

REPORT OF THE IPPC-APPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP

2 – 6 September 2024

Amid Hotel, Seoul, Republic of Korea



Contents

SUMMARY OF MEETING	4
SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS.....	4
OPENING OF SESSION & MEETING ARRANGEMENTS	6
1. Opening of the workshop	6
1.1. Welcome remarks	6
2. Meeting arrangements.....	7
2.1. Election of chair	7
2.2. Election of rapporteur.....	7
2.3. Adoption of the agenda	7
3. Administrative matters.....	7
3.1. Participant list & other administrative matters	7
IPPC UPDATES.....	7
4. Updates on governance and strategic issues.....	7
4.1. Governance and strategy (Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), CPM Bureau)	7
4.2. Update from Standards Committee.....	8
4.3. Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)....	9
4.4. Strengthening pest outbreak and response systems (POARS).....	11
4.5. CPM focus group on sea containers.....	12
4.6. CPM focus group on safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (FGSA).....	14
SECTION 1: CONSULTATION ON ISPMS.....	15
5. Discussion on substantive comments on draft standards.....	15
5.1 1st Consultation: draft annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection).....	15
5.2 1st Consultation: draft revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021-010)	20
5.3 1st Consultation: Draft annex <i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds)</i>	26
5.4 2nd Consultation: Draft annex <i>International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46</i>	31
5.5 2nd Consultation: Draft annex <i>Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood)</i>	33

5.6	Draft specification on holistic revision of the draft <i>reorganized pest risk analysis standard</i> (2023-037).....	36
SECTION 2: FAO/RPPO FRAMEWORK.....		37
6.	APPPC activities and strategic plan implementation.....	37
SECTION 3: IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS		39
7.	Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session).....	39
7.1	Sustainable funding mechanism for ePhyto solution	39
7.2	Update on TR4 global and regional coordination	40
7.3	E-commerce guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade	41
7.4	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments	41
7.5	IPPC commodity standards:	42
7.6	IPPC advertising.....	44
APPPC Activities		44
8.	APPPC activities	44
8.1.	APPPC 33rd session in China.....	44
8.2.	RSPMs on longan fruit and white rice.....	44
CLOSING SESSION		44
9.	Conclusion of the workshop.....	44
10.	Online survey of the workshop	45
11.	Date and venue of the next regional workshop.....	45
12.	Report.....	45
13.	Close of meeting.....	45

SUMMARY OF MEETING

The primary objective of the APPPC workshop was to engage participants from the APPPC member countries in the review of the draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) for first and second consultation and decide regional comments for 2024. The workshop was also a forum for updating member countries on IPPC activities related to standards and implementation, developing capacity in a range of areas related to plant protection and an opportunity to share experiences at the regional level.

The draft ISPMs for discussion were:

First consultation

1. Draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010)
2. Draft annex to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) on field inspection (2021-018)
3. Draft annex to ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) on the design and use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds. (2018-009)

Second consultation

4. Draft annex International movement of fresh *Mangifera indica* fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)
5. Draft annex Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*)

The agreed regional comments on the draft ISPMs were entered into the IPPC online commenting system (OCS) during the meeting at: <https://ippc.int/en/online-comment-system>. This report provides a description of the discussion to support the agreed regional comments.

Presenters provided updates on the sustainable funding mechanism for the ePhyto solution, the TR4 global and regional coordination, the e-commerce guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade, the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE), and the call for information materials for new commodity standards.

The next regional workshop on draft ISPMs is tentatively planned for 8-12 September 2025 hosted by the Republic of Korea.

SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS

1. APPPC members to consider nominating members for new IPPC Focus Groups when calls are made. Calls for nominations are at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/commission/cpm-focus-group-reports/calls-nominations-for-cpm-fg/>
2. APPPC members to submit topics for guides and training materials, participate in webinars, respond to IPPC surveys, support translations of IPPC guides and training materials and submit ideas for new approaches for the development process of guidance material.

- a. APPPC members to respond to the survey on e-commerce by **31 October 2024** to ensure regional data is obtained (<https://www.ippc.int/en/resources/multimedia/online-tools/ippc-observatory/ippc-observatory-e-commerce-study/>).
3. Ms VIVIAN-SMITH to raise the issue of the timing and prioritization of developing guidance material to complement the newly adopted ISPMs with the IPPC Bureau. Also, the IPPC Secretariat, IC and SC regional representatives to raise this issue with their respective committees (*also refer to action item 6*).
4. APPPC members to consider if a webinar or interactive session on how to use the IPP to meet national reporting obligations would be beneficial. APPPC members to discuss at the Biennial session in September in China. If there is interest, Ms VIVIAN-SMITH will raise at the IPPC Bureau meeting.
5. APPPC members to support the agreed regional comments in the OCS and add country comments on the draft annex *Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)* that could not be discussed as regional comments. Specific areas for focus include:
 - a. general comments on the structure and logical order of the standard;
 - b. giving a country preference for whether the draft document should be an annex to ISPM 23 or, to a standalone ISPM.
6. APPPC members to support the agreed regional comments in the OCS and add country comments on the draft revision of *ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010)* considering the discussions at the regional workshop. Specific areas for focus include:
 - a. propose text to address how to evaluate the effectiveness of surveillance systems with respect to fruit fly pest free areas (ISPM 26).
7. Ms YIM to discuss with the IC the urgency for the development of specific guidance information on fruit fly species and their life cycles in different climates to support the revised ISPM 26.
8. APPPC members to provide country comments in the OCS on the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds)* considering the discussions at the regional workshop. (NB: No regional comments were included on the OCS due to the complexity of the concept of the annex).
9. APPPC members to support the adoption of the annex and consider adding country comments in the OCS on the *Draft annex International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46* considering the discussions at the regional workshop. (NB: No regional comments were included on the OCS due to the technical nature of the annex).
10. APPPC members to support the agreed regional comments in the OCS and add country comments on the draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks*



associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood) by considering the discussions at the regional workshop.

11. APPPC members to support the agreed regional comments in the OCS and add country comments on the *Draft specification on holistic revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis standard (2023-037)* considering the discussions at the regional workshop.
12. The IPPC Secretariat to follow up on letters regarding voluntary country contributions to e-Phyto.
13. APPPC members to submit information for the development of 4 new topics for commodity standards. The deadline for providing information is **30 September 2024**. The call is available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/news/ippc-secretariat-calls-for-information-material-to-future-commodities-standards/> for:
 - a. international movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris*;
 - b. international movement of fresh taro (*Colocasia esculenta*) for consumption;
 - c. international movement of fresh banana (*Musa paradisiaca*) fruit;
 - d. international movement of *Citrus* fruit.
14. APPPC members to nominate experts for working groups to develop regional standards (RSPMs) when calls are made.

OPENING OF SESSION & MEETING ARRANGEMENTS

1. Opening of the workshop

1.1. Welcome remarks

Mr Kyung Bong KOH, Director, Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency (APQA), Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, Republic of Korea, welcomed the IPPC Secretariat representatives and all participants to the meeting. Mr KOH introduced the pre-recorded welcoming remarks by the Secretary of the IPPC, Mr Osama EL-LISSY.

Mr EL-LISSY thanked the hosting countries of the Regional Workshops and stressed the importance of international standard setting to global plant health. He highlighted the fundamental need of having the voices of all the IPPC community heard as it was important for efforts to protect plant health globally and that international cooperation was paramount. The regional meetings are an important mechanism for supporting plant health and he wished all participants a successful meeting.

Mr Avetik NERSISYAN, from the IPPC Secretariat, also welcomed participants and informed the workshop participants of the retirement of Mr EL-LISSY. He described the arrangements in place until a new appointment to replace Mr EL-LISSY could be made. He estimated that the recruitment process would take approximately 6 months. He encouraged all those suitable for the position to apply.

Mr NERSISYAN thanked the hosting country, Korea, and specifically thanked Ms Kyu-Ock KIM for her continued commitment to the IPPC. He highlighted that the idea of regional workshops came from the APPPC and how the initiative had since become

important to all regions. He introduced Mr Emmanuel KRAH and Mr KRAH's role in providing support for the OCS. He encouraged questions throughout the meetings. He also encouraged participants to work constructively to decide regional comments on the draft standards for consultation.

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1. Election of chair

Ms Kyu-Ock YIM, Republic of Korea was elected as the chair.

2.2. Election of rapporteur

Ms Joanne WILSON, New Zealand, was designated the report writer for the workshop and Ms Lauren MADDEN and Ms Mi Chi YEA were nominated as rapporteurs.

2.3. Adoption of the agenda

Ms YIM discussed the agenda (Attachment 1) and noted that flexibility would be applied with times to ensure that all the draft ISPMs were covered.

3. Administrative matters

3.1. Participant list & other administrative matters

Ms Mi Chi YEA gave an overview of the meeting arrangements including the official welcome dinner, the field trip to the Forest Technology Management Research Centre and National Arboretum (day 4) and the lunch on the final day of the meeting hosted by the Director of APQA. She briefly provided information about the city and local sites in the old part of Seoul where the meeting was held.

The participant list is in Attachment 2 of this report. The meeting was attended by participants from 16 countries. Apologies were received from Mr Yubak DHOJ GC, APPPC Secretariat. He was unable to attend the meeting due to issues securing funding.

Attachment 3 contains a list of acronyms used in this report.

IPPC UPDATES

4. Updates on governance and strategic issues

4.1. Governance and strategy (Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), CPM Bureau)

As Bureau member, Ms Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH provided an overview of the IPPC (the vision, mission objectives and core activities), the roles of its various governance and subsidiary bodies, meetings and decisions i.e. CPM-18, CPM Bureau, the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), Standards Committee (SC) and Standards Committee 7 (SC-7), Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), Focus Groups (FGs) and the Africa Phytosanitary Programme. FGs covered topics including strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems, climate change and phytosanitary issues, sea

containers, safe provisions of food and other humanitarian aid and sustainable funding of the IPPC ePhyto solutions.

One Health is likely to be discussed further at the IPPC Strategic Planning Group (SPG) meeting. There is a world congress on One Health in South Africa later this year. A CPM FG on Plant Health in the context of One Health will develop recommendations for CPM to consider next year.

Several activities regarding the Strategic Framework (SF) development agenda items (DIAs) that are either underway or completed are:

- a. the creation of a draft *Investment Prospectus for the Strategic Framework Development Agenda Items*;
- b. a technical resource entitled *Climate-change impacts on plant pests* (an output of the FG on Climate Change);
- c. terms of reference developed and adopted for a FG on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (GPRC) and a FG on Global Laboratory Diagnostic Networking (GLDN)

The CPM also made progress on the implementation of the Communications Strategy. This includes the establishment of the IPPC Regional Communications Networks and a steering group; a redesign of the IPPC website and IPPC branding; the release of 16 IPPC newsletters in 2023-2024; and hosting an International Day of Plant Health event.

Other notable achievements included seven regional workshops in 2023 and two Technical Consultations among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPO) meetings. These meetings promote the development and use of the international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) and encourage inter-regional cooperation in plant health.

The CPM endorsed the Africa Phytosanitary Programme and the approach to empower governments and stakeholders with the technical capacity to manage plant pests effectively and consistently. Contracting parties were encouraged by the CPM to advocate for donor support for the programme noting the significant contributions already made by several countries and regions.

Discussion:

The Chair noted that a lot of activities were underway and encouraged countries to nominate members for new FGs when calls are made.

Action 1: APPPC members to consider nominating members for new IPPC Focus Groups when calls are made. Calls for nominations are at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/commission/cpm-focus-group-reports/calls-nominations-for-cpm-fg/>

4.2. Update from Standards Committee

The update from the SC was presented by SC member, MR Masahiro SAI. Mr SAI provided background on the role of the Standard Setting Unit of the IPPC Secretariat, introduced staff and outlined the work of the SC in 2024. The SC is composed of 25



members from 7 FAO regions who meet in May and November each year. There are four technical panels overseen by the SC.

