it's unnecessary.

[83] **"General surveillance":** was revised following the comments from the first consultation and the Steward explained the changes. The overall process of surveillance, whether general or specific, is official, whereas the "*various sources*" of data can be official or unofficial. "*Data*" refers to the raw collected material, which then becomes "*information*" once analysed and verified. The data collected with general surveillance are not official until they have been approved by the NPPO. Therefore, the process does not stop with the data, as analysis and verification are very key parts of the process when non-official data-sources are being used "*because you cannot rely directly on them*" commented the Steward.

[84] **"Specific surveillance":** was unchanged from the first consultation. The revised ISPM 6 *Surveillance* resulted in slight change of the meaning of general and specific surveillance, with the previous version of ISPM 6 referring to "*specific surveys*" for what is now called "*specific surveillance*" in ISPM 6. The only

distinction between general and specific surveillance is the source of data, as both types of surveillance can be directed to specific pests. So what is important is that "*specific surveillance*" is achieved through "*surveys*". And whereas "*data*" is used for the raw collected material from "*general surveillance",* "*information*" is the appropriate word in the context of "*specific surveillance*" "*because specific surveillance and surveys are officially done the NPPO. That's why we can use the word information, the NPPO can rely on the results of surveys directly. This is why it's on purpose that information is used for specific surveillance and not for general surveillance*" commented the Steward.

[85] **"Surveillance":** was revised following the comments from the first consultation and the Steward explained the changes. The current definition of "surveillance" indistinctly mentions various methods and restricts the surveillance objective to only "*present or absence of pests*". The new definitions of "*general surveillance*" and "*specific surveillance*" distinguish the two disjunctive surveillance types. The generic characteristic of the overarching "surveillance" then remains as "*an official process whereby information on personal area is obtained…*", and the conceptual relationship between the terms is determined by *"… through general surveillance, specific surveillance or a combination of both*".

[86] **"Emergency measure":** was subject to editorial changes following comments from the first consultation and the Steward explained the changes. The use of "*phytosanitary measure*" would imply that an emergency measure can only be used against a regulated pest, which contradicts the Convention Article VII.6 and ISPMs. An emergency measure can be applied against a pest not regulated yet but that could pose potential threat. That's why it is suggested to replace "*A phytosanitary measure established*" with "*An official rule or procedure established to prevent the entry, establishment or spread of a pest*". And the addition of "not addressed by existing phytosanitary measures" underscores that "*emergency measure*" and "*phytosanitary measures*" are disjunctive concepts.

[87] **"Emergency measure":** was subject to editorial changes following the comments from the first consultation and the Steward explained the changes. To overcome the current discrepancy between "*phytosanitary regulation*" and the lack of full technical justification, it is suggested to replace "*phytosanitary regulation*" with "*temporary official rule*" in order to increase its temporary nature; rule encompasses legislation, statute, etc.; furthermore, the rule or procedure is official. And *"…to prevent the entry, establishments or spread of a pest*" qualifies the phytosanitary nature and intent of the rule or procedure.

[88] **"Inspection":** was unchanged from the first consultation. The word "**determine**" is substituted by "**check**" to reflect the change from "*compliance*" to "*conformity*". This is because through Convention Art. VII.2f and the definition of "*compliance procedure*", "*compliance*" is linked with consignments and the "General recommendations on the use of terms in ISPMs" it stipulates that "*conformity*" be used in other case. As "*inspection*" has a broader scope than only consignments, it is proposed to replace "*compliance*" with "*conformity*". Moreover, the term "*regulations*" is going to be substituted by "*requirements*" because phytosanitary regulations are at the higher level and refer to regulated pests. However, inspection can be carried out in scenarios other than import, like at place of production or production site or at export, and in such scenarios inspection may not always be related to regulated pests. *"Also to be consistent with the definition of "test" which uses the wording phytosanitary requirements*" added the Steward.

[89] "**Test**": was subject to editorial changes following the comments from the first consultation and the Steward explained the changes. As for "*Inspection*", also for "*Test*" there is the replacement of "*determine compliance*" with "*verify conformity*" "*because test is not only done on consignment, you can test also when you inspect a place of production and test to check the absence of the pest so to broaden the scope it's better to verify "conformity" instead of "determine compliance*" added the Steward. Moreover, the term "determine" was changed to "verify" because in case of testing, the use of appropriate methods and technology would ensure that the result of the test leads to a decision. In this case, test is a decisive action. That's why the use of the word "verify" describes the action more appropriately. Lastly, the comment that

proposed to replace "*other than visual*" by "*non-visual*" was accepted by the TPG and the Standards Committee. The intention is the same, it's an editorial change just for simplification.

