



# REPORT

## 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia

04–06 September 2023

IPPC Secretariat

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

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

© FAO, [2023]



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

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

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

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

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

Text in this document is not an official legal interpretation of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) or its related documents, and is produced for public information only. To translate this material please contact [ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org) for information about a co-publishing agreement.

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the session.....	3
1.1	Opening remarks by the IPPC Secretariat .....	3
1.2	Opening remarks by the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia .....	3
1.3	Opening remarks by European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization.....	3
1.4	Opening remarks by the Government of Montenegro.....	4
2	Meeting arrangements .....	5
2.1	Election of the chairperson .....	5
2.2	Election of the rapporteur .....	5
2.3	Adoption of the agenda.....	5
3	Administrative matters.....	5
3.1	Participants list.....	5
4	Update on governance and strategic issues .....	5
4.1	Update on IPPC governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau) .....	5
4.2	Update from Standards Committee .....	6
4.3	Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee .....	6
5	section 1: discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations .....	7
5.1	Reorganisation and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001).....	7
5.2	International movement of mango ( <i>Mangifera indica</i> ) fruit. Draft Annex to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) .....	9
5.3	Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood. Draft Annex to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood) (2015-004).....	10
5.4	2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on phytosanitary terms) (1994-001).....	12
5.5	Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit-to-fruit flies. Draft Annex to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies ( <i>Tephritidae</i> )) (2018-011).....	14
5.6	Draft CPM Recommendation on minimizing pest risk associated with sea container pathway ..	14
6	Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs .....	15
6.1	Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities.....	15
6.2	EPPO activities .....	15
6.3	2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.....	16
7	Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action.....	16
7.1	New IPPC Guides and e-learning courses .....	16
7.2	Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade (new IPPC Guide to support implementation of ISPM 15) .....	17
7.3	e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade ..	17
7.4	Draft Specification for new IPPC guide: <i>Audits in the phytosanitary context</i> (2021-009) .....	17
7.5	Benefits of conducting Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments ....	18

---

7.6	Phyosanitary Capacity Evaluation in Uzbekistan.....	18
7.7	The IPPC ePhyto Solution update and regional developments .....	19
7.8	National Reporting Obligations: update .....	20
7.9	Contingency planning in North Macedonia.....	21
7.10	Emerging pests (Cases of Fall armyworm and Fusarium TR4) .....	21
7.11	IDPH 2023 and look ahead to 2024.....	22
7.12	IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 Development Agenda Items .....	22
8	Brainstorming sSession on Implementation and Capacity Development Needs of the Europe and Central Asia Region.....	23
9	Conclusion of the workshop. Date and venue of the next regional workshop .....	24
10	Online survey of the workshop.....	24
11	Adoption of the report .....	24
12	Close of the meeting .....	24
	<b>Appendix 1: Agenda</b> .....	<b>25</b>
	<b>Appendix 2: Participants list</b> .....	<b>29</b>

## 1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

### 1.1 Opening remarks by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] Mr Osama EL-LISSY, the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretary, welcomed all participants to the 2023 IPPC regional workshop. He stated the importance of health and prosperity of plants – the foundation of life in the planet of earth. He noted that plant pests cause up to 40 percent of crop loss each year. The IPPC secretary noted the mission of IPPC – a holistic approach to improve plant health at the national, regional, and global levels. He expressed confidence that the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia would provide a platform to exchange ideas, strengthen cooperation, add synergies, and join forces to safeguard plant health across the region. On behalf of the IPPC Secretariat, Mr EL-LISSY wished a productive workshop to the participants.
- [2] Ms Sarah BRUNEL, Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU), IPPC Secretariat, followed with her welcoming remarks, noting that this was the first time for her, as the lead of the Implementation and Facilitation Unit of the IPPC Secretariat to attend the regional workshop in the region of Europe and Central Asia.
- [3] Ms BRUNEL expressed gratitude to the host country for the excellent organization of the workshop, and for planning the field trip scheduled for the last day of the workshop. She warmly thanked all presenters and in particular the Standards Committee (SC) and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) leads taking an instrumental role; the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (FAO REU) for identifying outstanding funds to cover for the travel and accommodations costs of many participants and for administrative support provided; the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) for translating into Russian the draft ISPMs and the draft Specification for the Audits Guide sent for consultation; the All-Russian Plant Quarantine Centre (VNIKR) for the translation of all workshop presentations into Russian; and all participants for their foreseen active listening and participation, and for the observers for their interest. Ms BRUNEL invited all participants to be active in the regional workshop. She noted the brainstorming session planned for the last day of the workshop, expressing her hope for the interactions and discussions to culminate to identify implementation and capacity development needs in the region.

### 1.2 Opening remarks by the FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia

- [4] Mr Nabil GANGI, the Officer-in-Charge for FAO REU, Deputy Regional Representative, and de facto head of FAO offices in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, North Macedonia and Serbia welcomed all participants to the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia. In his welcoming remarks Mr GANGI noted that the regional workshop is the result of long-term good cooperation among the IPPC Secretariat, the countries in the Europe and Central Asia region, EPPO and FAO REU, expressing his gratitude to the Government of Montenegro for hosting the workshop. Mr GANGI highlighted the regional workshop as a unique opportunity to discuss the phytosanitary measures and mentioned the areas of FAO REU work that is implemented in cooperation with the countries from the region to enhance national phytosanitary systems.
- [5] On behalf of the FAO REU, Mr GANGI thanked for the cooperation on the enhancements to the agri-food sector in the region and wished the participants a fruitful workshop.

### 1.3 Opening remarks by European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization

- [6] Mr Nico HORN, the Director-General of EPPO welcomed all participants to the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia. He expressed gratitude on behalf of EPPO to Montenegro, a

respected EPPO member country, for hosting the regional workshop and providing the setting for good discussions. Mr HORN stated EPPO's commitment to co-organize the workshop with the IPPC Secretariat and the FAO REU. He added that the workshop offers an excellent opportunity for direct interaction, which is much missed after three years with remote connections. He wished all workshop participants good discussions on draft ISPMs and implementation materials, that both contribute to a more harmonized approach in plant health in the ECA region, which he noted as beneficial in protecting plant health.

#### **1.4 Opening remarks by the Government of Montenegro**

- [7] Mr Vladimir JOKOVIĆ, Deputy Prime Minister for Economic System and Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management, Montenegro delivered his welcoming remarks to the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia on behalf of the Government of Montenegro.
- [8] In his welcoming remarks, Minister JOKOVIĆ welcomed all regional workshop participants to Montenegro, expressing great joy in hosting the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia in Montenegro. He stated the great importance of the regional workshop for the region, noting the importance of the sector for economic development, and the agricultural development depends on plant health. He expressed appreciation and gratitude for the phytosanitary work implemented within the framework of IPPC and FAO and noted the regional workshop as a platform to create coordinated activities to prevent plant pest incursions and to facilitate exchange of information and best practices specifically within Europe and Central Asia region.
- [9] Lastly, Minister JOKOVIĆ highlighted Montenegro as an IPPC contracting party and an FAO member, that actively contributes to the IPPC and FAO work every year recognising the importance of the work in this area. Minister JOKOVIĆ stated his strong belief that the RW goal of better phytosanitary work in the region to be achieved.
- [10] Ms Sarah BRUNEL thanked Minister JOKOVIĆ and expressed gratitude on behalf of the IPPC Secretariat for giving such importance to the phytosanitary affairs in Montenegro at the highest level in the country, which is exemplary.
- [11] Mr Vladimir ĐAKOVIĆ, Director, Administration for Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Affairs, Montenegro reiterated the words of Minister JOKOVIĆ and joined him in welcoming the regional workshop participants to Montenegro. He added that protection of plant health is key for planet health. As plant pests caused losses of 40 percent of the agricultural products, phytosanitary work and efforts of the IPPC community were noted to be of utmost importance. Mr ĐAKOVIĆ stated that the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia would be another step to reach the common goal of protecting plant

health, food security, food safety, protection of the environment, and safe and facilitated trade in plant and plant products.

## **2 MEETING ARRANGEMENTS**

### **2.1 Election of the chairperson**

[12] Mr Ringolds ARNITIS (Latvia) was elected as the chairperson of the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia.

### **2.2 Election of the rapporteur**

[13] Ms Maja PETROVIC (Montenegro) was elected as the rapporteur to the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia.

### **2.3 Adoption of the agenda**

[14] The chairperson prompted the participants to the agenda of the regional workshop and opened the floor for any comments or proposals.

[15] Update from the CPM Focus Group for ePhyto Sustainable Funding Model was included in the agenda dedicated to the IPPC ePhyto Solution update and regional developments (7.7).