Ms Mi Chi YEA, Republic of Korea, recently replaced Ms Chonticha RAKKRAI, Thailand, in the Standards Committee. Mr SINGH, India, will start in November.

This year SC approved three ISPMs for first consultation, two for second consultation, four draft annexes to ISPM 28 (phytosanitary treatments), three diagnostic protocols and one specification. The draft ISPMs will be discussed in this meeting. The draft phytosanitary treatments will not be discussed during this regional workshop nor will the draft diagnostic protocols.

Discussion:

The Chair noted that the SC worked hard to approve the standards for consultation. She drew attention to the annex on Khapra beetle treatment which is not under discussion at this meeting. The annex provides irradiation and modified atmosphere treatment for Khapra beetle and noted its relevance to the draft RSPM on milled rice.

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

The update from the IC was presented by IC member, Mr Xiaoliang WANG. Mr WANG gave a brief introduction on the role of the IC to support the implementation of the IPPC, strengthen the phytosanitary capacity of contracting parties and oversee the IPPC Strategic Framework Development Agenda Items. There are 14 members of the IC including 7 regional representatives, 5 experts, 1 RPPO and 1 SC representative. The IC meets face-to-face twice per year and has a demanding work programme.

Since November 2023 the IC has worked towards strengthening the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS), managing e-commerce postal and courier pathways, developing guidance on the use of third-party entities, and harmonizing electronic data exchange. The IC subgroup on the IPPC observatory initiated a study on e-commerce in 2024 and will conduct a general survey and evaluation of the IPPC strategic framework in 2025. Also, in 2025 the IC subgroup will conduct a survey on antimicrobial resistance.

The IC reported several significant achievements in the past year, most notably a review of 13 contributed resources, of which 9 are posted on the IPP, and the development and delivery of simulation exercises for *Fusarium* tropical race 4 (TR4) – Panama wilt disease, a diagnostic course and virtual surveillance course for TR4. Ongoing work of the IC includes finalising the risk-based inspection guide, the development of further e-learning courses and a curriculum for training plant health officers in collaboration with the FAO e-learning academy.

It was highlighted that in 2025 there would be a call for IPPC Observatory topics for studies and surveys and that this would be merged with the main IPPC call for standards and implementation materials.

Mr WANG described ways to get involved including submitting topics for guides and training materials, participating in webinars, responding to IPPC observatory surveys, support translations of IPPC guides and training materials etc.

Discussion:

Ms ZHU, New Zealand, commented on the contributions made on implementation issues during the commenting on new and revised ISPMs. She questioned how these issues are captured in the development of guidance material by the IC. At present there is quite a delay between the adoption of standards and the development of implementation materials. Mr WANG recognised this delay and said that the IC was looking for ways to improve this through resourcing.

Mr Avetik NERSISYAN suggested that during the call for topics, countries could include guidance materials and encouraged ideas for new approaches. Mr NERSISYAN suggested that the SC and IC work together to collaborate on standards and guidance material. Ms ZHU said that generally implementation materials are proposed (e.g. Australia proposed guidance material for ISPM 26) during the call for topics but the topic may not be prioritised by the IC. The prioritisation process does not currently align with the standard setting process which leaves gaps in information. Ms ZHU asked if there was specific funding allocated for the development of implementation materials, if there was any consideration of requesting funding from non-NPPOs to develop guides and, if there was a conflict of interests by doing so. Ms Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH thought that there were no issues with seeking non-NPPO funding.

The Chair noted the time gaps between adopting standards and guides, and this is being discussed at IC including the resources needed for developing guides and noted that more sustainable funding is needed. She also added that in the current workflow, implementation materials are only considered for development after adoption of relevant ISPMs, resulting in significant gaps in some cases. There is a high demand for guides and the message will be taken to the IC on how this situation can be improved. The IC is a relatively new committee and there needs to be more discussion on how the current issues can be resolved with the Bureau.

Ms ZHU reiterated her question of whether implementation issues highlighted during the consultation on draft ISPMs are analysed in some way and by whom. Collation of this information would highlight what new topics are needed. Mr NERSISYAN responded that the SC could propose implementation materials to the CPM and that it was not always necessary to go through the call for topics. ISPMs include guidance materials and could be used to minimise implementation materials. The decision makers are CPM, Bureau, SC and IC and the voices of NPPOs are important.

Mr Bhoj Raj SAPKOTA, Nepal, agreed with Ms ZHU's comments and specifically highlighted issues with the implementation of irradiation treatments. Ms Kamani Priyadarshani Siyambalapitiyage DONA, Sri Lanka, highlighted the problems her country had with inspection. Ms ZHU encouraged a coordinated process to ensure that implementation issues are addressed and not lost.

The Chair noted that previously there used to be workshops on new ISPMs, but this had not happened more recently.

Action 2: APPPC members to submit topics for guides and training materials, participate in webinars, respond to IPPC surveys, support translations of IPPC guides and training

materials and submit ideas for new approaches for the development process of guidance material.

- a. APPPC members to respond to the survey on e-commerce by **31 October 2024** to ensure regional data is obtained (<https://www.ippc.int/en/resources/multimedia/online-tools/ippc-observatory/ippc-observatory-e-commerce-study/>). (*from discussion on agenda item on e-commerce*)

Action 3: Ms VIVIAN-SMITH to raise the issue of the timing and prioritization of developing guidance material to complement the newly adopted ISPMs with the IPPC Bureau. Also, the IPPC Secretariat, IC and SC regional representatives to raise this issue with their respective committees (*also refer to action item 7*).

4.4. Strengthening pest outbreak and response systems (POARS)

The item was presented by IPPC Bureau member, Ms Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH. The presentation provided a background on the POARS system and highlighted that strengthening POARS is one of the eight development agenda items of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030. As such a FG on POARS was established to provide recommendations on effective POARS. The FG studied existing national, regional, and global systems to determine overall strengths and weaknesses. This included studying plant, animal, and food safety systems. The POARS group proposed developing criteria for what constitutes an emerging pest rather than having the TPG develop a definition.

The FG made eight recommendations including regarding system components, legal frameworks, criteria for pests to be considered under POARS, early identification of outbreaks and communicating alerts, systems and tools, processes for engagement and resources and other generic POARS tools. The FG also provided a list of actions that RPPOs may take.

In 2024 a Steering Group initiated work on establishing POARS capability. The Steering Group will provide governance to the IC to ensure synergy, POARS technical development advice, strategies for collaboration and resource mobilization strategies, and made recommendations regarding POARS resourcing (personnel and finance).

POARS has an agreed action plan and will report progress at the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) and the CPM Bureau meetings in Oct 2024 and CPM-19 in 2025.

Discussion:

The Chair commented that POARS has been discussed for some time and that it is not an easy task. The contributions of the countries are very important to the success of POARS. The chair noted that POARS was now quite advanced as one of the IPPC strategic development items but asked if there was discussion on other development agenda items. Ms VIVIAN-SMITH said POARS needed more resources as do other strategic development items. There needed to be a staged approach to all the items recognising that new tasks are coming up such as 'One Health' that were not previously considered. She suggested that the current IPPC Strategic Framework may need to be extended or revisited.



The current Strategic Framework is quite ambitious and there needed to be further discussion on it at Bureau.

Mr Bhoj Raj SAPKOTA, Nepal, noted that the role of neighbouring countries is important for POARS. He asked if there were any provisions for neighbouring countries to be involved. Ms VIVIAN-SMITH noted that contracting parties needed to act on their obligations although this is a complex matter and may not always be possible.

Mr Glenn PANGANIBAN, Philippines, asked if there was anything that could be done on disaster risk management and climate change that could help to move POARS forward. Ms VIVIAN-SMITH said that POARS was more about reporting rather than responding although there are strong links between the two. A workshop could be considered for addressing the issue. Mr PANGANIBAN noted that there was a fall armyworm workshop in the region that discussed this.

The Chair hoped that the SPG would discuss this issue in the framework of the IPPC. Ms ZHU, commented from a regional perspective and sharing of pest information was one of the APPPC Strategic Framework objectives for the region. She encouraged participants to think about what tasks could be considered under the APPPC Strategic Framework (to be discussed at the Biennial meeting in China) to ensure prompt information sharing to minimise spread and, what platforms could be used to facilitate information sharing despite the current limitations. The willingness to share information was also a consideration. Ms VIVIAN-SMITH noted that there is a good reporting system in the IPPC. There could be a workshop on how to use the IPPC reporting function.

Action 4: APPPC members to consider if a webinar or interactive session on how to use the IPPC to meet national reporting obligations would be beneficial. APPPC members to discuss at the Biennial session in September in China. If there is interest, Ms VIVIAN-SMITH will raise at the IPPC Bureau meeting.

4.5. CPM focus group on sea containers

The agenda item was presented by IPPC Bureau member, Ms Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH, and discussed the purpose of the FG, the global risk context, the complexities of sea container commerce, the options explored by the FG for risk management, potential future solutions and why the term of the FG was extended.

The key functions of the FG included: identifying and describing a preferred option or options that contribute to pest risk management; examining the practicalities needed for such options; exploring the global commercially driven solution; revising the CPM recommendation on sea containers (R-06); and considering and estimating the resources required by NPPOs and industry parties to establish and operate preferred options.

The FG collected data from four countries and international literature to determine pest interception rates on sea containers and concluded that global action is required, actions need to be practical, effective at reducing pest risk and be cost-effective noting the large and complex nature of the risk pathway.



The options explored by the FG for managing pest risk on sea containers included: raising awareness through education and outreach, industry-led programmes, best practices at critical points in the supply chain by industry, automated detection capabilities, improved container designs, development of an international phytosanitary standard, third party authorization with NPPO oversight, incorporating phytosanitary measures into multilateral frameworks, and revising the CTU Code which is a non-mandatory global code of practice for handling and packing of cargo transport units.

So far, the FG have:

- a. revised the CPM recommendation on minimizing pest risk associated with the sea container pathway to provide interim guidance;
- b. proposed an industry-led approach to management;
- c. updated the CTU Code with a new chapter on pest contamination and amendments to roles and responsibilities;
- d. made proposals to the World Customs Organisation (WCO) to update their SAFE framework of standards to secure and facilitate global trade re cooperating and aligning compliance and other activities between customs and agricultural agencies; and collaboration between border agencies to harmonise border control processes, measures and strategies.
- e. initiated discussions with WCO on tracking container cleanliness through customs declarations;
- f. proposed changes to container designs to minimise pest contamination and pest detectability with two countries currently conducting trials and collecting data on the efficacy of new container designs;

Other initiatives include:

- a. Australia hosting a workshop on sea container hygiene earlier this year;
- b. Australia and China collaborating on a container design trial to collect data on improvements to container designs.

Future solutions being trialled and/or discussed are:

- a. the use of eDNA and eRNA testing trials to determine critical control points for pest management;
- b. automated threat detection systems such as cameras mounted on cranes and machine learning to identify biosecurity risks in real time;
- c. hand-held hyperspectral imaging cameras to detect and categorize biosecurity threats.

The term for the FG has been extended so they can continue to assess the effectiveness of the CPM recommendation on sea containers, continue to analyse options and their impacts, and provide guidance on the feasibility of an ISPM as a long-term solution.

Discussion:

Ms Mi Chi YEA, Korea acknowledged that this is not easy work. Korea has communicated the recommendations to industry groups. Despite awareness there is concerns that trade logistics could be interrupted if a standard was developed. The NPPO of Korea does not

have jurisdiction over containers and the issues cannot be addressed by single countries or a region. She requested that the sea container FG consider these issues.