[90] "**Compliance procedure** (of a **consignment**)": was revised following the comments from the first consultation and the Steward explained the changes: because "Compliance procedure (of a consignment)"is not only verification of consignment integrity, inspection or testing, it is also the process of document checks. So it adds "*…document checks, verification of consignment integrity, inspection or testing*" creating a conceptual link to and makes explicit the elements of compliance procedure may consist of. "*You don't need all these elements, but all these elements can be part of compliance procedure*" commented the Steward. And "*procedure*" is substituted by "*process*" to highlight that it is a series of steps or actions that are performed. And the last change is about the end of the definition is to replace "*phytosanitary measures*" with "*phytosanitary requirements*" as it could be potentially confusing as in ISPM 25, where the term "*phytosanitary measures*" mainly refers to measures that the country of transit itself applies to the transiting consignment. "*So you cannot have a compliance procedure for the methods that the country of transit itself applies*" added the Steward. So changing to "*requirements*" clarified that a compliance procedure in the transit case aims at verifying that a transiting consignment meets the set phytosanitary requirements.

[91] "**Release** (of a **consignment**)": was subject to editorial changes following the comments from the first consultation in order to link "*release*" to "*compliance procedure*" rather than "*clearance*" which is proposed for deletion. Moreover, the addition *"(of a consignment)"* in the definition makes the wording as a standalone definition clearer, even if redundant.

[92] "**Clearance** (of a **consignment**)": was unchanged from the first consultation. The terms "clearance (of a consignment)" and "compliance procedure (for a consignment)" are almost synonymous, given the general agreement that clearance is a *process* rather than the *result* of such process. Therefore it's supposed to delete the term "clearance (of a consignment)" from the Glossary because it's redundant.

"**Germplasm**": was changed following comments from the 1st consultation. The SC had proposed to make explicit that "*germplasm*" is as subset of "*plants for planting*" and therefore generally representing a higher risk. SC-7 is now proposing the term and definition to be deleted because: (1) the term is rarely used in ISPMs, (2) the *proposed* revision may lead to confusion rather than clarity; (3) the *current* definition is not different from ordinary dictionary meaning and not specific meaning to the IPPC and therefore it is not needed, and (4) the CPM has recently deleted several other commodity-related terms and definitions from the Glossary.

[93] One comment proposed that in the definition of "emergency measure" it would be better to use the word "measure" instead of "rule". The Steward agreed with it since it clarifies better because official measure is more easily understandable than official rule. Therefore, keeping the word "measure" does not require to add «or procedure» because «phytosanitary measure» is defined as "legislation, regulation, official procedure". Also for simplification and ease of understanding, it was suggested the replacement of «rule or procedure» with «measure» in the proposed revised definition of an «emergency measure»".

[94] One participant proposed the introduction of the new term "official measure" instead of "phytosanitary measure" because "you have to be able to have some emergency measures on not yet regulated pests".

[95] The Chairperson understood the point but stated that the creation of a new term "official measure" might be difficult to explain and might be "better to leave «phytosanitary measure» and some kind «official rule or procedure for non regulated pests» to make it clearer".

[96] One participant highlighted that Article II of the IPPC it is clearly written what phytosanitary measure: « any legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests». So, process, procedure, there are too many words the same definition".

[97] The TPG member replied that it is very complicated because you have the definition in the Convention which doesn't speak of regulated pests, while in the Glossary the definition of phytosanitary measure reads «any legislation, regulation, official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction, of spread of quarantine pests or to limit the economic impact or regulated non quarantine pests». So the definition in Glossary makes the relationship between phytosanitary measure and regulated pests and that's why we need this little change in the definition of "emergency measure" and "provisional measure".

[98] One participant mentioned that there is no good reason to change from «measure» to «rule or procedure» and most logical would be to change «phytosanitary measure» in «official measure» because you keep the measure, you only change «phytosanitary» to «official», because «phytosanitary measure» is also already official only for regulated pests and we want to broaden it to keep it official.

[99] The Chairperson concluded that this issue may need additional discussion at the EPPO Panel.

6. Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs

6.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities

[100] Mr. Piotr WLODARCZYK presented the agenda item and highlighted that the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia conducts a number of activities in the countries of the region aiming at the enhancement of national systems for the protection of plants from pests. He stressed that these activities could relate to phytosanitary measures (for quarantine pests) as well as to crop protection measures (for common non-regulated pests), while some projects addressed selected sectors of agriculture and included plant protection components. Examples of such broader scopes included certification systems for plants for planting, integrated pest management or international trade and market access.