[16] The agenda was adopted as presented in Appendix 1.

## **3 ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

### **3.1 Participants list**

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

[18] Two observers from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), and three from the Plant Health in the Western Balkans project attended the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia.

[19] The list of participants is attached to this report as Appendix 2.

## **4 UPDATE ON GOVERNANCE AND STRATEGIC ISSUES**

### **4.1 Update on IPPC governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)**

[20] Ms Sarah BRUNEL, IFU lead, IPPC Secretariat, presented updates on the IPPC governance and strategy, and communication and international cooperation. Ms BRUNEL provided an overview of the IPPC, including a brief history, vision, mission, objectives, core activities of the convention, IPPC Secretariat Units as well as the IPPC governance and IPPC Secretariat structure. Ms BRUNEL provided an update confirming that all activities of the secretariat on e-Phyto, the e-Phyto Group, was moved under the Implementation and Facilitation Unit of the secretariat, reducing the number of the secretariat units to three, Implementation and Facilitation Unit, Standards Setting Unit, and the Integration and Support Team.

- [21] Ms BRUNEL then provided updates on IPPC governance and strategy achievements for 2022-2023, including the achievements of the IPPC governing and subsidiary bodies, Focus Groups, and the CPM-17 (2023) decisions and achievements.
- [22] The chairperson thanked Ms BRUNEL and closed the agenda item.

## 4.2 Update from Standards Committee

- [23] Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI, a member of the Standards Committee (SC) presented an update from the SC.
- [24] The presentation encompassed an overview of the SC work, IPPC's Standard Setting Unit (SSU) workplan for 2023, and updates on the status of the draft ISPMs and ISPM annexes approved for the first consultation; the draft ISPMs approved for the second consultation; the draft ISPMs the SC recommends for adoption by CPM; the draft ISMPs not progressed by the SC: Draft 2023 amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1994-001), and the Draft annex to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds): Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009), noting that there were lots of discussions between SC members, which agreed to establish a second small working group of SC members, with Mr Harry ARIJS, as the head, to develop a paper for the SPG explaining concerns from SC members and asking for guidance on how to proceed in the development of the standard.
- [25] Ms CIAMPITTI also provided an update on the progress of the definition of the term "Emerging Pest". The SC considered that the definition should not have been sent for consultation in May 2023 due to a lack of consensus even on the necessity of the definition itself. The SC recommended that the CPM Bureau that the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) Steering Group continue the work of the CPM POARS Focus Group on developing criteria for what constitutes an emerging pest, with input as necessary from the Technical Panel on Glossary (TPG) and taking account of the comments made at the SC meeting (May 2023) on the definition drafted by the TPG and invited the CPM Bureau to advise on the next steps.
- [26] Ms CIAMPITTI then reported the SC decision to undertake an additional consultation period for Diagnostic Protocols in January 2024 (from 30 January to 30 June 2024).
- [27] The chairperson thanked Ms CIAMPITTI for the detailed presentation and closed the agenda.

## 4.3 Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee

- [28] Mr Ringolds ARNITIS, a member of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) presented updates from the IC. Mr ARNITIS noted the growing importance of implementation of the ISPMs for the IPPC community and provided the updates related to the IC work on IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2030) development agendas for Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS), Management of e-Commerce postal and courier pathways, and developing guidance on the use of third party entities, indicating that ePhyto now also falls under IFU. Mr ARNITIS then provided updates and achievements of IC meetings in 2022 and 2023, updates and activities of the IC subgroups, IC teams, as well as the updated Implementation and Capacity Development List of Topics.
- [29] Mr ARNITIS elaborated on the IPPC guides and training materials, and mentioned the three newly published IPPC guides that are available on the IPP:
- Emergency Preparedness: A guide for developing contingency plans for outbreaks of quarantine pests;
  - Prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for Fusarium Tropical Race 4 (TR4) of banana;



- Guide to regulation of wood packaging material: Understanding the phytosanitary requirements for the movement of wood packaging material in international trade.<sup>1</sup>

[30] Mr ARNITIS then listed the IPPC guides that are under development:

- e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles (2017-039).
- Two ISPM 15 treatment manuals (heat treatment and fumigation) have been drafted.
- Guide on risk-based inspection, first WG held, publication planned by the end of 2024.
- Plant Health Officers Curriculum, first WG scheduled in 2024.

[31] Mr ARNITIS mentioned the guides that were added to the workplan of the IC and IFU for revision:

- Guide on National Reporting Obligations;
- Manual on Participating in CPM meetings.

[32] Mr ARNITIS encouraged the workshop participants to get involved in the work of the IC and IPPC, recommending to actively participate in the IPPC webinars, IPPC surveys, the working groups, IC subgroups and IC teams, to support translations of the IPPC guides and training materials, to contribute with case studies, to review the draft specifications for the IPPC guides and training materials during consultation.

[33] Ms BRUNEL then added a short overview of IFU and the staff composition of the unit, noting the availability of the IFU organigram on IPP that is regularly updated.<sup>2</sup>

[34] Ms BRUNEL also noted the IPPC Observatory survey on e-Commerce inviting the NPPOs to participate and provide feedback to make sure their voice, concern, recommendations are heard. Ms BRUNEL thanked the European Commission for supporting the work of the IPPC Observatory under the framework of the IRSS project, and the dedicated support for the upcoming year.

## 5 SECTION 1: DISCUSS SUBSTANTIVE COMMENTS ON DRAFT STANDARDS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

[35] The regional workshop participants voiced an overall general comment related to the OCS system, *requesting* to have the version of the draft standards and implementation and capacity development documents that are in consultation in OCS with paragraph numbering.

### 5.1 Reorganisation and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)

[36] Mr Jose Maria GUITIAN CASTRILLON, EPPO steward for the pest risk analysis (PRA) standard, presented the draft reorganization and revision of PRA standards, which are currently provided in ISPM 2 (*Framework for pest risk analysis*, adopted in 1995, revised in 2007) and ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*, adopted in 2001, revised in 2003, 2004, and 2013).

[37] Mr GUITIAN CASTRILLON elaborated on the purpose of the revision - to include all the requirements of the stages in PRA in one standard and to provide revised guidance on the pest risk management stage. The reorganization and revision were achieved in line with Specification 72<sup>3</sup> by combining and revising where

---

<sup>1</sup> IPPC Guides and Training Materials: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/>

<sup>2</sup> IFU organigramme: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91133/>

<sup>3</sup> Specification 72 - Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/90498/>

relevant, ISPM 2, ISPM 11, and the draft ISPM on Pest risk management for quarantine pests (2014-001) (originally drafted as a stand-alone standard) into one standard.

[38] Mr GUITIAN CASTRILLON encouraged the reviewers to focus their review on new and revised text (specifically focusing on black text), and the general comments on red and blue text at that stage of the consultation.

[39] Mr GUITIAN CASTRILLON then continued with potential implementation issues and recommendations:

- Implementation material should be developed to highlight that PRA should consider more than just the economic (monetary) consequences of the introduction of a pest, including in the definition of endangered area, in line with the concept in Supplement 2 of ISPM 5;
- Implementation material should consider the time frame that the PRA is relevant for, as it facilitates the inclusion of the impact of climate change to be considered in the PRA;
- Development of a matrix on the strength of measures as part of the implementation material should be considered;
- The Risk communication part of Annex 6 (plants as pests) should be revised to avoid repetition with the content of the risk communication guide. If not, Annex 6 is recommended to be included.
- A detailed description of the various exit points (places to stop the PRA process) should be included in implementation guidance.

[40] Mr GUITIAN CASTRILLON noted that there were more than 300 comments on the draft PRA standard, out of which 88 were substantive. Only the most critical comments were detailed during the session.

[41] The chairperson thanked Mr GUITIAN CASTRILLON for the presentation noting the challenges of compiling several ISPMs into one document, then opened the floor for further comments.

[42] One participant supported the idea of compiling relevant standards into one ISPM as a very practical idea.

[43] **Technical comments:**

[44] One participant asked a question regarding biological control agents. Mr GUITIAN CASTRILLON stated that certain biological control agents can act as pests in certain locations, under certain circumstances, therefore, they need to be evaluated following normal PRA procedures.

[45] Another participant reiterated the comment related to the use of the terminology “cultivated” and “wild” for plants. Instead, it was proposed to use uncultivated/unmanaged plants, wild flora, habitats and ecosystems.

[46] Several participants called to pay attention to the concept of “selection” in the Appendix, stating that it is an act of carefully choosing something and could be confused with the selection of measures by the risk manager. The participant suggested indicating “selection of options” within stage 3. The steward responded that indeed the intention is the selection of options (appropriate ones) within the pest risk management process only.