Ms VIVIAN-SMITH said that there was only information from four countries about the pest risks from containers and more is needed to highlighted risks to the CPM. Recent workshops have included many industry representatives, and it has been encouraging that they understand the risks. It is important to work together and collecting the evidence is a very important way to communicate the risks.

The Chair informed participants that the Biennial session would decide if there will be a regional standard on sea containers. The topic was proposed by China and India during the recent APPPC call for topics. There was an old APPPC draft standard developed in the region many years ago, but it was not adopted. Now with the issue being highlighted internationally it is timely that it is discussed regionally. Unfortunately, progress is slow considering there are tangible pest risks. Hopefully the APPPC can have a practical discussion on this. Mr Xiaoliang WANG, China, queried the old draft that was developed. The Chair said that the old draft will be an important resource if the Biennial session chose to progress a regional standard.

Mr Prateep ARAYAKITTIPONG, Thailand, expressed his concerns about how to implement a standard because of the limited powers of some NPPOs. The Chair noted that this is a concern of many countries. She noted that the risks of wood packaging had a similar issue but was resolved through collaboration. Ms ZHU supported what the Chair said and expressed the need for data to highlight the risk. She also drew attention to the safe provision of food and humanitarian aid and that countries needed to take responsibility to limit the spread of pests. With respect to sea containers, countries such as New Zealand have developed a national standard. A regional standard or guidance on limiting the spread of pests on sea containers could be very useful and the APPPC had pioneered many changes with respect to new standards.

Ms Natsumi YAMADA, Japan, noted that Japan has discussed sea container hygiene with industry and were committed to gathering information on the pest risks. Likewise, Mr Glenn PANGANIBAN, the Philippines, supported sea container cleanliness and has been gathering information.

4.6. CPM focus group on safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (FGSA)

The agenda item was presented by Ms Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH and discussed the background and purpose of the FG to reduce the pest risks that can occur during emergency situations e.g. where emergency aid supplies can host pests and the affected country may be constrained in their ability to implement phytosanitary actions.

A CPM recommendation on the “*Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (R-09)*” has been adopted but it is acknowledged that more is needed. As such the FG are looking at:

- a. gaps in the current suite of ISPMs;
- b. the complexity of the topic and the need for a suite of materials and tools;
- c. donor agencies and engagement partnerships;

- d. an action plan in collaboration with the World Organization for Animal Health (WOAH), the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CODEX) and the World Food Programme (WFP);
- e. developing communications and advocacy material;
- f. developing a specification for an ISPM;
- g. a webinar on '*Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid*'.

Participants were invited to discuss the role of the RPPOs and NPPOs in supporting the work of the FG and the topic. The mandate of the FG has been extended to 2026. The next meeting of the FG will be 7-10 October in Barbados.

Discussion:

Mr Glenn PANGANIBAN commented that the Philippines, have been a beneficiary of aid and have a good relationship with foreign aid agencies and government. He stressed the need for good communication.

Ms Gabrielle VIVIAN-SMITH said the comments on the draft specification will be reviewed by the Standards Committee and the CPM will decide if a standard should be developed. Mr Avertik NERSISYAN noted that there was a lack of a mechanism for stopping the spread of pests through aid. He also said that a standard could provide the mechanism for governments to consider.

The Chair asked if contamination of aid by insect pests is the most significant problem with receiving humanitarian aid. Ms VIVIAN-SMITH highlighted that it was not restricted to insect pests. There are a range of pests including storage pests, mycotoxins, propagative material and pathogens affecting plant germplasm which is needed for rebuilding agriculture after a disaster. She also referred to pests such as rhinoceros beetle that have proved to be an important issue in Pacific aid programmes. The Chair confirmed that the development of an ISPM was not yet decided.

SECTION 1: CONSULTATION ON ISPMS

5. Discussion on substantive comments on draft standards

All IPPC presentations for the 2024 regional workshops can be found at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/events/regional-ippc-workshops/2024-ippc-regional-workshop/>

5.1 1st Consultation: draft annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)

The draft standard was introduced by Mr Masahiro SAI, the Standards Committee steward for the draft standard. The draft standard was developed by an expert working group (EWG) in Oct 2023 based on Specification 74. Field inspection is a phytosanitary measure to inspect field crops, seed crops, mother plants and other plants in fields (including plants in open fields, in nurseries, under protected cultivation and in controlled environments). Field inspection is required by many importing countries as a phytosanitary import requirement aimed at reducing, directly or indirectly, the pest risk associated with the international

movement of plants. The annex was developed because it was considered that there was a lack of guidance on field inspection leading to some confusion about its objectives and that of specific surveillance.

The draft annex describes the requirements for inspection in the field, conducted by, or on behalf of NPPOs, specifically for plants being produced for international trade either as a standalone measure or a component of a systems approach. The specific requirements include documentation, verification of the identity of the field and plants, visual examination for pests and with other phytosanitary measures. It provides guidance on planning a field inspection, outcomes of inspection and the responsibilities of NPPOs.

General comments:

China supports the draft but thought the contents needed reorganising. China believed that the main purpose of the standard is how to conduct field inspection rather than the planning process of field inspection. China's main comments and recommendations on the document structure were:

- moving section 7 before section 5 as it seems intuitive to plan field inspection before initiating field inspection activities;
- moving the 'Responsibilities of NPPOs' to before section 4;
- sections 3-5 reorganised to remove repetition with ISPM 23 and make the annex more logical.

The Chair suggested all countries consider the logical order of the standard and make country comments. Reorganising the standard was considered too challenging for the time allotted during the workshop. Australia supported China's comment. Australia also believes the annex is quite repetitive and repetition could be removed.

The Chair attended the EWG for the development of the annex and said the EWG discussed if it is appropriate to be an annex to ISPM 23 or, a separate ISPM. ISPM 23 is specifically for consignments and the draft annex goes beyond consignments and deals with the production of more than a consignment. Nepal's position is that the annex should not be an annex to ISPM 23. This was agreed by others while other countries did not provide comment.

The steward, Mr Masahiro SAI, clarified that similar comments on whether it should be an annex to ISPM 23 were received during the consultation on the specification.

The Chair clarified that the scope is not the same as ISPM 23. She suggested that countries make comments on the options for the annex as there were differing opinions on if it should be an annex or a separate ISPM. The Chair commended the EWG on their wide range of views on field inspection during the development of the standard.

Mr SAI talked more about the rationale for field inspection being annexed to ISPM 23 at the request of Thailand. The annex was approved by the SC to be annexed to ISPM 23 and the reasoning was covered in the specification. Mr SAI's preference was for it to be annexed to ISPM 23 and the Chair proposed that countries comment in the OCS about their preference.

Substantive and technical comments:

Section 1. Concept of field inspection

New Zealand proposed to add more specificity about when field inspection should be applied ‘during a specific time in the growing season’ [para 29]. Thailand suggested ‘during the development stage of plants’. Mr SAI, the steward, clarified that field inspection does not always have to be during the ‘growing season’ and can include dormant stages. Australia noted that there were a diverse range of experts on the EWG and that the wording didn’t need any additions. The Chair highlighted that the point made by New Zealand appears later in the text. No regional comment was agreed.

Korea proposed clarifying that field inspection needs to be for the production of ‘plants for planting for export in the exporting country’. Nepal proposed that clarifying where field inspection should occur in the first paragraph of the section might be a better option following on from New Zealand’s comment. However, the Chair noted that field inspection can also occur in the importing country in post-entry quarantine. No regional comment was agreed.

New Zealand suggested deleting ‘voluntary inspection programmes’ [para 29] as ‘voluntary’ is not something that needs to be covered by an ISPM. The Chair clarified that the reason it was included was that it was a quality process that an exporting country may use to support phytosanitary assurances. Thailand supported retaining the original text on voluntary nature of field inspection. No regional comment was agreed.

Section 3. Difference between field inspection and specific surveillance

China proposed moving this section to under section 1. Thailand proposed that [para 33] is removed as it is not necessary. Cambodia proposed that the section was important to be retained so that it is clear to staff what the difference between field inspection and specific surveillance is. Korea agreed that it should be retained to clarify the difference. The Chair clarified that the EWG thought it was necessary to define the difference between field inspection and specific surveillance. No regional comment was agreed.

Section 4. Assumptions involved in the application of field inspection

Thailand proposed to amend bullet 2 [para 37] to remove ‘more’ and ‘than’ and add ‘*in addition to inspection ...*’ as both field and consignment inspection would be needed. The steward clarified the assumptions made with the paragraph that it is about field inspection not consignment inspection. No regional comment was agreed.

Section 5. Other considerations for field inspection

China proposed adding a bullet point to include ‘*the number of plant samples to be inspected*’ after field size and configuration [para 45]. Thailand didn’t think it was necessary to include the additional bullet. Australia thought that it might be better termed ‘*sampling design*’. The Chair thought that sampling design was addressed later in the text.

[\[Para 45\] The regional comment agreed was to amend ‘*Inspection method, including sampling design, timing and frequency*’;](#)

Thailand requested clarification of what is meant by ‘configuration’ in [para 46] and if that meant the way a field is walked as it was inspected. The steward thought ‘configuration’ had a broader meaning which included Thailand’s interpretation. The Chair proposed that countries comment that it is not clear what is meant by ‘configuration’. No regional comment was agreed.

Korea proposed that an example would be useful for the bullet ‘difficulty of pest detection on a specific plant (e.g. xxx)’ [para 47]. Australia referred to the comment made by the PPPO which reworded the bullet to ‘the ability to detect the pest or signs or symptoms on a specific plant’ which would negate the need for examples.

[Para 47] The regional comment agreed was to amend the bullet to ‘the ability to detect the pest or signs or symptoms on a specific plant’.

Thailand proposed clarifying examples of documents that may be associated with field inspection section 6.1 i.e. field maps and their coordinates, site plans, field-identity documents [para 64].

[Para 64] The regional comment agreed was to amend bullet to field maps and their coordinates, site plans, field-identity documents.

Thailand proposed new text for examples of documents that may be associated with field inspection section 6.1 i.e. new bullet ‘bilateral agreement/arrangement or import permit conditions’. Sri Lanka described the situation in their country relating to import permits. It was noted that the bullet is an example only.

[Para 72] The regional comment agreed was to include a new bullet in section 6.1 i.e. bilateral agreement/arrangement or import permit conditions’ after [para 72].

China proposed to expand on the bullet ‘commercial contracts and invoices; and...’. The Chair questioned whether the NPPO could require a copy of a commercial contract. New Zealand proposed deleting the bullet.

[Para 72] The regional comment agreed was to delete the bullet as NPPOs may not always have access to commercial documents.

Section 6.3 Visual examination for pests and conformity with other phytosanitary requirements [Para 76]

Japan proposed to change the title to ‘Visual examination for ~~pests~~ plants and conformity with other phytosanitary requirements’ [para 76]. Mr SAI confirmed that ‘pests’ is the correct term in the title. No regional comment was agreed.

Section 7. Planning for field inspection

China proposed to change the title of the section to ‘Field inspection’ [para 90] as planning is an initiative. The Chair was hesitant to change the title as the new title is the same as the title of the annex.

[Para 90] The regional comment agreed was to amend the title of the section to ‘Field inspection’ as the section included more than just planning.

Thailand proposed to delete the title of 7.1 ‘The field inspection process’ [para 91] and use as an introductory sentence. Others agreed that the introductory text [para 92] is also not needed which aligned with the comments made by the PPPO.

[Para 91 and 92] The regional comment agreed was to propose deletion of [91] and [92] as they were not needed and noted that renumbering of titles would be required.

Section 7.2 Specific objectives of field inspection

Nepal suggested there needed to be more alignment with other standards with respect to bullet 4 [para 98]. The Chair suggested that this is why there was a need for the section that points out the difference between field inspection and specific surveillance.