[101] He presented examples of recent activities in the countries of Europe and Central Asia, which related specifically to pest surveillance systems, laboratory diagnostics, and implementation of the IPPC ePhyto Solution for electronic phytosanitary certificates, enhancement of national phytosanitary capacities, seed potato production systems or certification of fruit tree nursery material.

6.2 EPPO's activities

[102] Mr. presented EPPO's activities highlighting the EPPO regional Standards that will be presented to Council in 2022 for approval, the PRAs produced by EPPO in 2022, the EPPO PRA Platform which gives access to many PRAs produced in the EPPO region, the recently opened EPPO Platform for communication material to raise awareness for plant health, the on-going revision of the EPPO pest datasheets in EPPO Global Database, and upcoming Workshops that EPPO is organizing in 2023, one on targeted inspection and another one on Pest Reporting.

6.3 Topics of interest for the region

- ***Popillia japonica* and other pests in the region**

[103] The NPPOs of Italy and Switzerland shared the prevention and control official measures that were implemented on the cross-border outbreak of Popillia japonica (Japanese beetle) in a coordinated approach.

[104] *Popillia japonica* Newman (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae) is a scarab beetle native to Japan. This pest is able to create serious damage to agricultural crops, ornamental, and forest plants. This beetle has more than 300 host plants and after its introduction it is extremely widespread in the Nearctic region.

[105] *Popillia japonica* is a strong flyer with a great ecological plasticity that allows it to invade large areas in a few time. In the United States, P. japonica was introduced in 1916 and within 100 years it also colonized

part of the Eastern and Western Canada. In Europe, *P. japonica* was first detected in the early 1970s in the Azores Islands, more specifically on the Terceira Island.

[106] In Europe, the species was first found in Terceira Island (Azores, Portugal) in the early 1970s. *P. japonica* has been also found in mainland Europe, specifically in Italy between Lombardy and Piedmont Regions, in 2014 and in Switzerland, in 2017.

[107] The Italian and Swiss NPPOs have promptly reacted and phytosanitary measures were immediately adopted by action plans in order to contain the natural spread of the pest and to avoid its dissemination through nursery stock.

[108] Visual inspections and control measures have been focused on all high-risk sites, nurseries in primis, comprising the high-risk sites of passive dispersal such as industrial areas, trucking companies, railway stations, athletic fields, playgrounds, boulevards, waste collection areas, petrol stations, car and truck parking areas, swimming pools, and shopping centers. For the airport and cargo areas of Malpensa and Cameri, located within the regulated area, specific risk based plans and peculiar prescriptions were provided, respectively.

[109] In the regulated area, control measures to suppress *P. japonica* adult populations have been performed by installing traps for mass trapping , auto-dissemination traps with fungus *Metarhizium anisopliae* and "attract & kill" traps.

[110] In order to contain the larval populations treatments with biocontrol agents, in particular with the entomopathogenic nematode *Heterorhabditis bacteriophora* and the entomopathogenic fungus *Metarhizium anisopliae*, have been carried out on more than 2.000 hectares.

[111] In the second presentation regarding the Popillia japonica, it was given an overview of its biology, its behavior and its reproduction.

[112] Then it was shown the damages it causes to fruits, flowers, crops on plants and flowers and the strategy and control measures put in place in Italy to control the spread of the Pj as well as the communication campaigns. In particular, the surveys, the larval monitoring, the visual inspections and main host plants, and the control measures like trapping and treatment against larvae.

[113] The results of integrated management of the Japanese Beetle (JB) were also reported: reduction in the risk of adults spreading passively, stabilisation of the annual advance of the diffusion front, protection of the territory and containment of direct damage to crops, and pest risk management in nurseries with an innovative integrated approach.

[114] Eventually, it was illustrated the pest risk management plan on the JB at Malpensa airport (Milan, Italy) 2021-2025, which lead to the creation of 5 risk levels, from 1 to 5 (from preventive insecticide treatments to disinsectation of all passenger aircraft)-, and the related measures to take on the vegetation of wooded/sedimentary areas, for meadows, for parking areas, for parking/loading/unloading areas, and for aircraft.

- **Uzbekistan's experience in ePhyto**

[115] E-Fitouz is the national automatized information system that connects the public sector (the Agency of Plant Protection and Quarantine (APPQ)) and the private sector.

[116] E-Fitouz targets to increase the efficiency and the speed exchange of documents between the Main Office and the subordinate organizations of the Agency through:

- information on data use, proecss, speed, data processing and its analysis;

- optimization of the interaction of all process participants in the system based on creating a single information place, increasing its efficiency; and
- increase of the speed of reporting processes in the required analytical sections, with the required level of detail.