[47] **Substantive comments:**

[48] One participant called to decide on the use of terminology - “consequences” or “impact”, and suggested focusing on three impacts: economic, social and environment. The steward agreed that the impact/consequences could be integrated into the suggested three categories.

[49] **General comments:**

- [50] One participant called for including a brief introduction/overview of pathway/commodity-based PRA to guide countries on how to conduct pathway/commodity-based PRA especially the selection of pests for which a pest-based risk analysis will be performed. Mr GUITIAN CASTRILLON noted that many countries do pathway/commodity-based PRA. However, there was no procedure/guidance for pathway/commodity-based PRA.
- [51] The IPPC Regional Workshop for the Europe and Central Asia *recommended* that the SC to consider introducing information (one or two paragraphs) for the pathway/commodity-based PRA in the revised standard for PRA.
- [52] The chairperson thanked Mr GUITIAN CASTRILLON for the comprehensive presentation, and the participants for their comments and contributions.

## 5.2 International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit. Draft Annex to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)

- [53] Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI, a member of the SC, presented the draft annex: International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) by introducing a quick background to the given draft annex to ISPM 46.
- [54] The chairperson thanked Ms CIAMPITTI for the presentation, and then opened the floor for further comments.
- [55] **Technical comments:**
- [56] One participant expressed concern that options for phytosanitary measures have not been categorized according to confidence in the measure as required by ISPM 46 and that its effectiveness has not been evaluated leading to misinformation. Ms CIAMPITTI responded that the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) has agreed that the minimum confidence criterion (there is no ranking of measures) is met by a measure and its effectiveness is deemed acceptable if it has been used in the past or is still in use for trade in this commodity between at least two countries without any reported problems.
- [57] Another comment was voiced with regards to “general agricultural practices”, with a suggestion to remove the adjective “general”. Ms CIAMPITTI voiced the steward's response, that the TPCS made a conscious decision to use *general*, to reflect that those practices were not “phytosanitary measures” and could be applied in broad commodity production situations.
- [58] One participant asked whether in paragraph 251, inspection should include “and/or testing”, noting the different definitions for inspection and testing in ISPM 5. Ms CIAMPITTI confirmed that this comment was proposed for discussion during the EPPO Panel meeting scheduled for 06-08 September 2023.
- [59] One participant asked the reason the Annex was limited to one species of mango fruit - *Mangifera indica*, while there are over 20 other species of edible mango fruit. The participant added that the pests affecting this fruit must be the same.
- [60] Ms CIAMPITTI stated that the request to develop a commodity standard was made specifically for *Mangifera indica*. Maybe in the future, more species/varieties could be added to the standard. She added that the SC still had not decided if the commodity standards would follow the regular process for ISPMs, or the one followed for phytosanitary treatments and diagnostic protocols (usually one round of consultations). The process would be to be decided and followed for this annex as well.

- [61] **Substantive comments:**

- [62] One participant suggested reviewing the paragraph dedicated to the "scope" and recommended moving paragraph 32 to the section "scope". Ms CIAMPITTI stated that there was an intentional repetition and the steward recommended maintaining it. She agreed to raise the comment related to moving paragraph 32 to the "scope" to the steward.
- [63] Another participant voiced the comment related to the proposal to identify pests that are present and put some reference to country pest risk analysis (PRA) or other sources for justification in table 1, section 1. Ms CIAMPITTI stated that the SC approved the new form for providing a proposal of topic for commodity standards, that includes that type of information to transmit the reference for the pest to provide technical justification for the pest to be included in the list.
- [64] One participant voiced the comment regarding the use of the term "international movement", and not "international trade", Ms CIAMPITTI responded that perhaps the reason lies in the fact that the term movement also includes movements of commodities without money transfer and agreed to share the comment with the steward.
- [65] Another participant proposed to highlight the use of alternative treatments through the annex so that all options were included in table 1.
- [66] Another comment was raised with regard to vapour heat treatment on paragraph 475, asking the percentage of product spoilage in a lot that occurs when using this method. Ms CIAMPITTI replied that the proposed details were not pertinent to an annex to ISPM 46, but that the comments would be forwarded to the Phytosanitary Treatment Technical Panel steward for consideration.
- [67] **Editorial comments:**
- [68] One participant suggested removing the last sentence in paragraph 224 "Alternative treatments that are more environmentally friendly are being pursued". Ms CIAMPITTI noted the comment.
- [69] One participant voiced the industry stakeholders' fear stating that the commodity specific standards could increase the pest list and potential requirements. Ms CIAMPITTI noted the concern as valid, but pointed out that the commodity standard was not a PRA.
- [70] The chairperson thanked Ms CIAMPITTI for the presentation and the participants for their fruitful comments.

### **5.3 Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood. Draft Annex to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*) (2015-004)**

- [71] Mr Harry ARIJS, member of the SC, presented the draft annex: *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood) (2015-004)*, providing a background to the given draft annex to ISPM 39, as well as the overview of the document. Mr ARIJS then listed the drafting issues:
- Could *contamination risk* be addressed in the Annex despite the fact that ISPM 39 specifically mentions that contaminating pests are excluded from the scope of this standard.
  - How to ensure a common understanding of the concept.
  - Size of wood chips to be brought to the attention of the SC, including a potential revision to ISPM 39.

- How to address the responsibilities of NPPOs and participating entities that are not authorized? The draft Annex does not refer specifically to “non-authorized entities” but recognizes that a systems approach may include participants who are not authorized.

[72] The EPPO representative stated that there was a study initiated within EPPO to produce guidance on the size of the wood chips and associated pest risks. The results of the study will be available upon finalisation.

[73] Mr Thorwald GEUZE, the EPPO steward to the standard, then presented the summary of comments, highlighting the most technically relevant ones.

[74] **General comments:**

[75] One participant commented that there was a lot of overlap with the text of the general standard, and suggested avoiding redundancy. Mr GEUZE noted the comment.

[76] **Substantive comments:**

[77] One participant suggested that the examples in paragraph 31 are to be completed, and added that risk should not only be reduced, but risk management should be ensured to reach an acceptable level. Mr GEUZE responded that the examples mentioned do not have to cover the whole range of possible measures, however agreed that risk management to an acceptable level should be ensured.

[78] Another participant raised a question regarding paragraph 136, asking if “pre-dispatch sampling and inspection” could be considered as surveillance. Mr GEUZE noted the question to be raised with the EPPO Panel on Global Affairs.

[79] A comment was voiced related to the word "may" in the last sentence of paragraph 187, adding that all the procedures were considered as essential to be documented. It was noted that in that case, the intention is not to create a responsibility by the participating entities, the documentation could be limited to the NPPOs. Mr GEUZE stated that he would tend to agree but noted the comment to be discussed by the EPPO Panel on Global Affairs.

[80] For paragraph 217, one participant noted that not only pathogenic, but also other species of nematodes may be found in the wood, and the presence of any live nematode species in wood could indicate that the wood was not properly treated. In response, another participant added that there are only two pathogenic nematode species (*Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* and *Bursaphelenchus cocophilus*) and proposed to consider referring these two species in order to avoid the impression that there are many pathogenic wood related nematodes.

[81] **Technical comments:**

[82] One comment was raised with regard to paragraph 64, asking if there was a practical experience for pest free areas or areas of low pest prevalence in the forest areas. Mr GEUZE noted the question for the EPPO Panel on Global Affairs.

[83] **Editorial comment:**

[84] One participant suggested adding “phytosanitary” before the word “certification” in paragraph 140.

[85] It was added that there are many other certificates, such as forestry, food security, which may not comply with phytosanitary certificates. Therefore, it was suggested to stick with phytosanitary certificates, to avoid accommodating other non-phytosanitary certifications, Mr GEUZE agreed to the suggestion.

[86] One participant requested information on the push-pull system since it was not clear in the Russian translation. Ms CIAMPITTI responded that was an IPM strategy involving the behavioral manipulation of

insect pests and their natural enemies. This strategy is commonly used in crops, e.g. in Africa for fall armyworm, but in that specific case it referred to forests. She added that she was not aware about the method being used in Europe.

- [87] The chairperson thanked Mr ARIJS and Mr GEUZE for the presentation, and to the participants for their comments and contributions.

#### 5.4 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary on phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001)

- [88] Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC, EPPO steward presented the draft 2022 amendments to ISPM 5: (*Glossary on phytosanitary terms*) (1994-001) and the background to the proposed amendments of terms and definitions.