Mr SAI clarified that the bullet was about verification of freedom within the field when it is inspected whereas surveillance is a much broader term. To overcome the confusion with the bullet Mr SAI suggested deleting reference to ‘*in a field*’. No regional comment was agreed.

Section 8. Field inspection outcome

Korea proposed to amend para [127] to ‘*If the target pest is detected or conformity with phytosanitary requirements is not verified, further actions should be taken under the responsibility of the NPPO. These actions may be determined by the nature of the findings, considering the pest or other objectives and circumstances and discussion with the NPPO of the importing country.*’

Nepal did not support the additional text. Mr SAI noted that field inspection is not always required under bilateral agreements. New Zealand noted that field inspection is only one method of supporting phytosanitary assurances and therefore the proposed new text implies that countries would need to do more to support their assurances than currently. The Chair noted that the NPPO is the responsible party, and the first addition is clear. However, she did not think the second addition was clear or needed. New Zealand made similar comments and Sri Lanka and the Chair gave examples to support the proposed addition. There was a discussion on examples of actions that could be taken by NPPOs without being explicit within the annex. New Zealand proposed that rather than ‘*if the target pest is detected*’ it is replaced with ‘*exceeding a tolerance level*’ to allow for all scenarios. No regional comments were agreed.

Section 9. Documentation

Japan highlighted that ‘*documentation is necessary for phytosanitary certification for consignments derived from the plants and essential for promoting consistency*’ and as such proposed additional wording to support this assertion in [para 129]. Korea and New Zealand did not consider it was necessary to specify this. Thailand gave an example of the documentation that would be required for their field inspections. No regional comment was agreed.

The Philippines proposed introducing a time period into para [130] for records retention. The Chair said that it was often difficult to define a time. No regional comment was agreed.

A new section proposed by Japan ‘*Review of field inspection*’ to capture the idea of monitoring by the importing country to verify that field inspection is working effectively by the exporting country. New Zealand thought this would be very difficult to achieve and that an importing country is more likely to require the exporting country to conduct a traceback investigation if there were doubts that field inspection was effective. Mr SAI referred to ISPM 23, section 2.6, and agreed that the section is not necessary. The Chair recalled that the EWG discussed an auditing programme to address non-conformities and to allow flexibility for the importing country. In practical terms this happens quite often. It was noted that monitoring has a definition in ISPM 5. No regional comment was agreed.

Implementation issues

Japan proposed that providing examples would support the implementation of the annex. The EWG discussed how to conduct a field inspection. The guide could include such information and Japan’s comment.

The Chair encouraged countries to include implementation issues when they make their comments in the OCS.

Action 5: APPPC members to support the agreed regional comments in the OCS and add country comments on the draft annex *Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)* that could not be discussed as regional comments. Specific areas for focus include:

- a. general comments on the structure and logical order of the standard;
- b. giving a country preference for whether the draft document should be an annex to ISPM 23 or, to a standalone ISPM.

5.2 1st Consultation: draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010)

The draft standard was introduced by Ms Joanne WILSON, the SC steward for the draft standard. The draft standard was developed by an EWG in July 2023 based on Specification 75. The working group included experts from the APPPC region (Australia, China, Japan, New Zealand and Vietnam). The purposes of the revisions were to:

- a. ensure consistency with the requirements in recently revised standards ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) and ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*);
- b. provide criteria for determining if an outbreak constitutes an incursion or an established population;
- c. provide better descriptions of criteria for suspension, reinstatement and revocation of pest free areas status and corrective actions and;
- d. to determine if Appendices and Annexes should remain part of the ISPM or removed to implementation materials.

Ms WILSON, outlined the main revisions made to the standard including:

- a. the inclusion of ‘*and maintenance*’ into the title to accurately reflect the contents of the ISPM;
- b. inclusion of a statement in the ‘Scope’ regarding pest absence that was incorporated into ISPM 4 i.e. *If a country has declared a fruit fly to be absent in an area in accordance with ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area), then establishing and maintaining a PFA in accordance with this standard should not be required by importing countries unless there is technical justification;*
- c. clarification, and where appropriate, replacement of terms and definitions including ‘*breeding population*’, ‘*outbreak*’, ‘*detection*’, ‘*incursion*’ ‘*detection*’ ‘*lures* to replace *attractants*’;
- d. A new section was added regarding criteria for an area to qualify as a fruit fly pest free area and clarification of triggers that indicate a breeding population;
- e. A new annex (1) was created for *Fruit fly surveillance (trapping and host sampling)* and revisions made to the current Annexes on corrective action plans and control measures for an incursion within a fruit fly pest free area;
- f. The current Annex 3, Appendix 1 and 2 were removed for further development as implementation materials.

General comments:

China thought that SIT needs to be considered within the standard.

The regional general comment agreed was to request that the steward consider making it clear the difference between SIT flies and wild flies where necessary throughout the text.

PPPO comments were to consider the standard as an annex to ISPM 4 which aligns with Australia's comments. This would bring it in line with the style of ISPM 27 and ISPM 28. If this approach was adopted, then it would mean the standard would need to be adjusted. The PPPO also suggested that the word '*requirements*' is included in the scope [para 38]. That is, '*this standard provides requirements and guidance for the*'. The Chair suggested that guidance is removed and should only include requirements.

Korea proposed that [para 39] should not be in the 'Scope' but should be moved to the 'Outline of requirements'. The Chair noted that similar text is in [para 63] 'General requirements'. New Zealand supports the text in the 'Scope' and maybe deleted from [para 63]. Thailand suggested that the two paragraphs do not quite say the same. The Chair suggested that it is important to have the statement up front.

Substantive and technical comments:

Scope

New Zealand proposed that 'guidance' should be replaced with 'requirements' in [para 38].

[Para 38] The regional comment agreed was to replace '*guidance*' with '*requirements*' as the standard should be about requirements more than guidance.

Background

Korea proposed to include *Myiopardalis* in the list of economically important species of fruit flies [para 55]. The species is also included in the Appendix. The Chair suggested that countries check this with their experts.

Korea added the word '*maintenance*' of pest free areas into [para 56] to align with the new title of the ISPM.

[Para 56] The regional comment agreed was to add '*maintenance*' to align with the new title of the ISPM.

Korea suggested moving the [para 57] to the 'Requirements' [para 52] to align with ISPM 4 and add '*maintenance*' to align with the new title of the standard.

[Para 57] The regional comment agreed was to move [para 57] to the 'requirements' [para 52] to align with ISPM 4.

Impacts on biodiversity and the environment

Korea suggested rewording of impacts on biodiversity and the environment to be '*...introduction of target fruit fly into an area*' [para 59].

[Para 59] The regional comment agreed was to replace '*regulated pest*' with '*target fruit fly*'.

General requirements

Korea suggested to remove the last sentence of [para 62] in the ‘General requirements’ as it is a duplicate of [para 61].

[Para 62] The regional comment agreed was to remove the last sentence of [para 62] in the general requirements to remove duplication.

Section 1. Communication and stakeholder engagement

Korea suggested including more examples of different media into [para 65] such as television, social media, internet etc. This aligns with PPPO comments.

[Para 65] The regional comment agreed was to include more examples of media.

Korea proposed to replace ‘*outbreaks (including incursions)*’ with ‘*outbreaks*’. However, an outbreak should never occur in a PFA as per the ISPM 5 definition of an outbreak. Incursion is a more appropriate word. No regional comment was agreed.

Section 3. Documentation and record-keeping

Korea proposed to amend [para 71] to keep records for 36 months. New Zealand and the Chair proposed that this statement could be records should be retained for 24 months or more based on the biology of the fly.

[Para 71] The regional comment agreed that the retention time of records should be based on the biology of flies.

Section 4: Initiation of a fruit fly pest free area

China proposed to add a new bullet at [para 76] ‘*- identify the biology, ecology, main pathway and regulated article of the target fruit fly*’. The Chair had concerns as this information is already known for the species which the PFA will be initiated. Japan questioned what specific information is needed about the biology and ecology of the target species. The Chair suggested that the proposed text should say ‘*- identify the biology, ecology, main pathway and regulated article of the target fruit fly in the area*’. Thailand thought that bullet two [para 76] needed more detail to differentiate it from the proposed new text from China. Australia supported the addition as it would align with the similar bullets in establishment and maintenance sections. Japan thought it is unnecessary to include reference to regulated articles since this is covered in [para 76] which lists commercial and non-commercial hosts.

[Para 76] The regional comment agreed was to include a new modified bullet ‘*- identify the biology and ecology of the target fruit fly in the proposed area*’ and to remove some duplicate text.

Section 5.1 Establishment of a buffer zone

China proposed amending [para 85] to ‘*pest spread pressure*’ from the target fruit fly in neighbouring areas. Australia commented that the paragraph was about pest population pressure rather than spread. No regional comment was agreed.

China proposed to delete ‘*natural*’ from para [89]. ‘*The capacity for ~~natural~~ spread through identified pathways*’

[Para 89] The regional comment agreed was to delete ‘*natural*’.

Section 5.2 Surveillance activities for the establishment of the fruit fly pest free area

China proposed specifying the '*target fruit fly species*' rather than the '*pest*' [para 93].

[Para 93] The regional comment agreed was to replace '*pest*' with '*target fruit fly species*' to be more specific.

China proposed to change '*grid*' to '*density and sensitivity*' in [para 98]. Australia suggested '*trapping network*' but did not think this improved the bullet. The Chair suggested that '*grid*' and '*density*' were different concepts. Australia thought that '*grid*' might create the idea that a '*grid*' is a certain shape. New Zealand thought that it was only an example and therefore should avoid using the word sensitivity. The Chair noted that it is a very technical and countries could make their own comments on the point. No regional comment was agreed.

China proposed removing [para 99] and move it to '*General requirements*'. Korea thought it could be retained in '*Specific requirements*'. New Zealand proposed that a new general requirement could be created for '*diagnostics capacity*' but also retain it in the '*Specific requirements*' for the surveillance activities for the establishment of an FF-PFA. Nepal agreed that it could be in both sections.

[Para 99] The regional comment agreed was to include an additional paragraph in the '*General requirements*' to capture the need for diagnostic capacity as diagnostics is core to the activities for establishing and maintaining a PFA and for surveillance.

Section 5.4 Additional technical information for the establishment of the fruit fly pest free area

China proposed deleting [para 107] as it appears in a previous paragraph.

[Para 107] The regional comment agreed was to delete the paragraph.

Section 5.5 Criteria for the area to qualify as a fruit fly pest free area

China proposed changes to [para 113] to make it more explicit that the presence of sterile insects do not affect the status of a PFA. New Zealand proposed that the text could be simplified to '*wild adults (male or virgin female)*'. Timor-Leste gave an example of their programme for SIT and the detections of males and females.

[Para 113] The regional comment agreed was a general comment that the concept of wild vs sterile insects needs to be differentiated for clarity.

New Zealand proposed rewording of [para 113] to show that trapping density influences trapping sensitivity.

[Para 113] The regional comment agreed was to clarify that sensitivity influences trapping density.

New Zealand proposed removing '*during the survey period*' from the second sentence of [para 113] as the detection of a fruit fly at any time outside of the survey period means that the area is no longer pest free.

[Para 113] The regional comment agreed was to '*remove during the survey period*' i.e. '*Detection of an immature life stage, or an inseminated female, of the target fruit fly during the survey period should be considered a sign of a breeding population.*'

New Zealand proposed to delete the text [para 114] to avoid overemphasizing three generations if there is science to justify a shorter period. Japan suggested that

environmental conditions may not be correct as it has a broader meaning, and it should be replaced with climate conditions. The Chair agreed and gave examples of how the three consecutive life cycles could unnecessarily disadvantage some countries. Examples/case studies of different fruit flies and their life cycles in different climates would be useful guidance material.