[117] The E-Fitouz system is a system that covers the "from field to export" chain:

- Phytosanitary field control: an ID number is linked to a Farm in the System.
- Internal phytosanitary/quarantine certificate: the identification number is pointed out in the internal certificate.
- Phytosanitary certificate for export: issuing of phytosanitary export certificate.
- Identification of the field where the product was grown by scanning the QR code.

[118] In fact, the E-Fitouz system includes several aspects such as agro reporting, risk management, quarantine measures conduct and registration, laboratory diagnostics, treatments, phytosanitary field control, interactive online services, and phytosanitary certificates (permits).

[119] The E-Fitouz improved the efficiency, leading to:

- total elimination of fraudulence and increased transparency;
- unified terms of trade;
- direct and swift transfer, reusable data, online application and processing;
- simplified installation and use process;
- a single harmonized reporting system;
- time-saving in determining compliance; and
- no costs associated with the conclusion of agreements between individual countries.

[120] It was then showed the integration of the E-Fitouz system to the IPPC ePhyto Solutions Hub.

[121] Eventually, some suggestions to improve the efficiency of the integration with ePhyto Solutions: at national level, to amend phytosanitary legislation to accept ePhyto certifications as equal as the paper ones, while at regional level, integrate the electronic certification system of the Central Asian countries with IPPC ePhyto Solutions Hub to increase the virtual exchange of PCs and promote the use of electronic certifications to industry and private sector.

- **Azerbaijan and Georgia: twinning project results**

[122] The presenter illustrated the results of a twinning project between Georgia and Latvia, the objectives, and the related implementation activities that were carried out in the plant protection area:

- Strengthening of the administrative and operational capacity of the National Food Agency to ensure efficient approximation of the relevant legislation by e.g., conducting GAP analysis and providing recommendations to amend national legislation.
- Monitoring/surveillance programmes regarding phytosanitary policies developed and effectively implemented.
- Phytosanitary Information system established by e.g., developing database and IT modules for plant health.

- Capacities for plant health and control of plant production products strengthened by e.g., promote Pest Risk Analysis and cooperation among authorities, develop training courses for personnel.

7. Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session)

7.1 Plant Health Innovation for Food Security: Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems and e-Commerce

[123] IPPC Secretariat outlined the pest outbreak alert and response systems, starting from its overarching components (e.g., policy and financial model, legal framework and data management and communication system), from pre-presence to detection components (alert and early detection), and post detection ones (response and notification). The Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (FG POARS) was established by the CPM with the scope to quarantine or potential quarantine pests, after countries' concerns regarding the situation with *Spodoptera frugiperda*. The FG met virtually every month from January to September 2021.

[124] Then the Global Pest Outbreak and Response System Framework was presented, showing the relations of the FG POARS with other bodies and stakeholders (e.g., UN agencies, RPPOs and NPPOs).

[125] The system, through a dedicated webpage, should provide access to a toolbox to include:

- Automated processes to scan media and scientific sources for information on emerging pests;
- Data visualization of the geographic distribution of emerging pests, and their progressive spread;
- Tools for the collection and sharing of surveillance data for emerging pests and facilitate access more readily to expertise on diagnostics, surveillance and eradication;
- Specific webpages to provide simple, up to date, and accurate pest specific pages on emerging pests.

[126] The FG considered whether POARS should be established as part of the IC, or whether a new subsidiary body should be established, while CPM-16 agreed that a POARS Steering Group be established to advance the priorities on the topic.

[127] Then e-Commerce was presented and its connections with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030, which is managing the phytosanitary risks associated with e-Commerce and the postal and express carrier pathways e-Commerce is one of eight Development Agenda items in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030. The IC, which oversees it, set up an IC team on e-Commerce. Then, the key challenges were presented (rate growth, increased volume of small parcels, rapid growth in digital technologies and identifying regulated articles).

[128] IPPC activities related to e-Commerce were reported: organization of a workshop or a webinar, creation of factsheets and videos to raise awareness about related phytosanitary risks, and constant collaboration with key international organizations such as the World Customs Organization (WCO) and the Universal Postal Union (UPU) to create synergies and develop joint recommendations related to e-Commerce.

[129] The IPPC Observatory will contribute to monitoring the achievement of the objectives outlined in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 by providing data gathered via studies and surveys.

7.2 Emerging pests and Pest Outbreak and Alert Response System (Cases of FAW and Fusarium TR4)

[130] IC and SC members presented to the participants the Fall armyworm (FAW) Global Action Plan, which aims at:

- crop yield losses reduced to 5-10% by applying area-specific IPM strategies in target countries;
- prevention of further spread of the pest to new areas by applying phytosanitary measures; and
- global coordination.