- [89] “**General surveillance**” (2018-046) was revised following the comments from first and the second consultation. The presenter noted the proposed definition being prepared for the third consultation, modified and simplified compared to the version sent for second consultation.

- [90] The presenter explained that the proposal to add the definition of “general surveillance” in the ISPM 5 is aimed to clarify the terminology without reading the ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*). Additionally, the presenter noted that the proposed definition refers to “various sources” rather than “procedures” to allow for sources of information that are not procedures. As it is explained in the ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) the overall surveillance process is official (i.e. exclusively an NPPO responsibility) and those “various sources” of information can be official or unofficial. Additionally, in the proposed definition “pests” is used rather than “pest presence or absence” to allow for surveillance of other characteristics of pests. Lastly, the presenter noted that as per the ISPM 6, general surveillance and specific surveillance being disjunctive concepts. They could be used in combination, as provided for in the revised definition of “surveillance”.

- [91] “**Specific surveillance**” (2018-047) was recommended to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM with no changes from the version from the second consultation.

- [92] “**Surveillance**” (2020-009) was revised based on the comments from the first and second consultation and being prepared for the third consultation unchanged from the version sent for the second consultation.

- [93] The presenter explained that the definition of “surveillance” at that time rather indistinctly mixed various methods from the two surveillance types, and unnecessarily restricted the surveillance objective to only “presence or absence of pests”. The proposed definitions of the new Glossary terms “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance” provided the essential distinction between those two disjunctive surveillance types. Subsequently, the presenter explained that the generic characteristics of “surveillance” remained as “an official process whereby information on pests in an area is obtained...”. The possible surveillance methodologies and the conceptual relationship between the terms are then outlined in the second part of the definition as “...through general surveillance, specific surveillance or a combination of both”.

- [94] “**Test**” (2021-005) was revised based on the comments received from the first and second consultations. The presenter noted that the version for the third consultation was prepared, considerably different from the initial consultation versions.

- [95] The presenter elaborated that “visual” had been extended and corrected to become the Glossary term “visual examination”, and the entire clause “other than visual examination” moved to near the start of the definition to clarify it as being in apposition to “official examination” and emphasize that it is the main distinction between “test” and “inspection”. Further, “using for example chemical, molecular or serological methods,” had been added as some examples of types of methods that could be used for tests and also to illustrate the



distinction between “test” and “inspection”. And lastly, the word ‘determine’ in relation to “compliance” was substituted by ‘verify’ in consistency with wording in similar definitions.

- [96] **“Inspection”** (2017-005) was recommended to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM with no changes from the version from the second consultation.
- [97] **“Release of a consignment”** (2021-007) was recommended to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM with no changes from the version from the second consultation.
- [98] **“Phytosanitary action”** (2020-006) was revised based on the comments received from the first consultation. The presenter noted that it is proposed to insert “with reference to a phytosanitary procedure” to highlight that every action needs a procedure.
- [99] The presenter explained that an NPPO may apply phytosanitary actions against pests regulated in the country itself. Furthermore, to fulfil all requirements for performing phytosanitary certification in export situations, the NPPO may similarly apply *phytosanitary actions* against pests regulated in other (importing) countries in order to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of those countries. The presenter noted that the proposed revised definition reflected the actual use of the term “phytosanitary action” in ISPMs and, therefore did not conflict with and did not necessitate amendments to ISPM texts.
- [100] **“Phytosanitary procedure”** (2020-007) was revised as per the comments received from the first consultation.
- [101] The presenter explained that the conceptual linkage between “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary action” was that a phytosanitary procedure is a method on how to perform a phytosanitary action. To simplify, and to avoid redundancy, the conceptual linkage between “phytosanitary procedure” and “phytosanitary measure” was no longer explicit, but implicitly remained intact through the linkage to “phytosanitary action”.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the presenter noted that with the linkage to “phytosanitary action”, the listed examples in the current definition as redundant and therefore deleted from the proposed definition.
- [102] Ms BOUHOT-DELDUC then presented a summary of editorial, substantive, editorial, technical and general comments.
- [103] **Substantive comments:**
- [104] Several participants raised comments with regard to the revised definition of “general surveillance”, asking the rationale for adding “official” and non-official” sources, given that “various” means all sources. The information is at the end provided by NPPO, which makes it official. Noting the reservations, the participants agreed with the proposed definition of “general surveillance”.
- [105] Several comments were made on the definition of the term “test”, that includes inspection, noting the need to make a distinction between “inspection” and “test” by adding “other than visual examination”. As a general comment, the participants recommended SC to discuss this issue, if needed to raise at other platforms for discussion on how to distinguish “inspection” vs “test”.

---

<sup>4</sup> Defined as ‘an official operation... undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures or to enable phytosanitary certification’ in the proposed revision.

[106] The chairperson thanked Ms BOUHOT-DELDUC for the presentation and the participants for their contributions.

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

[107] Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI, a member of the SC, presented the draft annex: *Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit-to-fruit flies to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae))* (2018-011). The presenter provided a background and a rationale for the draft annex to ISPM 37, and an overview of the document.

[108] Ms CIAMPITTI then presented the summary of comments focusing on the most relevant and critical ones.

[109] One comment was raised regarding paragraph 32, proposing to add “to avoid trade disruption” after the word “PRA”, reflecting the discussions of the 2022 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia. The comment was noted by Ms CIAMPITTI.

[110] Another comment was raised regarding paragraph 75, on “specialist taxonomist” and instead suggested using for instance “botanist”. Ms CIAMPITTI noted the comment as a good point, as a “specialist taxonomist” may not be present in all NPPOs. The participants agreed to make the general comment to discuss the afore mentioned issue by the panel.

[111] The chairperson thanked Ms CIAMPITTI for the presentation and the participants for their contributions.

### **5.6 Draft CPM Recommendation on minimizing pest risk associated with sea container pathway**

[112] Mr Thorwald GEUZE, the member of the IC, presented the CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers (R-06), providing the background. The presenter went over the revised CPM Recommendation (R-06), including contextual information regarding the background to plant health risks and the international sea container pathway, identification of shared responsibilities for stakeholders, a description of the types of risks presented by sea containers moving in international trade and related contamination of concern, and encouraged engagement with other regulatory bodies such as the World Organization for Animal Health in the interest of avoiding the development of duplicating or conflicting measures.

[113] Additionally, the presenter elaborated on the recommendations included in the revised document:

- reducing the risk of contamination of sea containers and their cargoes;
- visual examination for contamination of sea containers and their cargoes;
- methods to remove contamination;
- container structure - expanded use of steel floored containers;
- input from NPPOs for effective measures and best practices;
- raising awareness.

[114] Mr GUEZE presented the comments, noting the purpose of the recommendations, not to specify and assign responsibilities to countries.

[115] One comment was related to paragraph 18 and suggested to use "plant pests" instead of “pests” for more clarity, to be reflected across the document.



[116] Several participants suggested more clarity on the use of “cargoes” in paragraph 21, and called to paraphrase to reflect that cargo transported in containers can also contaminate the containers, to make sure it also addresses contamination from cargo. Mr GEUZE added that the concern over contamination from cargo was already addressed in a different paragraph, and called the participants to review the document and see if the topic is sufficiently addressed.

[117] The chairperson thanked Mr GEUZE for the presentation. There were no further comments from the participants.

## **6 SECTION 2: IMPLEMENTING AND RAISING AWARENESS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF FAO/ RPPS**

### **6.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities**

[118] Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK, Agricultural Officer, FAO REU, delivered a presentation on the current phytosanitary-related activities of FAO REU in the Europe and Central Asia region. The presentation included an overview of the current FAO REU projects aimed at improving phytosanitary systems, trade facilitation, digitalisation and sustainable agricultural sector in the countries across the region:

- Azerbaijan (*Establishment of a national disease-free seed potato production system*);
- Georgia (*EU innovative action for private sector competitiveness*);
- Global project (*FAO/EBRD Cooperation: Facilitating trade digitalization: assessing cost, benefits and options for technical assistance*) - Georgia, Serbia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, (and in NENA (Egypt, Morocco));
- Kyrgyzstan (*Support for development of sustainable value chains for climate-smart agriculture*);
- Tajikistan (*Revision of the application for funding by the Standards and Trade Development Facility; Strengthening the resilience of the agricultural sector*); and
- Ukraine (*Enhancement of the national phytosanitary system; Upgrade the export certification laboratories (phytosanitary and veterinary)*).

[119] Additionally, the presenter provided updates on the non-project activities related to phytosanitary matters the FAO REU carried out, such as co-organization of the IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia, organization of webinars on plant protection and pesticide management, and the development of a regional plant protection strategy.