[Para 114] The regional comment agreed was to delete (*which, for some species, may correspond to up to three consecutive life cycles*).

An implementation issue raised was that the IC should consider developing examples/case studies of different fruit flies and their life cycles in different climatic conditions and the Chair agreed to discuss the urgency of the development of such material with the IC but noted that there are also fruit fly examples included in the existing PFA guide.

Section 5.6 Official declaration of the fruit fly pest free area

Japan proposed adding '*as appropriate*' at the end of the first sentence in [para 116].

[Para 116] The regional comment agreed was to include '*as appropriate*' at the end of the first sentence in the paragraph.

China made further comments to separate the concept of wild vs sterile insects throughout the text as needed.

Section 7.2 Reinstatement

Thailand commented on [para 152] to add new text that discusses the effectiveness of the surveillance system. Supported by New Zealand.

[Para 152] The regional comment agreed was to request additional text regarding the evaluation of the effectiveness of the surveillance system. Also, that countries would propose text to address how to evaluate the effectiveness of the surveillance system as country comments.

New Zealand requested that the required period '*(which, for some species, may correspond to up to three consecutive life cycles)*' be deleted as per previous comments.

[Para 152] Agreed as a regional comment as per previous comment on the same issue.

Korea suggested adding new text at the end of [para 152] to require that countries notify NPPOs of relevant importing countries when a FF-PFA has been reinstated and request recognition of the reinstatement. New Zealand sought clarification on what was meant by the additional text and if the IPPC pest reporting system was sufficient or if there needed to be permission/ recognition of the reinstatement of a PFA noting that communication was always important. Australia agreed that communication was important but may be agreed bilaterally. New Zealand commented that the 'how to communicate' didn't necessarily belong in the standard as it sets an unrealistic expectation and could potentially be misused. The Chair noted that there was two points raised, one about reporting and another about recognising freedom status. ISPM 29 could be cited for recognising freedom. China was concerned that domestic recognition may be different from importing country recognition. However, the Chair noted that ISPM 29 could be used as a guide for domestic recognition.

[Para 152] The regional comment agreed was to include additional text at the end of the paragraph i.e. '*The NPPO of the exporting country should notify through the IPPC pest reporting system or the NPPOs of relevant importing countries. The recognition procedure is described in ISPM 29.*'

Section 7.3 Withdrawal

Japan proposed adding ‘FF-PFA, or a part of it’ to [para 154]. New Zealand asked if this meant the boundaries of the PFA also change as potentially the additional text could be misinterpreted. Japan proposed ‘FF-PFA or the affected part within the FF-PFA’ to align with the wording within section 7.1.

[Para 154] The regional comment agreed was to include *FF-PFA, or a part of it* in the paragraph.

Implementation issues

The member countries raised that there needs to be the concurrent development of guidance to support the standard to prevent important information from being lost. The IC should consider developing examples/case studies of different fruit flies and their life cycles in different climatic conditions.

Annex 1

New Zealand proposed introducing information about different survey types into the annex 1 [para 159]. This includes an additional three paragraphs.

[Para 59] The regional comment agreed was to include three new paragraphs on survey types i.e. monitoring survey, detection survey and delimiting survey in fruit fly surveillance.

China proposed a new title for [para 160] and [para 161] for clarity and alignment with New Zealand comments.

[Para 160 and 161] The regional comment agreed was to rename [160] ‘*Trapping considerations for surveys*’ and [161] *Trapping considerations for fruit fly surveys may include*:

Thailand proposed to expand on bullet [170] “*identification capacity and capability (such as capture capacity, retention capacity and capability to identify fruit fly)*”. Australia explained the difference between capacity and capability – the examples provided may not be commonly understood as Japan questioned what was meant by capture capacity. The examples that Thailand provided aimed to clarify the difference between capacity and capability. Australia suggested that the meaning was about sample management and sample retention. The Philippines suggested elevating the concept of capacity and capability to para [159]. Australia supported the Philippines suggestion.

[Para 170] The regional comment agreed was to delete the paragraph as it is covered by Section 3 *Handling of samples and identification of species*.

New Zealand suggested to remove the last sentence of [para 174] as trap density should reflect the confidence you require that any population that establishes is detected in a timely manner. That would not change if the likelihood of establishment occurring was high or low. Japan thought that it was useful information and should be retained. China also agreed to retain the sentence. No regional comment agreed.

[Para 180] the regional agreed was an editorial comment.

Korea included *host fruit maturity* in para [186].

[Para 186] The regional comment agreed was to include ‘*host fruit maturity*’ to be more specific.

Annex 2

China proposed replacing the ‘*length of the time...*’ in [para 238] with ‘*the required period of time*’ for clarity.

[Para 238] The regional comment agreed was to change to ‘*The required period for eradication...*’

Annex 3

New Zealand proposed additional wording for [para 247] ‘... *centred on the actual detected population of target fruit fly detection and with...*’. Australia was uncertain if this was a practical modification because of the unknowns associated with a detection. No regional comment was agreed.

Japan proposed including some examples in [para 312] of mechanical and cultural controls *e.g. removal and destruction of host material, soil treatment etc.* New Zealand questioned if soil treatment was a cultural control. This was confirmed by other countries and other modifications were proposed.

[Para 312] The regional comment agreed was to include examples of mechanical and cultural controls *e.g. removal and destruction of the fruit and disturbance (ground swamping and ploughing), soil chemical treatment, insecticide bait application technique, bait stations, male annihilation (MAT) mass trapping, sterile insect technique (SIT) and biological control.* Also, it was suggested that the steward checks acronyms such as SIT.

Editorial comment [324] ‘*inside and outside facilities*’.

[Para 333] upon detection.

Action 6: APPPC members to support the agreed regional comments in the OCS and add country comments on the draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010) considering the discussions at the regional workshop. Specific areas for focus include:

- a. Propose text to address how to evaluate the effectiveness of surveillance systems with respect to fruit fly pest free areas (ISPM 26)

Action 7: Ms YIM to discuss with the IC the urgency for the development of specific guidance information on fruit fly species and their life cycles in different climates to support the revised ISPM 26.

5.3 1st Consultation: Draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds)*

The draft standard was introduced by Ms Mi Chi YEA. The Annex was developed by an expert working group in 2021 and has undergone revisions by the Standards Committee for the past two years to address conceptual issues.

Trade in seed is complex compared with other commodities and NPPOs are exploring the use of systems approaches for managing pest risk in international trade. This draft standard provides a framework for an alternative option for the phytosanitary certification of seeds

that could be adopted by several importing and exporting NPPOs involved in the seed supply chain. The optional framework using a systems approach proposes a multilateral approach to harmonize phytosanitary measures. The framework describes the responsibilities of NPPOs, and the authorization of entities involved in the approach. The framework is a paradigm shift from managing single pests to managing pest groups. It describes NPPO responsibilities for identifying critical control points, evaluating risk management options (including quality management system used by seed entities), auditing and verification functions. It also discusses performance criteria for seed entities and the minimum requirements for a quality system that can contribute to managing pests.

General comments:

General comments from the PPPO were that the draft annex did not meet the needs of the end-users of the seeds. It did not give any more guidance than ISPM 14 and ISPM 38.

The Chair commented that in the current trade, multilateral recognition of systems approach may not be easy to accept by NPPOs.

Korea commented that implementing/harmonizing the same systems approach would be very difficult as each country would have its own regulated pests and requirements. Also, some countries may not have the appropriate regulatory frameworks to allow for a multilateral systems approach. There may also be difficulties for the re-export of seeds to countries with different requirements.

Japan found it difficult to understand how to implement the standard and have discussed this with their industry. The concept is new approach. It is understood that the USA is using this approach, but it is uncertain how it is implemented. More information is needed.

New Zealand thought the annex has value, but the annex is not clear how it would be implemented multilaterally compared with bilateral agreements. New Zealand found it hard to understand how measures will be integrated in a way that manages pest risk. They thought it lacked information on traceability, NPPO oversight, verification testing etc. Further development is needed as is the need to strongly support it with implementation material including data to support measures, appropriateness of verification procedures, pest thresholds etc, contingency actions when the system fails, minimum requirements for a systems manual, what ADs would look like and case studies.

Australia noted that NAPPO agreed to develop a regional standard to progress some of these general issues.

The Chair suggested that the standard could be put on hold until a regional standard is developed. She thought that systems approaches have merit especially for some developing countries that might not have good capacity for seed testing. The Chair had difficulty following the annex but recognised there were very different views.

New Zealand recognises that there is a need for this annex to resolve issues for industry. If this version does not go for consultation, then CPM do not know what the issues are. It was questioned whether the APPPC region could make a recommendation to the CPM on the way forward for this annex noting that NAPPO are developing their own standard. New Zealand asked if it is the concept or the version that there is an issue with.

The Chair revisited the PPPO comment that a commodity standard for a seed species might add more value. She asked if it is better to work on a bilateral systems approach before a multilateral framework or to wait and see the experiences of other countries in

implementing a systems approach for seed. She asked all to submit general country comments on the annex.

Mr Avertik NERSISYAN noted that there are issues with the annex and that it is now up to countries to decide whether to go through the text and make it better. It doesn't mean that the annex needs to be used. He noted that ISPM 46 is not used by all countries, but it is available for countries that do want to authorize entities.

The Philippines noted that the APPPC region produces a lot of seed, and the standard could provide an important opportunity for the region.

Workshop participants discussed specific comments for countries to consider when they are making their own comments on the draft. Only general comments will be submitted from the region due to no agreement on whether to support the annex to proceed.

Substantive and technical comments:

Section 1. Introduction

New Zealand proposed to reword the beginning of [para 33] to highlight key parts of a seed systems approach i.e. *'In addition to commodity used phytosanitary measures, relevant industry best-practices and quality systems could serve as the basis for designing systems approaches as an alternative option for the phytosanitary certification of seeds.* This brings in the idea that this is an alternative option and phytosanitary certification is still required.

New Zealand commented that *'measures and production practices and ...'* are added to [para 33] as phytosanitary measures would normally be a part of any systems approach.

New Zealand proposed rewording [para 36] *'...seed production (i.e. from pre-planting processes, pre-harvesting, harvesting, post-harvest handling taking place in the countries of origin and re-export until the seed reaches the final destination where it is planted;'* to specify all the steps in the production and movement of seed. This approach aligns with ISPM 38 terminology.

New Zealand proposed adding a new para after [37] *'...re-exporting country" refers to the country where seeds are imported and transiting; and (re-export was removed from [para 37] to separate out two parts of the system. The Chair questioned the addition of 'transiting country' as transiting is not an import. Australia suggested that there needs to be more clarification on re-exporting.*

New Zealand proposed rewording [para 38] to *'"importing country" refers to the final destination country'*

Section 1.1 Scope

New Zealand suggested including *'...approved by one or more NPPOs...'* to capture the multilateral nature of the seed trade in [para 40].

New Zealand suggested to add words into [para 41] *'...from planting to import into the country of final destination, helping...'*. The discussion focused on the start and end points of the seed production and movement.

Japan proposed moving text from [para 57] into the 'Scope' in [para 42] i.e. *Production practices used by participating entities may be included as measures in systems approaches if those practices are recognized by participating NPPOs as effectively managing pest risk. Such measures, in combination with the participating entities' quality systems (including*

audit and other requirements as outlined in this annex), should be considered as meeting the phytosanitary import requirements of the import country.

Thailand proposed clarifying the final sentence of [para 42] and should include *...additional measures should be discussed with the NPPO of the country of origin / exporting country.* An alternative proposal from Australia was *...additional measures should be discussed with the NPPO countries along the seed supply chain*.

China thought the annex needed reorganising overall and that the ‘Scope’ did not look like the ‘scope’ in other standards.