[131] For the years 2020-2022 the Action Plan aims to:

- establish and implement a globally coordinated system that will connect the national FAW response efforts directly to global, political level support;
- scale up capacity development on integrated management of FAW in affected countries in Africa, Asia and the Near East, to sustainably manage FAW and reduce crop yield losses; and
- ensure that the risk of further introduction and spread of FAW to new areas is reduced.

[132] Then the objectives of the FAO/IPPC Technical Working Group on Quarantine and Phytosanitary Measures for Global Action on FAW Control were outlined:

- Prevention: implementation and promotion of globally harmonized quarantine and phytosanitary measures.
- Preparedness: implementing and promoting globally harmonized FAW surveillance, management, and engagement resources.
- Response: promoting globally harmonized contingency and response resources and training materials.

[133] The Technical Working Group also developed and published FAW Guidelines "Prevention, Preparedness and response guidelines for *spodoptera frugiperda*", outlining:

- the distribution and the biology of the pest;
- the prevention and preparedness plan, developed for when the pest is still absent; and
- the response plan, prepared for when the pest is officially detected and confirmed.

[134] Three webinars were held in 2021 regarding the IPPC Fall Armyworm Prevention Programme (October 2021), FAW Prevention and Preparedness (November 2021) and FAW Response and Communication (December 2021).

[135] The activities of the IC Team on Fusarium TR4 were, in particular:

- support the revision of the contributed resources on Fusarium TR4;
- drafting prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for Fusarium TR4;
- questionnaire to assess countries' capacities on Fusarium TR4 response; and
- support virtual training workshops on surveillance, diagnostic, inspection, and simulation exercises on TR4.

[136] Draft Prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for *Fusarium* TR4, reviewed by 49 reviewers worldwide and the IC, were published in order to give information on the Fusarium TR4 and how to act when the pest is still absent (prevention and preparedness plan) and when the pest is officially detected and confirmed (response plan).

[137] Three webinars were held in 2022 regarding the Diagnostics of Fusarium TR4 in bananas (March 2022), Surveillance and early warning of Fusarium TR4 in bananas (April 2022) and Inspection and simulation exercises (May 2022).

[138] Moreover, the IC Team on Fusarium TR4 submitted to the countries a questionnaire whose outputs will help identify the countries' priorities and gaps in their response and allow develop and offer concrete solutions to NPPOs, e.g., laboratory activities such as molecular diagnostic and classical phytopathology.

7.3 IPPC ePhyto Solution: A country example

[139] The topic was covered under the agenda item 6.3.

7.4 Benefits of conducting the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation and latest developments

[140] It was first defined that the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) is a fully comprehensive NPPO-led, facilitator-enabled, IPPC Secretariat-supported process of multiple phases, with a wide range of benefits, to help countries evaluate their phytosanitary capacities. The PCE empowers NPPOs to put in place a sovereign plan for how they wish to address any gaps identified, to enhance their food security and international trade.

[141] Then, it was presented how PCE modules work at system level (e.g., country profile, national phytosanitary legislation); and at organization level (NPPOs' structure, mission, strategy, processes) as well as their core activities (e.g., pest diagnostic capacity, NPPO pest surveillance and pest reporting capacity, pest eradication capacity, phytosanitary import regulatory system, pest risk analysis, pest free areas, places, and sites, low pest prevalence areas, and export certification, re-export, transit).

[142] A map was shown with the countries where PCE was completed or in progress.

[143] The benefits from PCE were shown at international and national levels as well as for stakeholders, in particular for exporting and importing NPPOs, households, exporters and importers, and farmers. It is to be reminded that the entire PCE process is under the control of the country; it is not something that is done to a country, it is a framework that the country adopts for its own purposes and benefits. Then several successful case studies were reported.

7.5 IPPC Commodity Standards: start and perspectives

[144] The IPPC Secretariat provided an overview of the latest developments relating to the commodity standards, having now an overarching standard (ISPM 46) adopted. The purposes of this standard are:

- to harmonise phytosanitary measures across the world in terms of specific commodities,
- to facilitate safe trade,
- to have a consistent approach;
- to optimise the resources;
- to support Contracting Parties to implement IPPC, in particular developing countries.

[145] The IPPC Secretariat highlighted that there are no additional national obligations associated with the adoption of the commodity standards.

[146] The IPPC Secretariat explained briefly what happened in 2019 when CPM-14 established the Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS), which adds up to the other existing Technical Panels (TPG, TPDP and TPPT). TPCS will be tasked to deal with the commodity or pathway-related standards present in the work programme of the IPPC and their development will follow the Standard Setting Process of the IPPC.

[147] The IPPC Secretariat further noted that in 2020 CPM-15 agreed on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 and that commodity standards are one of the development agenda items within this Framework.

Mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit as the topic was submitted during the call for topics, approved, and added to the work programme. All commodity standards, when adopted, will be annexes to ISPM 46. The IPPC Secretariat added that the first meeting of the TPCS was held in May 2022 and highlighted the fact that the group is very diverse, ensuring a comprehensive approach.

[148] One question from the EPPO Secretariat was to clarify if the Specification covered only *Mangifera indica* or also other *Mangifera* species, since the measures could be different for different fruit species or for different pests.

[149] The EPPO Secretariat also questioned what the reason for choosing only one species was.

[150] It was explained that international movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruits was the only topic submitted during the call for topics for commodity standards.

7.6 Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)/IPPC Observatory

[151] The IPPC Secretariat representative introduced the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS), its history, and its objectives: identify gaps in the implementation of the Convention and Standards and the monitoring was conducted through studies and surveys.

[152] He then illustrated main achievements and milestones: two big general surveys, 15 studies and eight new desk studies, three international meetings, six regional workshops and three CPM recommendations related to IRSS.

[153] He explained that CPM-16 (2022) approved the transition from IRSS to the IPPC Observatory, and why the IPPC community felt the need to improve it:

- clearer scope: monitor implementation of IPPC, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations;
- more suitable name: better reflect its objectives and missions;
- sustainably resourced: baseline funding from IPPC Secretariat to cover fixed costs and mobilize other sources to cover studies and surveys.

[154] The IPPC Observatory contributes to monitoring the achievement of IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030's objectives, it has a three-year work plan and it is updated annually.

[155] The IPPC Secretariat representative made participants aware that the Strategic Framework is not the work plan of IPPC Secretariat, but it is responsibility of countries' NPPOs to implement it and the Secretariat will support them.

[156] The IPPC Secretariat representative showed the structure of the IPPC Observatory, how it will be run and then explained how contracting parties (CPs) can contribute:

- submitting topics for studies on challenges faced in the implementation of IPPC and ISPMs;
- respond to surveys and studies questionnaires;
- provide funding,

as well as the benefits for the CPs e.g., sharing best practices, gaps and common challenges.

[157] The IPPC Secretariat representative highlighted that results of all work that has been done are publicly available on IPPC website, and illustrated steps for the future e.g., to implement periodical monitoring, improve coordination, and publish reports. One question was raised regarding the permanent staff, asking if more details can be provided. The IPPC Secretariat representative replied that Secretariat is taking into consideration whether to assign a person within the Secretariat to take care of IPPC Observatory in order to have a contact person that can provide support.

7.7 Update on the 2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation

[158] The IPPC Secretariat representative explained the updated Standard Setting Process and reminded participants to pay attention to when and how long the Call for Topics is open and that IPPC Secretariat is glad to support NPPOs in the submission process. He specified that only phytosanitary treatments can be submitted anytime.

[159] Moreover, the IPPC Secretariat representative stated that there were not many submissions from this region and asked participants to provide their feedbacks in order to incentivize countries to submit proposals and how IPPC Secretariat can support them in the process e.g., with a training session before the opening of the Call for Topics.

[160] The EPPO Secretariat mentioned that in the past their proposals were rejected without good reasons, discouraging EPPO members to submit other proposals.

[161] The IPPC Secretariat representative asked for further details and explained that currently the Task for Topics is in place and criteria are clearly identified and publicly available for the evaluation of the submissions.

[162] The IPPC Secretariat encouraged EPPO members to submit new topics during 2023 Call for Topics and offered the IPPC Secretariat's support to the countries in the process of preparation of topics for submission.

[163] The FAO Regional Office also invited countries to submit proposals that may be specifically for commodity or pathway standards.

8. Conclusion of the workshop/ Date and venue of the next meeting

[164] The Regional Workshop's co-organizers (IPPC Secretariat, EPPO, FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia) confirmed that Montenegro will be the host of the next Regional Workshop, expecting that the workshop would be held in face-to-face modality.

[165] The co-organizers thanked Azerbaijan for the hospitality and for all the arrangements, and all the participants. It was highlighted that the excellent organization allowed to work and converse between two different locations (Paris, France, and Baku, Azerbaijan) and the possibility to have face-to-face discussions after years of COVID-19 pandemics.

9. Online survey of the workshop

[166] The participants will receive a link to meeting evaluation.

10. Adoption of the report

[167] The report will be produced by the IPPC Secretariat together with the Organizing Committee members, revised by the Rapporteur and then posted on IPP. It will then be distributed to all participants.

11. Close of the meeting

[168] The Vice-Chairperson closed the meeting.