[120] Ms BRUNEL asked if the current projects in Georgia and Azerbaijan could be related to the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCEs) in both countries that took place 10 years ago. She also thanked the FAO REU for a fruitful collaboration and called for joining synergies between the FAO REU and the IPPC secretariat for a common effort. She also reported that she would be the STDF Working Group Chair in 2024 and that synergies could be sought in that respect.

[121] Mr WLODARCZYK responded stating that the projects could be linked to the previously conducted PCE.

[122] The chairperson thanked Mr WLODARCZYK for the presentation, no further comments were made.

### **6.2 EPPO activities**

[123] Mr Nico HORN, EPPO Director General delivered a presentation on the activities EPPO carried out. Mr HORN provided a quick background for EPPO, an overview of active EPPO panels, and an overview of EPPO activities across the region. Mr HORN highlighted EPPO's role in information exchange across the region on phytosanitary matters, highlighting the EPPO databases and platforms for information sharing.

[124] The chairperson thanked Mr HORN for the presentation, no further comments were made by the participants.

### 6.3 2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation

[125] Ms Sarah BRUNEL, IFU Lead, IPPC Secretariat, delivered a presentation on the IPPC 2023 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation. The presenter explained the purpose of the IPPC call for topics, gave a detailed overview of the IPPC call for topics process, and presented a step-by-step guide for preparation of a successful submission for call for topics and the key elements of a successful proposal. The IPPC 2023 Call for Topics was noted as open from 5 May until 15 September, and the presenter encouraged the participants to submit the topic of interest within the deadline.

[126] The EPPO representative thanked the IPPC Secretariat for agreeing to postpone the deadline to mid-September that allowed discussing call for topics in the IPPC regional workshops.

[127] Then, the EPPO representative added that EPPO is supporting the preparation of two proposals on commodity standards, prepared by two countries in the EPPO region. Then, the representative invited the countries in the region, even if not EPPO member country, to seek EPPO support with preparation and submission of topics.

[128] The representative from the FAO REU asked for a demonstration on the IPP to show how to find information about IPPC call for topics. Ms BRUNEL projected the IPP and made the requested demonstration.

[129] One participant asked if the submission of calls could be coordinated by the EPPO Secretariat to prepare the topic submission. The representative from EPPO expressed the willingness of the organisation to support countries to develop topics for submission, however noted that countries' role cannot be taken over by the EPPO Secretariat. Finalisation and submission of the topic rest with the countries.

[130] The chairperson thanked Ms BRUNEL for the presentation and demo.

## 7 SECTION 3: MOVING TOGETHER FROM IDEAS TO ACTION

### 7.1 New IPPC Guides and e-learning courses

[131] A representative from the IC presented updates on the new IPPC guides and e-learning courses. The presentation included a quick overview of the objectives, purpose and development process of the IPPC guides and training materials and a demo of the dedicated IPP page.<sup>5</sup> The newly published guides in 2023, namely, *Guide to regulation of wood packaging material*, *Emergency Preparedness: A guide for developing contingency plans for outbreaks of quarantine pests*, and the *Prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for Fusarium Tropical Race 4 (TR4) of banana* were presented with quick overview and purpose for each. The presenter provided updates with regards to the translation of the IPPC guides and training materials.

[132] Then the presenter listed the new four e-learning courses on *Pest Risk Analysis (PRA)*, *Phytosanitary Export Certification System*, *Phytosanitary Inspection*, and *Surveillance and reporting obligations*. The presenter noted the upcoming IPPC webinar to introduce and provide information on new IPPC guides and e-learning courses on 19 October 2023.

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/>

[133] Ms BRUNEL highlighted the need to translate more of IPPC Guides and training materials into Russian, an important need for the ECA region. She noted that according to the FAO Intellectual property rights, the institution/organization that undertakes translation work will then become the owner of the translated version of the material.

[134] The chairperson thanked Mr GEUZE for the presentation, and Ms BRUNEL for her comment.

## **7.2 Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade (new IPPC Guide to support implementation of ISPM 15)**

[135] Mr Thorwald GEUZE, member of the IC presented the new IPPC Guide to support the implementation of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade). The presenter noted the key challenges in implementing ISPM 15, the purpose, objective and the key features of the Guide to regulation of wood packaging material. The presentation was then continued with questions for interactive discussions to encourage better understanding, hence better use of the new guide. Lastly, the presenter asked the workshop participants to check the IPP page for the IPPC guides and share their feedback with the IPPC Secretariat.

[136] One participant highlighted the need for building capacity of the customs officials on ISPM 15.

[137] Ms BRUNEL recalled the webinar planned for the 19 October 2024 on IPPC guides and training materials, that will include an introduction to the *wood packaging material in international trade guide*.

[138] The chairperson thanked Mr GEUZE for the presentation.

## **7.3 e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade**

[139] Mr Thorwald GEUZE, the member of the IC presented the upcoming IPPC guide, e-Commerce guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade, noting the topic as one of the key development agendas in the IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2030). The presenter provided an overview of what e-Commerce entailed, the phytosanitary risks and the key challenges it poses for national plant protection organizations.

[140] Mr GEUZE noted that the guide is aimed for effective management of e-Commerce and the postal and courier pathways for safe trade in plant and plant products and noted that the guide is to be published soon, with a video and a factsheet to be produced to raise awareness. Lastly, the upcoming IPPC Survey on e-Commerce was mentioned, and the presenter encouraged the workshop participants to respond to the survey.

[141] The chairperson thanked Mr GEUZE for the presentation and closed the agenda.

## **7.4 Draft Specification for new IPPC guide: *Audits in the phytosanitary context* (2021-009)**

[142] Mr Ringolds ARNITIS, the member of the IC presented the draft specification for a new IPPC guide: *Audits in the phytosanitary context* (2021-009) to support the implementation of ISPM 47 (*Audits in the phytosanitary context*), noting that the draft specification was available for consultation with a closing date of 30 September 2023. The presenter then gave an overview of the purpose, scope and proposed structure of the guide. The presenter then asked a question for an interactive discussion to enquire about the key challenges NPPOs face in implementing the ISPM 47 (*Audits in the phytosanitary context*) and noted the ways NPPOs could support the development of the guide.

- [143] One participant asked in which cases an audit can be carried out, and suggested including list of situations when an audit can be carried out. The chairperson noted the comments and asked the participant to provide the comment.
- [144] Another participant asked if the distinction between the audit in the country of NPPO, and the audit in another country could be indicated in the guide. The chairperson noted the comment and asked the participant to post this comment to the draft specification in consultation.
- [145] The chairperson thanked the participants for their contributions.

## **7.5 Benefits of conducting Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments**

- [146] Ms Sarah BRUNEL, IFU Team Lead, IPPC Secretariat delivered a presentation on the benefits of conducted Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and updates on the latest developments. Ms BRUNEL provided an overview of what the PCE was and the benefits it entails, noting that the process is fully under the control of the country, fully guided by a confidentiality agreement.
- [147] The presenter noted that all efforts are made by the IPPC Secretariat to modernize and make the PCE tool and the process even more efficient.
- [148] Ms BRUNEL reiterated that PCE is an evaluation tool, not an audit. The information is kept confidential, available only to the country implementing the PCE.
- [149] Lastly, instructions on how to request access to PCE were given, and success stories for the period of 2020-2023 were presented.
- [150] One participant asked whether the donor country funding a PCE in another country would attend the PCE consensus workshops, noting that given the sensitivity of the information discussed, the implementing country may wish to keep it confidential. Ms BRUNEL responded that it depended on the wish of the country implementing the PCE, and indicating a confidentiality undertaken was developed to protect the implementing country.
- [151] The example of Uzbekistan was given, where the donor provided funds for the PCE process, but was not involved and did not have access to the confidential reports, therefore, all sensitive information remained with the country.
- [152] The observer from the Plant Health in the Western Balkans project expressed support and a positive vision for the PCE tool for evaluation.
- [153] The chairperson thanked Ms BRUNEL for the presentation.

## **7.6 Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation in Uzbekistan**

- [154] Mr Sultan Makhmud SULTANOV, a representative from the NPPO of the Republic of Uzbekistan, presented an overview of the PCE in Uzbekistan carried out from June 2022-April 2023, with 12 PCE modules completed. The presenter spoke about the objective of the request for PCE, the PCE process in Uzbekistan, the stakeholders who participated, and the results achieved.
- [155] It was noted that Uzbekistan implemented some PCE modules 5 years ago, after which they revised the legislation. And then the technical modules of the PCE were implemented between 2022 and 2023, for technical reforms in the phytosanitary system in Uzbekistan.