Section 1.2 Background

Japan proposed deleting sentence two from [para 44] as it is repetitive.

New Zealand proposed rewording of the [para 47] to capture the idea that NPPOs should consult with industry when designing systems approaches so that measures are practicable, feasible and effective. The Chair suggested deleting the paragraph as it is not specific to seed.

New Zealand suggested to add *‘phytosanitary measures including phytosanitary treatments’* as treatments are only one type of standalone measure in [para 47].

New Zealand proposed to refer to healthy seed throughout the annex to align with ISPM 38.

Section 1.4 Important considerations for systems approaches for seeds

New Zealand proposed rewording the first paragraph of section 1.4 and deleting all bullet points as the text is not needed. If seed is not approved for a systems approach it can still move using other requirements. New Zealand also proposed simplifying the language in this section. Japan commented that the process for seed production is not complicated but the *‘movement of seed’* is.

Korea proposed deleting the first sentence of [para 58] and move the second sentence to [para 96] about issuance of a phytosanitary certificate.

New Zealand proposed modifying [para 59] to emphasize that seed testing maybe used as a verification procedure if it is technically justified. That is, *‘To verify that regulated pests have been effectively managed in the seed supply chain, seeds lots produced in the supply chain may be tested for these pests where technically justified.’*

Japan proposed rewording [para 60] *‘...NPPOs can lead to designing of more efficient systems approaches’*. The proposal changes the meaning of the sentence.

Section 2.1 Identification of the commodity

Japan proposed an additional sentence in [para 64] *Identification of the seed commodity may be undertaken by the NPPO of the importing country, or the exporting country, or ideally through the cooperation of both countries. In addition, entities may identify...* The Chair questioned if the new text was necessary. Others thought that the sentence does not flow well and that this is not unique for seed and is applicable to other commodities. There was a general sentiment that the standard reads as though industry is telling the NPPO what to do. Countries should consider keeping the original paragraph and/or modifying the last sentence.

Section 2.2 Identification of individual pests or pest groups associated with the seed commodity

China proposed including a reference to ISPM 21 in [para 66].

Australia proposed that there needed to be more explicit detail about PRA in [para 66] to highlight that all in the multilateral agreement should conduct a PRA and recognise this across the supply chain. New Zealand noted that not all countries publish their PRAs and this might be complex. Bilateral agreement can be reached on a list of pests and measures – in a multilateral situation it was questioned how the quarantine pest list could be agreed because of the sovereign rights of each country. It was also discussed if a global pest list was possible and if it could be agreed.

The Chair noted that the understanding of this standard is different in different regions.

Section 2.3 Measures and critical control points

New Zealand proposed deleting a lot of text from [paras 71- 94] as they are only examples. They are not requirements, and they appear in the Appendix. Note that ‘varieties’ are used rather than ‘cultivars’ in the seed trade.

China proposed adding ‘*fungicide*’ [para 85] although others thought that pesticide covered insecticides and fungicides.

China proposed adding text to clarify that *cleaning of equipment, label clearly and store securely* [para 88].

Korea proposed thought that *seed quality testing* is not relevant to phytosanitary measures and should be removed.

China proposed merging sections 3 and 8 as they clearly describe responsibilities of the NPPO.

Section 4. Monitoring

New Zealand proposed to add new wording to clarify what is being verified in a systems approach [para 100].

Section 5. Establishing performance criteria for authorization of participating entities

Japan proposed to add a sentence at [para 103] ‘*Performance criteria should be established before the entities enter the agreement to participate in a systems approach*’.

New Zealand proposed to change [para 104] as a core requirement for the standard. *The entity should implement an effective quality system and production practices to reduce pest risk which can be evaluated and approved by the NPPO.*

Section 6. Multilateral systems approaches

Korea sought clarification of what ‘*particular attention*’ means in [para 106]. It was noted that the SC discussed this point and removed detail thus making it less clear. The sentence needs to clearly indicate who does what with respect to non-compliance.

Section 7. Evaluation of systems approaches for seeds

New Zealand proposed that further guidance material needs to be included on how to evaluate measures to decide what to incorporate into a systems approach. This could either be in this standard or ISPM 14 [Section 7].

Section 8.1 Responsibilities of NPPOs

New Zealand wanted to emphasize the collaboration between the NPPO and the industry to design effective and feasible systems approaches [para 118].

New Zealand noted that [para 127] is the responsibility of the NPPO not the entity and therefore the first sentence should be removed.

Some thought that ‘Documentation’ should be included in the reporting responsibilities.

Japan proposed a new section [9] for *Records that demonstrate implementation i.e. NPPOs and participating entities should record the measures that have been applied in implementing the systems approach and should retain these records to demonstrate the implementation of the systems approach. The retention time of these records should be agreed between the participating NPPOs.*

Japan wanted to introduce the concept of performance criteria, and this should be defined. They noted that ISPM 45 refers to this.

The Chair encouraged the participants to discuss comments within their countries and formulate their country comments on the annex.

New Zealand highlighted implementation issues with the annex.

Action 8: APPPC members to provide country comments in the OCS on the draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds)* considering the discussions at the regional workshop. (NB: No regional comments were included on the OCS due to the complexity of the concept of the annex).

5.4 2nd Consultation: Draft annex *International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46*

The draft standard was introduced by Ms Lihong ZHU on behalf of Ms Joanne WILSON, who is the Standards Committee steward for the draft standard. This is the second consultation on this draft standard and the main comments addressed during first consultation were:

- a. making the scope more specific to the commodity;
- b. reinforcing key statements;
- c. referencing pest-host association;
- d. emphasizing phytosanitary treatments adopted by the CPM;
- e. adding or removing specific pests and measures.

References for pest-host association were not included because the main purpose of the commodity standards is to provide information on measures, the pests included in the annex all required specific measures determined by NPPO pest risk analysis (PRA) procedures and it is not the role of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) to re-evaluate the PRA conclusions of NPPOs. New text was added to the draft annex to highlight these points.

Two new pests were added to the draft annex: a fruit fly, *Bactrocera umbrosa* and a bacterium, *Xanthomonas citri* pv. *mangiferaeindicae*. No pests were removed because all

pests included in the draft annex meet the criteria stated in ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures), references showed association with the host and listing a pest in the annex does not constitute technical justification for regulation.

As with pests, no measures were removed. There were requests to remove methyl bromide fumigation as an option however, the measure is currently accepted in trade and removing it might disadvantage some developing countries. Six new measures were added to the annex including the hot water immersion treatment submitted by Thailand and accepted by the EU.

General comments:

China generally supports the annex. They noted that references needed to be checked as there appeared to be gaps in the pest list and measures e.g. *Sternochetus olivieri* which has an effective irradiation treatment. The TPCS steward encouraged countries to submit new pests and measures if they regulate the pest on mango in their country. The TPCS do not actively look for additional pests, only those that are submitted by countries during the call for information materials. The Chair of the TPCS noted that the mango standard only received information submissions from the TPCS member countries during the development of the annex and she encouraged countries to submit information during 'the call for information for new commodity standards'.

The Chair asked countries to enter comments as 'country comments' as the technical nature of the comments meant that regional agreement could not be reached within this workshop.

Pests

China requested the addition of *Paracoccus marginatus*, *Milviscutulus mangiferae* and *Drosicha stebbingii*. China requested to remove *Bactrocera umbrosa*.

The Chair of the TPCS said that the TPCS were considering how to amend the standard such as through ink amendments. Significant changes would warrant a full revision of the annex which would need to go through the full standard setting process.

Measures

China requested rechecking of references for the HWIT 2.

Sri Lanka highlighted that they were researching VHT for the export of their mangoes.

China proposed adding an irradiation schedule for *Bactrocera correcta* of 98 Gy.

China questioned VHT 6 for the treatment of *B. tryoni* and asked if it applied to *B. frauenfeldi*, *B. jarvisi*, *B. umbrosa*. The Chair of the TPCS asked for supporting information.

Japan requested that SA was included for other fruit flies. The SAs were only included for countries that accepted the SA for a particular species.

Indonesia questioned the 'minimal impact' of measures for certain fruit flies.

China proposed table 4 is a single fruit weight (g).

China requested the rationale for the lower time for HWIT of 10 minutes. It was pointed out by the steward that 10 mins time was for the fruit pulp temperature not the water temperature.

References

Thailand will provide updated published references for HWIT. Thailand highlighted that the references are not all in the reference list and footnotes are not always accurate.

The regional comment agreed was that the APPPC fully support the adoption of the annex.

Action 9: APPPC members to support the adoption of the annex and consider adding country comments in the OCS on the *Draft annex International movement of mango (Mangifera indica) fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46* considering the discussions at the regional workshop. (NB: No regional comments were included on the OCS due to the technical nature of the annex).

5.5 2nd Consultation: Draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood)*

The draft standard was introduced by Mr Glenn PANGANIBAN. This is the second consultation on the draft standard which provides options for a systems approach for wood as an alternative to a single phytosanitary measure such as a treatment.

General comments:

Thailand supports the adoption of the standard but noted that the format differs from other standards. Australia and New Zealand thought the same and recommended that standards have a consistent look and feel. New Zealand noted that this is more of a guidance document than a requirements document. New Zealand doesn't support using this as an example template for systems approach. There was a similar discussion at the regional meeting last year.

The regional comment agreed was that the SC consider the format going forward.

Cambodia suggested that the word 'commodity' be used to maintain consistency through the text and be consistent with ISPM 5 e.g. in the title '*...with the movement of wood (commodity) (2014-004)*'. The Chair suggested that this would be an unusual approach. New Zealand suggested footnoting wood as a commodity within the text of the scope of the annex and/ or in the title. Laos' legislation means that they cannot export wood but can only export wood products or wood packaging. Australia noted that the original topic was for wood commodity, and this has since changed.

The regional comment agreed was to make a general comment on using 'wood' or 'wood commodity' consistently and clearly throughout the annex.

Substantive and technical comments:

Scope

Cambodia proposed additional text in [para 30] '*... with the international movement of wood, particularly those that infest trees.*' However, the proposal is in conflict with the overarching standard and this does not need to be narrowed in this annex. No regional comment agreed.

Pre-harvest

Korea had an editorial comment a [para 56] and proposed deleting reference to section 2.4. Thailand proposed deleting the word ‘field’ as inspection occurs at several points in the production cycle. No regional comment agreed.

Harvest

China proposed adding a sentence at the end of para [70]. i.e. ‘Reasonably selecting trees to be felled, and not choosing to cut down trees that are weakened, aged or dead, or subject to the risk of secondary hazards such as typhoons and forest fires, etc. for export.’ Australia made recommendations to make the wording more clear and the Chair suggested a new row is inserted into the table.

[Para 70] The agreed regional comment was to insert a new row for ‘Selected harvesting’ with new text ‘Selectively harvesting of healthy trees (e.g. not aged or dead), to reduce pest infestation levels’.

Post-harvest

China proposed to include a new sentence in [para 73] ‘vehicular transportation is used to avoid heavy soil contamination’.

The agreed regional comment was to insert a new para re vehicular transportation.

China proposed amendment to [para 74] to ‘Examination for pests during volume and quality determination management’ with additional text at [para 75] *select subsequent appropriate management methods based on the mode of transportation in containers, logs transported in bulk, in timber transported in containers, sawn timber transported in bulk etc.* Some thought it was not clear if this should be a new row and if this transportation fits here. China was asked to amend the suggestion to be clearer. No regional comment agreed.

China proposed including additional text in [para 77] *Applying pesticides, preservatives, and wrapping with protective materials.* It was suggested that this is an example only. No regional comment agreed.

Pre-dispatch

China proposed to add new text at [para 125] Determining restricted storage times based on the life cycle of pests, the timber trade cycle, and dispatching timber commodities within the specified timeframe of restricted storage times reduces the chances of post-harvest infestations.