Annex 1: Agenda

Day	Meeting schedule			
	Paris	**Coffee breaks**	**Baku**	**Coffee breaks**
5 September	09.00-12.30 and 13.30-17.00	10.30 (group photo) and 15.00	11.00-14.30 and 15.30-19.00	12.00 (group photo) and 17.00
6 September	09.00-12.30 and 13:30-17:00	10.30 and 15.00	11.00-14.30 and 15.30-19.00	12.30 and 17.00
7 September	09.00-12.30 and 13.30-17.00	10.30 and 15.00	11.00-14.30 and 15.30-19.00	12.30 and 17.00

AGENDA

No.	Item	Presenter / Facilitator	Time (min.)	Document
	Day 1, morning. Opening session			
1	**Opening of the Session**			
1.1	Welcome remarks: - Chairman of NPPO of Azerbaijan - IPPC Secretary - EPPO Director-General - FAO Representative in Azerbaijan	 - Goshgar TAHMAZLI - Osama EL-LISSY - Nico HORN (video) - Melek CAKMAK		
2	**Meeting Arrangements**	Organizer	**5**	
2.1	Election of the Chair		FAO	
2.2	Election of the Rapporteur		Chair	
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda		Chair	Doc
	Group photo			
3	**Administrative Matters**	Organizer	**5**	
3.1	Participants list		FAO	Doc
3.2	Documents and presentations list		FAO	Doc
4.	**Updates on Governance and Strategic issues**			
4.1	Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)	Bureau Member/ IPPC Secretariat	15	Presentation
4.2	Update from the SC	SC Member/ IPPC Secretariat	15	Presentation
4.3	Update from IC (including guides and training materials)	IC Member/ IPPC Secretariat	15	Presentation
5	**Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations** (This will involve presentations, discussion and questions from workshop's participants)			
5.1	Draft Annex to ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies* (Tephritidae)): *Criteria for the evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies* (2018-011)	SC Member	45	Presentation

No.	Item	Presenter / Facilitator	Time (min.)	Document
5.2	2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)	SC Member	30	Presentation
Day 1, afternoon. Session 2				
5.3	Revision of ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) (2014-007)	SC Member	30	Presentation
5.4	Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) (2009-002)	SC Member	30	Presentation
5.5	*Use of specific import authorizations* (Annex to ISPM 20: *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) (2008-006)	SC Member	30	Presentation
5.6	2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary on phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)	SC Member	30	Presentation
Day 2, morning. Session 2				
6	**Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs** (This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants)			
6.1	Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities	FAO Regional Office	15	Presentation
6.2	EPPO's activities	EPPO Secretariat	15	Presentation
6.3	Topics of interest for the region: - *Popillia japonica* and other pests in the region - Uzbekistan's experience in ePhyto - Azerbaijan and Georgia: twinning project results		90	Presentation
Day 2, afternoon. Session 3				
7	**Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session)** (This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants)			
7.1	Plant Health Innovation for Food Security: Strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems and e-Commerce		15	Presentation
7.2	Emerging pests and Pest Outbreak and Alert Response System (Cases of FAW and Fusarium TR4)	IPPC IC and SC members	30	Presentation
7.3	IPPC ePhyto Solution: A country example		15	Presentation
7.4	Benefits of conducting the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation and latest developments		30	Presentation
BREAKS	**Advertising slides and video on guides and training materials and standard setting process**		**10**	**Presentation /Video**
Day 3, morning. Session 3				
7.5	IPPC commodity-specific standards: the start and the perspectives	IPPC Secretariat / SC member	20	Presentation
7.6	Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)/IPPC Observatory	IRSS representative	20	Presentation
7.7	Update on the 2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation	IPPC Secretariat	10	Presentation
Day 3, afternoon. Session 4: Closing				
8	**Conclusion of the workshop/ Date and venue of the next meeting**	Chair	**15**	
9	**Online survey of the workshop**	All participants	**10**	

No.	Item	Presenter / Facilitator	Time (min.)	Document
10	**Adoption of the report (**Procedure to be decided**)**	All participants	**10**	
11	**Close of the meeting**	Chair	**15**	

Annex 2: Participants list

PARTICIPANTS (in alphabetical order)