[156] Mr SULTANOV listed the achievements and the outcomes of the PCE process in Uzbekistan, such as problem analysis and SWOT analysis, based on which the logical framework was developed. Finally, a logical measures matrix was prepared for each PCE module. Mr SULTANOV then stated that based on the final PCE report, Uzbekistan developed a national phytosanitary capacity development strategy. Recommendations for strengthening the phytosanitary service are also to be developed. He noted that the strategy is an important tool to mobilize resources from international donor organizations to strengthen the phytosanitary areas in Uzbekistan.

[157] The chairperson thanked Mr SULTANOV for the presentation.

## **7.7 The IPPC ePhyto Solution update and regional developments**

[158] Mr Nico HORN, Director General of EPPO delivered a presentation covering updates and regional developments for the IPPC ePhyto Solution. He gave an overview of the IPPC ePhyto Solution, presented the statistics on the ePhyto exchanges, and the results of the IPPC unpublished study. The presenter noted that the unpublished study indicated that with ePhyto, the costs of sending documents, cost of penalties, demurrage costs, storage costs are reduced.

[159] The presenter noted that the IPPC ePhyto Solution was enhanced with eSignatures/eSeal, and the future plans such as securing sustainable funding, translation of GeNS into French, Arabic and Spanish, routine maintenance, and collaboration with non-phytosanitary agencies.

[160] The chairperson thanked Mr HORN for the presentation. He added that now the IPPC ePhyto Solution is under the auspices of IFU. He then introduced Mr Dominique MENON who leads the IPPC ePhyto Solution in IFU. Mr MENON joined the regional workshop session remotely.

[161] Mr Marco TRAA, representative from the CPM Focus Group for ePhyto Sustainable Funding Model presented an update on proposals for sustainable funding. At CPM-17 (2023) the Focus Group proposed two main options to fund the ePhyto Solution:

- 1. Allocating costs to user countries based on development status, OR
- 2. Allocating costs to user countries based on the volume of transactions.

[162] Many contracting parties agreed with option 1 but consensus was not achieved. An additional proposal was made on the possibility of additional FAO regular-programme funding to cover the ePhyto Solution costs.

[163] The Focus Group was asked to develop a final detailed proposal for CPM-18 (2024). A hybrid concept is emerging in the Focus Group that calculates a country's contribution based on development status (using World Bank status) and usage (the number of transactions). The countries with higher development status and higher usage would pay more than countries with lower development status and lower usage. The UN Least Developed Countries would not pay to use ePhyto.

[164] Mr TRAA invited the country delegates to attend CPM-18 (2024) mandated to adopt a mechanism and a procedure for long-term funding of the ePhyto Solution, which otherwise endangers the ePhyto activities.

[165] Mr TRAA then mentioned that the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) meeting will take place in October, in Rome, and invited participants to attend the meeting if they wish to participate in the discussion.

[166] Several participants raised concerns regarding the financing of ePhyto, stating that the funding should come from FAO, the owner of the tool. Participants then asked about the legal basis for requesting the countries involved in ePhyto to pay.

- [167] One participant asked about the eSignature/eSeal on the ePhytos, without which the certificates were not being accepted by countries. Mr Menon stated that the European Union member states are the only ones requiring an eSignature/eSeal. Mr Horn added that the same issue is also relevant to some of the Latin American countries, such as Chile.<sup>6</sup> Mr Menon stated that in situations like this, countries should find IT specialists locally who can assist with eSignature, and/or send an email to the IPPC Secretariat to seek support. The chairperson invited the countries to reach out to the IPPC Secretariat to settle this type of technical issue.
- [168] Another participant asked if there was any kind of IPPC ePhyto strategy on how to involve all other countries that had not joined the ePhyto solution yet. Mr Dominique MENON, the IPPC focal point for ePhyto, who joined the session remotely, responded saying that the strategy to have the rest of countries is an integral part of the IPPC ePhyto solution. Ms BRUNEL added that indeed ePhyto solution grew exponentially during the last few years.
- [169] One participant called for the translation of the IPPC ePhyto solution into Russian for the Europe and Central Asia region.
- [170] The regional workshop *called* the CPM Focus Group for ePhyto Sustainable Funding Model considered the legal aspects for ePhyto funding before the CPM 18 (2024) and requested to crosscheck those aspects with the FAO legal unit.
- [171] The IPPC Secretariat encouraged the participants to send a request if they wish to raise the issues related to the IPPC ePhyto Solution governance – CPM, SPG, CPM Bureau, SC and IC.
- [172] The chairperson thanked Mr HORN, Mr TRAA, Mr MENON, and Ms BRUNEL for their presentation and updates, and the participants for discussion and suggestions.

## 7.8 National Reporting Obligations: update

- [173] Mr Ringolds ARNITIS, member of the IC presented an update on National Reporting Obligations (NROs). The presenter gave an overall overview of NROs, noting pest reports, situation reports, and the close linkage between the Development Agenda on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) and NROs. He then presented the IPPC *Guide on NROs*, and the *e-learning course on surveillance and reporting obligations*. The presentation was then continued with an update on NROs activities in 2022-2023, and the workplan for the rest of 2023.
- [174] The chairperson thanked for the report from the IPPC Secretariat on the NROs situation in the region. The IPPC Secretariat noted that indeed the IFU lead on NROs had been undertaking efforts to update the NROs contact points.
- [175] One participant stated that in some countries, the director/head of the NPPO happens to be an official contact point (OCPs), who most probably have a very busy schedule. The participant then called the countries to appoint OCPs people who can be more available and responsive.

---

<sup>6</sup> The IPPC Secretariat cross-checked the information with the Latin America and Caribbean region after the regional workshop. It is confirmed that neither Chile nor any other country in the region requires electronic signature on ePhytos.



[176] No further comments were made.

## 7.9 Contingency planning in North Macedonia

[177] Nadica DZERKOVSKA, Head of the Plant Health Department, Phytosanitary Directorate, North Macedonia delivered a presentation remotely on contingency planning from Central European Free Trade Agreement (CEFTA) and North Macedonia. The presenter provided background to developing general and pest specific contingency plans after the CEFTA decision for facilitating trade of fruit and vegetables plant health – aimed to simplify the system of controls for trade in fruit and vegetables within the CEFTA region and cut down the border control time.

[178] The presenter then presented the structure and scope of the general contingency plan, and the pest specific contingency plan – a template used for all pests across CEFTA. In conclusion, the presenter noted that the general and pest specific contingency plans enhance cooperation and communication between all involved parties, and ensure harmonized, flexible, and prompt responses to pest incursions.

[179] One participant asked a question about simulation exercises, asking about the steps and how they were organized. Ms DZERKOVSKA responded that organization of the simulation exercises was in the workplan and, therefore not yet organized.

[180] Several participants expressed a strong interest in having simulation exercises, general or pest-specific, in the region, and encouraged to include this type of activities under regional projects also quoting the Plant Health in Western Balkans (PHBW) project. In response, Ms BRUNEL indicated that a tabletop simulation exercise was being delivered during the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Africa, which could be replicated for another pest for the ECA region. She also added that a TR4 simulation exercise was planned to be delivered in one African country in early 2024. Ms BRUNEL then added that the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA) (the regional Plant Protection Organization in Central America) organizes simulation exercises of several types for all its member countries. A regional simulation exercise was held in Nicaragua against TR4 this year, attended by the IPPC Secretariat, which prompted the participants to look at the news article published on IPP, where several types of simulation exercises were listed with further details<sup>7</sup>.

[181] Several participants expressed a strong need from countries in the Europe and Central Asia region for simulation exercises and requested to conduct a tabletop simulation exercise as done for Africa in 2023 regional workshop.

[182] The IPPC Regional Workshop for the Europe and Central Asia *recommended* to considering the organization of a tabletop simulation exercise on a pest of preference, at the side of the next workshop in 2024.

## 7.10 Emerging pests (Cases of Fall armyworm and Fusarium TR4)

[183] Ms Rokhila MADAMINOVA, IPPC Programme Specialist, IPPC Secretariat, presented the IPPC activities implemented to address emerging pests.

[184] Ms MADAMINOVA noted the pests of primary concern for the IPPC community - fall armyworm (FAW) (*Spodoptera frugiperda*) and *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense* Tropical Race 4 (TR4) and gave an overview of activities targeted for each pest. For FAW, the achievements of the FAO/IPPC Technical Working Group on Quarantine and Phytosanitary Measures for Global action on fall armyworm were

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/news/spotlight-better-safe-than-sorry-nicaraguas-emergency-plant-protection-efforts-to-curb-fusarium-tropical-race-4-tr4-of-banana/>

listed, including the development of the , and the publication of the *Prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for Spodoptera frugiperda*.