China proposed removing the first sentence of [para 135] as forests in countries or regions in the tropics and subtropics may have multiple generations overlapping throughout the year and therefore it is not possible to implement. Australia agreed but proposed that the first sentence could be made clearer that it is only applicable to temperate regions. New Zealand supported deleting the sentence to avoid misinterpretation.

The regional comment agreed was to remove the first sentence of para [135] and replace ‘should’ with ‘may’ in the second sentence i.e. *The timing of dispatch may be based on biological data and technical justification.*

China proposed further text to add a new row after [para 142]. That is: *-pre-transportation phytosanitary treatment and For logs that are not suitable for treatment during transportation e.g. goods placed on deck, a quarantine treatment shall be carried out at a specialized site prior to dispatch. The type of treatment depending on the phytosanitary*

requirements for the importing country. It was suggested that the row heading could be amended to *Pre-dispatch Phytosanitary treatment*. The Chair asked if the new row was different from the current *Chemical treatment* row heading. Japan did not think that the two concepts needed to be separated and this was supported by Korea. The Chair suggested it was an example and did not warrant a separate row in the table. China agreed to discuss whether the proposed addition of a treatment differed from other chemical treatment further with his colleagues. No regional comment agreed. Timor-Leste discussed how he saw the difference in treatments.

Transport

China proposed to add new text to transport [para 147] *Planned transport method and usage* and [para 148] *Selecting pest management methods according to the planned transportation methods (such as container or bulk) and usage (such as construction or furniture manufacturing) of wood commodities can more effectively control the spread of pests, protect wood quality, enhance management efficiency and reduce economic losses*. Although it was understood what China proposed, others suggested rewording to make the point clearer.

[Para 147 and 148] The agreed regional comment was to include the following text at [para 147 & 148] *Selecting pest management methods depending on the means of transportation (such as container or bulk) and usage of wood commodities (such as construction or furniture manufacturing) to effectively control the dispersal of pests, protect wood quality, enhance management efficiency and reduce economic losses*.

China proposed deleting ‘*Planned transport route*’ [para 151] as planning transportation routes for international trade in timber commodities is not practical. The Chair agreed that mostly this is not possible for sea freight but may be possible for land transportation. New Zealand thought that there was no harm in retaining the paragraph with a qualifier. No regional comment agreed.

Table 2.

Malaysia commented that [para 161] ‘*Treatment on arrival*’ should not be included as part of a systems approach. Korea pointed out that this was discussed at SC-7 and it was agreed to include it. New Zealand did not support removing the row and gave an example of countries that may not be able to fumigate due to minimum temperature requirements for treatments. The Chair discussed that this is only one option for a measure in a systems approach and did not need to be used. The Chair proposed to amend in the text to: *Treatment on arrival may be included as part of a systems approach as a preventable measure*, however this did not capture the example provided by New Zealand and only addressed treatment on arrival as a remedial ‘clean up’ action. No regional comment agreed.

Implementation issues

New Zealand commented that guidance on record-keeping and traceability is needed as the production cycle of wood can be long compared to other commodities. This was highlighted as an implementation issue.

The regional comment agreed was that further guidance on record-keeping and traceability for wood commodities is needed for implementation of the annex.

Action 10: APPPC members to support the agreed regional comments in the OCS and add country comments on the draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the*

pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood) by considering the discussions at the regional workshop.

5.6 Draft specification on holistic revision of the draft *reorganized pest risk analysis standard (2023-037)*

The draft specification was introduced by Mr Masahiro SAI who is the Standards Committee steward for this topic. A draft standard that reorganized the ISPMs related to PRA ((ISPM 2 (Framework for pest risk analysis), ISPM 11 (Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests) and the draft ISPM (Pest risk management for quarantine pests)) was reviewed at the 2023 regional workshop. However, the general comments received from the wider IPPC community during first consultation were that the reorganized standard needed a comprehensive revision. The new specification incorporates the comments from first consultation and aims to streamline the text of the reorganized standard to emphasize requirements and obligations for PRA and provide greater clarity for all contracting parties for ease of use and understanding.

Workshop participants agreed to discuss and record regional comments on the specification as it was an important standard for the region.

General comments:

China proposed that ISPM 21 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests*) was included in the revision. The steward, Mr SAI, clarified the difference between the PRA standard and ISPM 21 and suggested that the standards should remain separate. Indonesia supported China's proposal. No regional comment was agreed.

China proposed that more experts than 5-7 were needed for the revision as it a massive job i.e. 7-9. New Zealand supported a larger EWG to revise the reorganized PRA standard.

[The regional comment agreed was that more than 5-7 experts were needed to revise the standard.](#)

New Zealand supports inviting WOA and CODEX experts to learn from their experiences with developing and using their risk analysis standards as a wider range of experience is always a good approach. New Zealand asked to clarify the selection process and composition of the EWG. New Zealand recommended new members for the EWG would be beneficial.

Korea supported the revision but proposed to include consideration of climate change. Australia did not think it was feasible to include consideration of climate change as PRAs are intended to be based on current evidence and the future impact of climate change is uncertain. The Chair noted that inclusion of climate change may not be practical even though this was included as one of the reasons for the revision. New Zealand highlighted that there was modelling available but did not think that this was possible to provide accurate models for all pests and pathways. Adding climate change into PRA may affect the quality of the revision of the standard. China noted that there are models available that are based on history of climate change and predictions of the future that can be relevant for any pests. There are a lot of published papers on this now. The Chair noted the concern that such a cautious approach to include climate change may not be appropriate for the revision. No regional comment was agreed.



Australia supported the revision and recognised the work that the previous EWG did. Australia proposed virtual pre-meetings, and either a 2-week in-person EWG or 2x 1-week EWG meetings. The region supported virtual pre-meetings. The steward did not support a longer EWG due to budget. New Zealand supported a longer EWG but noted that there may be logistic issues for the IPPC secretariat. The IPPC Secretariat responded that the budget should not be a key consideration and they were open to ideas. Mr Avertik NERSISYAN noted that representatives from WOA and CODEX have been invited to present their standard setting process to the 2024 November meeting of the Standards Committee. The EU have allocated money that could be used for longer meetings.

The Chair noted that the reorganized standard is very complicated and needed to be simplified.

The agreed general regional comment was to recommend virtual pre-meetings including consideration of the required period of the EWG physical meeting. The APPPC also recommended to increase the size of the EWG to 7-9.

Action 11: APPPC members to support the agreed regional comments in the OCS and add country comments on the *Draft specification on holistic revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis standard (2023-037)* by considering the discussions at the regional workshop.

SECTION 2: FAO/RPPO FRAMEWORK

6. APPPC activities and strategic plan implementation

The topic was introduced by Ms Lihong ZHU. Ms ZHU outlined how the strategic plan adopted in 2022, was being implemented. She noted the country consultation on the strategy and questionnaire. Five strategic objectives were agreed as well as various activities to meet these objectives:

Objective 1: Effective operation of the regional system

- a. Members were encouraged to ratify the 1999 amendments to the Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia Pacific region. If they couldn't, they should provide some information about why the amendment could not be ratified. The secretariat was asked to facilitate a webinar with FAO legal if needed.
- b. An Advisory Group has been established and will provide advice to the secretariat and support the APPPC work programme management.
- c. Some work has been done to update the APPPC website and consolidate resources on the page to improve access and sharing between members. The website is much more user-friendly than previously. Suggestions for improvement were welcomed.
- d. Areas for external funding/donations for resource mobilization were being identified and this will be discussed further at the biennial meeting. Good responses were received from the survey.

Objective 2: Capacity development including the coordination and training of staff

1. Work programme for plant quarantine - three regional workshops were/are planned. These are:

- a. surveillance workshop – completed;
 - b. the last workshop on SALB hands-on training on diagnostic to be in Malaysia in April 2025;
 - c. ISPM 32/ risk-based inspection workshop - not completed.
2. Work programme for integrated plant health management – two workshops were/ are planned:
- a. IPHM workshop on systems approach for mango fruit flies – completed in Mumbai, India;
 - b. IPHM workshop on banana diseases – in planning stage.
3. Work programme for pesticide management – two workshops planned.
- a. workshop on pesticide application by unmanned aerial vehicles, completed in China;
 - b. an extra workshop on the application techniques and use of biopesticides, completed in Nepal;
 - c. workshop on pesticide residue testing for food safety, completed in China;
 - d. implementation of the Rotterdam Convention – planned webinars;
 - e. information exchange on registration and guideline for bio-pesticides.

Objective 3: Development of measures for plant protection

- a. development of criteria for commodity topic prioritization – to be reported to the Biennial session - under development;
- b. development of 1-2 RSPM including RGI and treatments – longan and milled rice developed in 2024 - completed;
- c. form EWGs to develop RSPMs and hold first meeting (Bangkok) - completed;
- d. call for RSPM/RIG topics has been made for 2025-26 – 7 topics received. The standards committee will report to the biennial session and decide topics for development – completed.

Objective 4: Sharing pest information – especially transboundary plant pest management (under regular programme). Activities have included:

- a. webinars on Fall army worm management in Timor Leste, Nepal, Bangladesh, Indonesia;
- b. knowledge products produced for fall armyworm;
- c. IPM farmers field school on turmeric and vegetables under GEF project (India);
- d. IPM FFS on millet in Orissa under GEF project – under GEF project;
- e. presentation on regional plant protection activities (China, Nepal);
- f. presentation of nature-based crop protection activities (Bangladesh, Nepal, Vietnam).



Objective 5: Coordination of input into international systems. Activities have included:

- a. regional workshop on ISPM consultation – completed;
- b. implement E-phyto – encouraging uptake and building capacity in the region and communication with donors. A request was made to the IPPC secretariat to provide information on the status of e-Phyto in countries, reasons for not implementing to be reported at the biennial session in China in September 2024;
- c. APPPC pre-CPM consultation meeting;
- d. attend TC-RPPO consultation and CPM;
- e. lead and participate in IPPC work programmes that are important to the region – many in the region involved in committees, technical panels and expert working groups (e.g. 5/10 members of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards are from the Asia Pacific region);
- f. regional workshop on sea containers in Australia - completed.

The remaining work programme activities are: 33rd session of the APPPC, 23-27 September in China; SALB hands- on training on diagnostics in Malaysia and; IPHM/IPHP workshop on banana disease in the Philippines.

In 2025 there will be a regional workshop on commodity standards and will be co-hosted by New Zealand and the Philippines. The workshop will be held in the Philippines. A concept note will be circulated ahead of the meeting.

SECTION 3: IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIONS

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

7.1 Sustainable funding mechanism for ePhyto solution

The topic was introduced by Ms Lihong ZHU. Ms ZHU's presentation outlined what ePhyto is, the advantages of moving to it, the status of ePhyto worldwide, the strategic implementation plan and the ePhyto funding model.

The presentation outlined current and planned future developments of ePhyto including:

- a. channel enhancements such as linkage to other government/ non-government systems;
- b. incorporation of eSeal for consignments sent to the EU;
- c. eBilling capability with the GeNS is now operational;
- d. availability of GeNS in Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

Also planned or underway is an ePhyto cost-benefit analysis and an ePhyto impact study on global trade, a long-term funding solution, NPPO workshops, projects with the Global Alliance and the World Bank for country support and an ePhyto initiative for Africa.

A FG was established to explore a funding model for e-Phyto. An e-Phyto funding model has been approved by CPM as a transitional pilot. CPM Bureau will govern the funding

model until an alternative governance mechanism is agreed by CPM. Contributions will not be mandatory.

Discussion:

Korea questioned when payments for ePhyto would begin however the timeline was unclear. The IPPC secretariat is looking for temporary (2-year) support from the FAO, but no decision has been made despite strong support from countries. A long-term solution is still being sought. More clarity is expected at CPM 2025.