1. ARNITIS Ringolds (Mr)	State Plant Protection Service, Latvia ringolds.arnitis@hotmail.com
2. BALASHOVA Tatsiana (Ms)	Main State Inspectorate for Seed Breeding, Quarantine and Plant Protection, Belarus rastenfito@ggiskzr.by
3. BISHOP Samuel (Mr)	Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA), United Kingdom sam.bishop@defra.gov.uk
4. BOUHOT-DELDUC Laurence (Ms)	Bureau des négociations européennes et multilatérales ; Sous-direction de l'Europe, de l'international et de la gestion intégrée du risque ; DGAL; Ministère agriculture et souveraineté alimentaire, France laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr
5. CAKMAK Melek (Ms)	FAO Partnership and Liaison Office in Azerbaijan, Azerbaijan gullu.huseynova@fao.org
6. CASSAR John Baptist (Mr)	Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries, Food and Animal Rights - Plant Protection Directorate, Malta john-baptist.cassar@gov.mt
7. CHAPMAN Diana (Ms)	United States Department of Agriculture/Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Austria diana.l.chapman@usda.gov
8. CHETRARI Viorel (Mr)	NATIONAL FOOD SEFETY AGENCY REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA, Moldova, Republic Of viorel.chetrari@ansa.gov.md
9. CIAMPITTI Mariangela (Ms)	Servizio Fitosanitario DG Agricoltura, Italy mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it
10. DADASHOVA Khayala (Ms)	Ministry of the Agriculture of Azerbaijan Republic, Azerbaijan khayala.dadashova@mail.ru
11. DAUTBASIC Ajla (Ms)	Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina for plant health protection, Bosnia And Herzegovina ajla.dautbasic@uzzb.gov.ba
12. DZERKOVSKA Nadica (Ms)	Head of Plant Health Department, Phytosanitary Directorate in the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy, Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic Of nadica.dzerkovska@mzsv.gov.mk
13. HNIZDIL Michal (Mr)	Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (UKZUZ), Czech Republic eppo.cz@ukzuz.cz
14. HORN Nico (Mr)	EPPO, France nico.horn@eppo.int
15. IOANNIDOU Stavroula (Ms) partially remote connection	Hellenic Ministry of Rural Development and Food, Greece stioannidou@minagric.gr

16. KAMAEV Ilia (Mr)	All-Russian Plant Quarantine Center , Russian Federation ilyakamayev@yandex.ru
17. KLAILOVA Tana (Ms)	Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (UKZUZ), Czech Republic tana.klailova@ukzuz.cz
18. LUCCHESI Valerio (Mr)	EPPO, France lucchesi@eppo.int
19. LUKIC Sladjana (Ms)	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management, Plant Protection Directorate, Serbia sladjana.lukic@minpolj.gov.rs
20. MARS Almabek (Mr)	State inspection committee in the agro-industrial complex of the ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Kazakhstan omarov.e@minagri.gov.kz
21. McNAMARA Joseph (Mr)	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine, Ireland joseph.mcnamara@agriculture.gov.ie
22. MUSOLIN Dmitrii (Mr)	EPPO, France dmitrii.musolin@eppo.int
23. NASIROV Safarali (Mr)	Azerbaijan Food Safety Agency, Azerbaijan safarali.nasirov@afsa.gov.az
24. NIKOYAN Arthur (Mr)	Food Safety Inspection Body of the Republic of Armenia, Armenia a.nikoyan@ssfs.am
25. NURBAEV Adyl (Mr)	the Department of Chemicalization, protection and quarantine of plants of the Ministry of Agriculture of the Kyrgyz Republic, Kyrgyzstan nurbaevkg@gmail.com
26. NUTSUBIDZE Lasha (Mr)	National Food Agency, Georgia lasha.nutsubidze@nfa.gov.ge
27. PRLJEVIC Zorka (Ms)	Deputy Director, Sector for Phytosanitary Affairs Directorate for Foodsafety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Affairs Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Montenegro zorka.prljevic@ubh.gov.me
28. RUSTEMOVA Vefa (Ms)	Azerbaijan Food Safety Agency, Azerbaijan vefa.rustemova@afsa.gov.az
29. SHAMILOV Artur	IPPC Secretariat artur.shamilov@fao.org
30. SHAMIYEV Taleh (Mr)	Azerbaijan Food Safety Agency, Azerbaijan taleh.shamiyev@afsa.gov.az
31. SULTANOV Sultan-Makhmud (Mr)	Agency of Plant Protection and Quarantine of the Republic of Uzbekistan, Uzbekistan glavkaruz@mail.ru
32. TOUBIA RAHME Hala (Ms)	USDA/APHIS, Austria hala.toubia@usda.gov
33. VON FELTEN Andreas (Mr)	Federal Office for Agriculture, Switzerland andreas.vonfelten@blw.admin.ch

34. WLODARCZYK Piotr (Mr)	FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia, Hungary piotr.wlodarczyk@fao.org
35. ZEKIRI Mentor (Mr)	Director of the Phytosanitary Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Water Economy, Macedonia, Former Yugoslav Republic Of mentor.zekiri@mzsv.gov.mk
36. ZINNIKOV Denis (Mr)	All-Russian Plant Quarantine Center , Russian Federation zinnikov.denis@vniikr.ru