[185] Then the presenter summarized the activities undertaken for TR4, the series of workshops, the revision of contributed resources, and the publication of *Prevention, preparedness and response guidelines for Fusarium Tropical Race 4 (TR4) of banana*.

[186] Lastly, Ms MADAMINOVA noted the newly published guide, *Emergency Preparedness: A guide for developing contingency plans for outbreaks of quarantine pests*, a generic resource for developing contingency plans.

[187] Ms MADAMINOVA voiced the need to translate more and more IPPC guides and training materials into Russian language to reach Russian speaking fraction of NPPOs and plant health specialists in the region, noting especially the new IPPC guide on *Emergency Preparedness: A guide for developing contingency plans for outbreaks of quarantine pests* that did not have Russian translation yet.

[188] One participant asked a question on the difference between tabletop simulation exercises and simulation exercises. Ms MADAMINOVA elaborated saying that the tabletop simulation exercise is theory based going through the scenario of a pest outbreak with a step-by-step response needed in a room. As for the simulation exercises, the scenario is outplayed, in the field, laboratory, at the airport, or anywhere else.

[189] The chairperson thanked Ms MADAMINOVA for the presentation, no further comments were made.

### **7.11 IDPH 2023 and look ahead to 2024**

[190] Ms Sarah BRUNEL, IFU Lead, IPPC Secretariat, presented the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) 2023 and a look ahead to 2024. She noted the importance of the IDPH, and gave an overview of IDPH celebration in 2023:

- 40 countries around the world organized events for IDPH 2023;
- over 34 million people were reached online from 23 April to 22 May;
- 26K people engaged and interacted with IDPH content online;
- A hybrid high-level event was organized in FAO HQ.

[191] Ms BRUNEL spoke about IDPH 2024 and elaborated on how to get involved and participate in the 2024 celebration. Then ideas on how to plan and organize IDPH celebration in 2024 were shared.

[192] One participant suggested organizing an exhibition based on the theme of the 2024 IDPH celebration. Another participant suggested organizing educational and informative activities on plant health or the theme of the 2024 IDPH celebration.

[193] The chairperson thanked the participants for their suggestions and Ms BRUNEL for her presentation.

### **7.12 IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 Development Agenda Items**

[194] Ms Sarah BRUNEL, IFU Lead, IPPC Secretariat, delivered a presentation on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 Development Agenda Items (SFDAIs). The presentation started with an overview of SFDAIs and what the IPPC Strategic Framework comprised: mission, vision, goal, and Strategic Objectives.

[195] The presenter then listed the eight SFDAIs, and provided implementation update along with the dedicated budget for each.



[196] The chairperson thanked Ms BRUNEL for her presentation, no further comments were made.

## 8 BRAINSTORMING SESSION ON IMPLEMENTATION AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF THE EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA REGION

- [197] Ms Ane SINDIK, an observer from the Plant Health in Western Balkans (PHWB) project presented the PHWB project and listed the beneficiaries: Albania, Bosnia Herzegovina, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, and Kosovo.<sup>8</sup> The two specific objectives of the project were mentioned, namely strengthening cooperation within the region and with the EU on plant pest surveillance and control, as well as improving the effectiveness of the Western Balkans in detecting, fighting and limiting the size of an outbreak of plant pests in line with the EU standards.
- [198] The chairperson thanked Ms SINDIK for the presentation and gave the floor to Ms Sarah BRUNEL to facilitate the session dedicated to brainstorming and reflection. Ms BRUNEL then invited the participants to voice their thoughts and reflections.
- [199] Several participants stated that the aim of the IPPC regional workshops was not only the discussion of standards, but also sharing and exchanging information on the developments and challenges occurring on the ground in different countries across the region.
- [200] The workshop participants *called* for countries in the region to present the phytosanitary needs, developments, updates, emerging issues and to identify common goals. The participants also *called* for the RPPO to play a role in understanding and coordinating the common phytosanitary issues and needs of the region.
- [201] Adding to the above point, several participants stated that the length of the workshop is too short to be able to discuss important issues other than standards.
- [202] Some participants reiterated the strong need for more simulation exercises, noting that not all countries have the financial means to conduct one. The participants stressed the need for more development funds to support the countries in the region.
- [203] Azerbaijan indicated a willingness to conduct a PCE, and a letter of request had been sent to the FAO Office.
- [204] One participant called the IPPC Secretariat to provide interpretation and translation into Russian for more IPPC e-learning courses, guides, and webinars.
- [205] The IPPC Regional Workshop for the Europe and Central Asia *called* the IPPC Secretariat to launch a survey to gather topics of interest for the Europe and Central Asia region to be included in the agenda of 2024 IPPC regional workshops.

---

<sup>8</sup> All references to Kosovo should be understood to be in the context of United Nations Security Council resolution 1244 (1999).

[206] The IPPC Regional Workshop for the Europe and Central Asia *proposed* to add additional days to the 2024 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia to cover more topics of interest to the countries in the region.

## **9 CONCLUSION OF THE WORKSHOP. DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT REGIONAL WORKSHOP**

[207] The chairperson thanked the IPPC Secretariat and the co-organizers for organizing the regional workshop, as well as the participants and observers for participation and fruitful discussions.

[208] The venue for the 2024 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia was confirmed as Yerevan, Armenia, unless any changes occur. The exact dates of the workshop to be communicated by the IPPC Secretariat.

## **10 ONLINE SURVEY OF THE WORKSHOP**

[209] The chairperson invited the participants to complete the final evaluation survey, which is available in English and Russian languages.

## **11 ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

[210] The Steering Committee of the 2023 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia region would review and adopt the report. The report would be posted on IPP. The IPPC Secretariat will notify the participants of the publication of the report.

## **12 CLOSE OF THE MEETING**

[211] The chairperson thanked the IPPC Secretariat, and the co-organizers and closed the workshop.

**Appendix 1: Agenda****2023 IPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA****THEME: PLANT HEALTH FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**

**4-6 September 2023**  
**Podgorica, Montenegro**

Day	Daily schedule	Coffee breaks
4 September	09.00-12.30 and 14:00-17.00	10.30 (group photo) and 15.00
5 September	09.00-12.30 and 14.00-17:00	10.30 and 15.00
6 September	09.00-12.30 and 14.00-17.00	10.30 and 15.00

**AGENDA**

*(Updated 2023-09-01)*

No	Item	Presenter/Facilitator	Time (min.)	Document
<b>Day 1, morning</b>				
<b>1</b>	<b>Opening of the Session</b>		<b>20</b>	
1.1	Welcome remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IPPC Secretariat</li> <li>- FAO REU</li> <li>- EPPO</li> <li>- Host country</li> </ul>			Video
<b>2</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>	Chairperson	<b>5</b>	
2.1	Election of the Chairperson			
2.2	Election of the Rapporteur			
2.3	Adoption of the Agenda			Doc
<b>3</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>	Co-organizer	<b>5</b>	
3.1	Participants list			Doc
<b>4.</b>	<b>Updates on governance and strategic issues</b>			
4.1	Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)	Bureau Member/ IPPC Secretariat	15	Presentation

No	Item	Presenter/Facilitator	Time (min.)	Document
4.2	Update from the SC	SC Member	15	Presentation
4.3	Update from the IC	IC Member	15	Presentation
<b>Day 1, afternoon</b>				
<b>5</b>	<b>Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations</b> (this will involve presentations, discussion and questions from workshop's participants)			
5.1	Reorganization and revision of <i>pest risk analysis</i> standards (2020-001)	EPPO Panel Member/ SC Member	60	Presentation
5.2	<i>International movement of mango</i> (Mangifera indica) <i>fruit</i> . Draft Annex to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> ) (2021-011)	SC Member	60	Presentation
5.3	<i>Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood</i> . Draft Annex to ISPM 39 ( <i>International movement of wood</i> ) (2015-004)	SC Member	60	Presentation
<b>Day 2, morning</b>				
5.4	2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 ( <i>Glossary on phytosanitary terms</i> ) (1994-001)	EPPO Panel Member/ SC Member	60	Presentation
5.5	<i>Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies</i> . Draft Annex to ISPM 37 ( <i>Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies</i> (Tephritidae)) (2018-011)	SC Member	60	Presentation
5.6	Draft CPM Recommendation on minimizing pest risk associated with sea container pathway	IC Member	30	Presentation
<b>6</b>	<b>Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/RPPO</b>  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 activities	EPPO	15	Presentation
6.3	2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation	IPPC Secretariat	25	Presentation
<b>Day 2, afternoon</b>				
<b>7</b>	<b>Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session)</b>  This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants			
7.1	New IPPC Guides and e-learning courses	IC Member	20	Presentation

No	Item	Presenter/Facilitator	Time (min.)	Document
7.2	Guide to regulation of wood packaging material (a new IPPC Guide to support the implementation of ISPM 15)	IC Member	30	Presentation
7.3	e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles	IC Member	15	Presentation
7.4	Draft Specification for a new IPPC guide: <i>Audits in the phytosanitary context</i> (2021-009)	IC Member	20	Doc/Presentation
<b>Breaks</b>	<b>Advertising slides on guides, training materials and the Standard Setting Process</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>Presentation</b>
<b>Day 3, morning</b>				
7.5	Benefits of conducting Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)	IPPC Secretariat/ IC Member	30	Presentation
7.6	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation in Uzbekistan	Uzbekistan	30	Presentation
7.7	The IPPC ePhyto Solution update and related regional developments  Update from the CPM Focus Group for ePhyto Sustainable Funding Model	EPPO/ FAO Regional Office	15	Presentation
7.8	National Reporting Obligations: update	IC Member	30	Presentation
<b>Day 3, afternoon</b>				
7.9	Contingency planning	North Macedonia	15	Presentation
7.10	Emerging pests (Cases of FAW and Fusarium TR4)	IPPC Secretariat	20	Presentation
7.11	IDPH 2023 and Look Ahead to 2024	IPPC Secretariat	10	Presentation
7.12	IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 Development Agenda Items	Bureau Member	15	Presentation
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion of the workshop/ Date and venue of the next workshop</b>	Chair	<b>5</b>	
<b>9</b>	<b>Online survey of the workshop</b>	All participants	<b>5</b>	<a href="#">Evaluation survey link</a> (available in EN and RU)
<b>10</b>	<b>Adoption of the Report</b> (Procedure to be decided)	All participants	<b>5</b>	
<b>11</b>	<b>Close of the meeting</b>	Chair	<b>5</b>	

---

No	Item	Presenter/Facilitator	Time (min.)	Document
12	Reflection on the IPPC Regional Workshop for ECA / exchange of experience	All participants	90	
13	Field visit to the vineyard	Host country		<a href="#">Information about the 13. Jul-Plantaže</a>

**Appendix 2: Participants list****IPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA****Podgorica, Montenegro, 4-6 September 2022***(Updated 2023-09-04)*

<b>Country/Organization</b>	<b>Name, Organization</b>	<b>E-mail account</b>
<b>Albania</b>	<b>Ms Valdete Buca</b> Director Directorate of Plant Health Policies, Seeds, Seedlings and Fertilizers Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development Albania	valdete.buca@bujqesia.gov.al
<b>Armenia</b>	<b>Mr Artur Nikoyan</b> Head of Phytosanitary Department Food Safety Inspection Body Armenia	nikoyanartur@mail.ru
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	<b>Mr Taleh Shamiyev</b> Head of Plant Health Department Food Safety Agency (AFSA) Azerbaijan	taleh.shamiyev@afsa.gov.az
<b>Belarus</b>	<b>Ms Tatsiana Balashova</b> Deputy Head State Plant Quarantine Inspectorate Main State Inspectorate for Seed Breeding, Quarantine and Plant Protection Belarus	rastenfito@ggiskzr.by
<b>Bosnia and Herzegovina</b>	<b>Ms Ajla Dautbasic</b> Senior Adviser for Plant Health Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations Bosnia and Herzegovina	ajla.dautbasic@uzzb.gov.ba
<b>Czechia</b>	<b>Ms Tana Klailova</b> Expert on EU and International Affairs Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture Czechia	Tana.Klailova@ukzuz.cz
<b>EPPO</b>	<b>Mr Dmitrii Musolin</b> Scientific Officer EPPO	dmitrii.musolin@eppo.int
<b>EPPO</b>	<b>Mr Nico Horn</b> Director General EPPO	nico.horn@eppo.int
<b>EPPO</b>	<b>Mr Valerio Lucchesi</b> Scientific Officer EPPO	lucchesi@eppo.int
<b>European Commission</b>	<b>Mr Harry Arijis</b> Deputy Head of Unit for Plant Health DG Health and Food Safety European Commission	Harry.ARIJS@ec.europa.eu

<b>FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia</b>	<b>Mr Piotr Wlodarczyk</b> Agricultural Officer Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia FAO	piotr.wlodarczyk@fao.org
<b>France</b>	<b>Ms Laurence Bouhot-Delduc</b> Expert in Plant Health International Affairs Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Souveraineté Alimentaire France	laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr
<b>Greece</b>	<b>Ms Stavroula Ioannidou</b> Regulatory Expert Head of Department of Phytosanitary Control Greece	stioannidou@minagric.gr
<b>Italy</b>	<b>Ms Mariangela Ciampitti</b> Plant Protection Service Regione Lombardia Italy	mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it
<b>Latvia</b>	<b>Mr Ringolds Arnitis</b> Senior Expert State Plant Protection Service Latvia	ringolds.arnitis@hotmail.com
<b>Latvia</b>	<b>Ms Kristine Lomakina</b> Director State Plant Protection Service Latvia	kristine.lomakina@vaad.gov.lv
<b>Malta</b>	<b>Mr John Baptist Cassar</b> Chief Agricultural Officer Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Animal Rights Malta	john-baptist.cassar@gov.mt
<b>Montenegro</b>	<b>Ms Zorka Prijević</b> Deputy Director of Sector for Phytosanitary Affairs Administration for Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Affairs of Montenegro Montenegro	zorka.prljevic@ubh.gov.me
<b>Montenegro</b>	<b>Ms Gordana Fušić</b> Senior Advisor of Department for Plant Health Protection Administration for Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Affairs of Montenegro Montenegro	gordana.fustic@ubh.gov.me
<b>Montenegro</b>	<b>Ms Maja Petrović</b> Senior Advisor of Department for Plant Health Protection Administration for Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Affairs of Montenegro Montenegro	maja.petrovic@ubh.gov.me
<b>Montenegro</b>	<b>Ms Tamara Popović</b> Head of Department for Plant Health Protection Administration for Food Safety, Veterinary and Phytosanitary Affairs of Montenegro	tamara.popovic@ubh.gov.me



	Montenegro	
<b>The Kingdom of Netherlands</b>	<b>Mr Marco Traa</b> COPHS policy affairs. Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food quality The Kingdom of Netherlands	m.j.w.traa@minInv.nl
<b>The Kingdom of Netherlands</b>	<b>Mr Thorwald Geuze</b> Senior Officer Plant Health Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA) The Kingdom of Netherlands	t.geuze@nvwa.nl
<b>North Macedonia</b>	<b>Mr Mentor Zeqiri</b> Director Phytosanitary Directorate Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy North Macedonia	mentor.zekiri@gmail.com
<b>PHWB</b>	<b>Ms Ane Sindik</b> Team Leader PHWB	asindik.ext@aenor.com
<b>PHWB</b>	<b>Ms Vlasta Knapič</b> Strategic Coordinator PHWB	vknapic.ext@aenor.com
<b>PHWB</b>	<b>Mr Martin Ward</b> Expert on International Cooperation PHWB	martin@york56.myzen.co.uk
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<b>Mr Konstantin Kornev</b> Deputy Director All-Russian Plant Quarantine Center (FGBU "VNIKR") Russian Federation	konstantin.kornev@gmail.com
<b>Russian Federation</b>	<b>Mr Igor Rylkov</b> Head of Department for Pest Risks and International Cooperation All-Russian Plant Quarantine Center (FGBU "VNIKR") Russian Federation	intervniikr@gmail.com
<b>Serbia</b>	<b>Ms Sladjana Lucki</b> Head of Department for Plant Health and Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Management Serbia	sladjana.lukic@minpolj.gov.rs
<b>USDA/APHIS</b>	<b>Ms Diana Chapman</b> Agricultural Specialist U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service USA	diana.l.chapman@usda.gov
<b>USDA/APHIS</b>	<b>Ms Hala Toubia</b> Agricultural Specialist	hala.toubia@usda.gov

	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service USA	
<b>Uzbekistan</b>	<b>Mr Sultan-Makhmud Sultanov</b> Chief Specialist NPPO Uzbekistan	glavkaruz@mail.ru
<b>IPPC Secretariat</b>	<b>Ms Sarah Brunel</b> Programme Officer IPPC Secretariat FAO	sarah.brunel@fao.org
<b>IPPC Secretariat</b>	<b>Ms Rokhila Madaminova</b> IPPC Programme Specialist IPPC Secretariat FAO	rokhila.madaminova@fao.org