There will be an opportunity at the biennial session meeting to share experiences on the implementation of e-Phyto.

Action 12: The IPPC Secretariat to follow up on letters regarding voluntary country contributions to e-Phyto.

7.2 Update on TR4 global and regional coordination

The topic was introduced by IC member Mr Xiaoliang WANG. The presentation outlined the implementation of the CPM-17 (2023) request to the IPPC Secretariat to coordinate global action on *Fusarium* Tropical Race 4 (TR4), using the proposals presented by the Latin American and Caribbean group (GRULAC) in CPM 2023/CRP/08 as an initial framework.

A team from the IPPC Implementation and Capacity Development Committee have revised and posted 12 contributed resources on the IPPC, conducted a series of virtual training workshops on surveillance, diagnostics, inspection and delivered simulation exercises on responding to TR4. They have also developed and published TR4 prevention, preparedness, and response guidelines. Courses have been delivered specially in Africa for surveillance, diagnostics, and a simulation exercise under the FAO support to COMESA trade facilitation programme.

Other collaborative hands-on learning activities have been delivered in collaboration between FAO and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). All materials have been made available globally and training courses can be delivered on request. APPPC members were encouraged to trial the learning activities on TR4.

There are currently no funds available to support the programme and CPM-18 has requested the development of a resource mobilization plan and the IPPC community has requested the development of public private partnership to advance TR4 global coordination.

Discussion:

The Chair highlighted that although TR4 is not a major issue in the Asian region the work in this area is a good example of what can be done for other pests in the future.

7.3 E-commerce guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade

The topic was introduced by IC member, Mr Xiaoliang WANG. The presentation outlined a study/survey developed by the Secretariat to understand the extent to which CPM recommendations have been implemented by contracting parties, thus providing baseline data to monitor the global evolution of phytosanitary e-commerce strategies and IPPC's e-commerce programme.

The CPM recommendation that the survey is based on, is available at: https://assets.ippc.int/static/media/files/publication/en/2018/11/R_05_En_2017-08-24_Combined_2018_MinorEditorial.pdf. APPPC members were encouraged to participate in the survey to ensure that the results represented data from the region by going to <https://www.ippc.int/en/resources/multimedia/online-tools/ippc-observatory/ippc-observatory-e-commerce-study/>. The survey ends on 31 October 2024.

All survey responses will be reviewed and analysed, and a report created by the IPPC Secretariat. The report will be presented at CPM-19 in 2025.

Action 2a: APPPC members to respond to the survey on e-commerce by **31 October 2024** to ensure regional data is obtained (<https://www.ippc.int/en/resources/multimedia/online-tools/ippc-observatory/ippc-observatory-e-commerce-study/>).

7.4 Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments

The topic was introduced by IC member, Mr Xiaoliang WANG. The presentation described the FAO-owned PCE as a confidential, comprehensive NPPO-led, facilitator enabled process of multiple phases supported by the IPPC Secretariat. The PCE provides a wide range of benefits to help countries evaluate their phytosanitary capacity.

The PCE has three modes: (1) facilitated evaluation with the support of an IPPC-certified PCE facilitator with technical guidance from the IPPC Secretariat; (2) facilitated evaluation with the support of an IPPC-certified PCE facilitator without IPPC Secretariat involvement; and (3) independent evaluation conducted by the NPPO.

The PCE offers three modules of assessment: system, organizational and core activities. Each module contains a set of questions which help to identify gaps and priorities. Up to five gaps are prioritized per module and countries can select the number of modules that suit their need and context. Full assessments are also possible.

The framework for evaluation includes situation analysis, strategic planning and validation with the outputs provided on a phytosanitary capacity development strategy and proposed new/revised legislation/regulation.

The vision for the evaluations is to empower countries to continuously improve their systems to prevent the introduction and spread of pests. The strategic objectives are that the tool will be widely used by countries to understand their strengths and weaknesses to

develop plans for improvement and that the IPPC Secretariat is resourced to aid countries as needed.

Free courses to become certified as a PCE facilitator are available. Further information on PCE and PCE facilitator certification is available on at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/about/core-activities/capacity-development/phytosanitary-capacity-evaluation/>

Discussion:

The Philippines indicated that they will be undertaking a PCE. The Philippines were looking at funding sources and how to tie together different themes such as climate change, pests, and disease etc.

Mr Avertik NERSISYAN talked about how useful the PCE tool is and that there is financial support available for conducting in-country PCE through the IPPC. The long-term goal is to have a qualitatively good tool that can be conducted by any country without a facilitator. The tool will help to develop a short and long-term strategy and action plan for improvement. He expressed that feedback will be useful for the IPPC.

Nepal conducted PCE in 2022. Nepal asked if there was any programme for capacity building/training that they could be a part of including any online courses. The IPPC secretariat indicated that requests / expressions of interest should be sent to Sarah Brunel at the IPPC Implementation and Facilitation Unit (IFU).

Thailand has undertaken PCE 1-2 times. Their experience was that it was difficult for other organizations within the country to access the results of PCE. Mr NERSISYAN advised that the results are confidential to the institution for which the evaluation occurred.

Sri Lanka have also undertaken PCE to understand the gaps in their system and found it to be a very good tool.

7.5 IPPC commodity standards:

7.5.1 Key principles overview

The topic was introduced by the Ms Lihong ZHU (Chair of the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS)). Ms ZHU emphasized the strategic purpose of commodity standards to support the development of phytosanitary import requirements that are technically justified, facilitate and simplify trade, and accelerate trade negotiations. She emphasized that no obligations are imposed on importing countries by commodity standards (as highlighted in ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)) other than to consider them when developing phytosanitary import requirements. The lists of pests and measures in commodity standards are not intended to be exhaustive.

Ms ZHU talked about activities of the TPCS and highlighted that the Asia Pacific region is well represented on the panel. There are members from Japan, Korea, China, Australia, and New Zealand. The region's representation in the TPCS demonstrates a strong regional commitment to commodity standards.

7.5.2 Call for information material for new commodity standards

There are currently 8 topics on the work programme of the TPCS. This includes the mango fruit standard currently out for second consultation. The 7 new topics added in 2023 are:

Priority 1 topics

- International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris*
- International movement of fresh taro (*Colocasia esculenta*) for consumption
- International movement of fresh banana (*Musa paradisiaca*) fruit
- International movement of *Citrus* fruit

Priority 2 topics

- International movement of *Vitis vinifera* fruit
- International movement of *Malus domestica* fruit for consumption
- International movement of fresh orange (*Citrus sinensis*) fruit, priority 2

A call for information materials has been made by the IPPC Secretariat for the four priority 1 topics. The call ends on 30 September 2024 and contracting parties are encouraged to submit information to ensure that there is sufficient content for the standards. The TPCS will develop two standards during their face-to-face meeting in December in Australia. The quality and quantity of information received will inform which standards are developed.

Discussion:

Japan asked for clarification on if the webinar on commodity standards would be before or after CPM 2025. Ms ZHU clarified that the webinar is planned for the first quarter of 2025, so it is likely to be before CPM. The webinar will mean that many people can be involved.

Sri Lanka asked what the criteria for attendance at CPM is. Mr Avertik NERSISYAN clarified that the IPPC contact should receive the invitation and coordinate nominations and attendance as per internal processes.

Nepal questioned why a product for processing is subject to stringent phytosanitary measures in some countries. The Chair and New Zealand responded by referencing ISPM 32 and how the intended use of a product affects pest risk. There is currently no standard that specifically addresses commodities imported for processing.

Action 13: APPPC members to submit information for the development of 4 new topics for commodity standards. The deadline for providing information is **30 September 2024**. The call is available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/news/ippc-secretariat-calls-for-information-material-to-future-commodities-standards/> for:

- a. International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris*
- b. International movement of fresh taro (*Colocasia esculenta*) for consumption
- c. International movement of fresh banana (*Musa paradisiaca*) fruit
- d. International movement of *Citrus* fruit

7.6 IPPC advertising

The IPPC Secretariat presented a video on IPPC guides and training materials and the standard setting process during the break.

APPPC Activities

8. APPPC activities

8.1. APPPC 33rd session in China

Mr Xiaoliang WANG provided an update on arrangements for the upcoming Biennial session in September in 2024. There are 18 member countries (66 people) attending the meeting. China's delegates will be from many areas in the NPPO and will be available to answer any questions. Hotels rooms have been reserved. Transportation will be documented and sent to participants. The field trip will be on the fourth day and will be to quarantine sites and to a traditional town in China. There will be an official welcome dinner.

8.2. RSPMs on longan fruit and white rice

The Chair noted that the RSPMs are recommended for adoption at the APPPC 33rd session in China. The one expert working group developed both RSPMs. The process was efficient because there was an existing RSPM for mango and the draft ISPM for mango. Only 5 experts were nominated for the EWG and Ms YIM was the steward. The development and consultation process is quicker than that for ISPMs. There will not be extensive discussion on the RSPMs at the Biennial session.

Rice was more complex than first through as it involved many storage pests. RSPMs should be more focused on commodities of regional interest than those developed by the IPPC. The Chair encouraged countries to nominate experts for future EWGs for commodity standards. The last call only attracted the minimum number of 5 for the EWG. New Zealand is developing a paper about criteria for prioritization of topics for commodity standards to present to the Biennial session.

Action 14: APPPC members to nominate experts for working groups to develop regional standards (RSPMs) when calls are made.

CLOSING SESSION

9. Conclusion of the workshop

The Chair reminded participants to submit their country comments on the draft ISPMs and thanked all participants for their contributions.

Korea will submit regional comments on the draft ISPMs through the IPPC Online Commenting System (OCS).

10. Online survey of the workshop

The IPPC Secretariat requested that meeting participants complete the online survey of the workshop. Korea also requested participants to complete a survey.

11. Date and venue of the next regional workshop

The next Regional Workshop of the APPPC will be held in the Republic of Korea, 8-12 September 2025. However, Korea is unable to support participants from developing countries in 2025 due to policy changes. The APPPC trust fund will be used to fully, or partially support travel for countries depending on their developmental status.

There was a brief discussion about options for future meetings. China proposed that every two years the workshop could be immediately followed by the Biennial session meeting. The Chair suggested this proposal was impractical if Korea was the host country. Similar discussions have been held in the past. Timing and funding are important considerations. Time constraints are especially important for Australia and New Zealand who also attend PPPO meetings.

12. Report

The action points for the meeting were discussed and circulated to participants before the close of the meeting. The full meeting report will be reviewed by the Chair, Secretariat and rapporteur and will be circulated to all participants.

13. Close of meeting

Mr Avetik NERSISYAN, from the IPPC Secretariat, expressed his pleasure at working with the APPPC and thanked the Chairperson for her excellent work in facilitating the workshop. He thanked participants for their contributions to the review of the draft ISPMs and standard setting processes. He expressed his appreciation for the work of the host country, the Republic of Korea, and the excellent field trip. He also thanked the technical support staff and SC members.

China, Australia, and New Zealand expressed their appreciation of Korea APQA for hosting the meeting and setting a high standard for their hospitality. They shared positive impressions from the meeting and field trip. They highlighted that Korea had hosted the regional workshop for 19 years and had increased regional capacity as a result. Sri Lanka also thanked Korea for funding of travel and for a very successful meeting.

Mi Chi YEA thanked all participants for their contributions and hoped all would have positive memories from the workshop. Lastly, the Chair thanked all members for their participation and closed the meeting.



Attachment 1: Agenda

AGENDA FOR THE 2024 IPPC-APPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP

2 – 6 September 2024

Amid Seoul, Republic of Korea

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

No	Item	Presenter / Facilitator	Time (min.)	Document
Day 1, morning Opening session:				
1	Opening of the Session		30	
1.1	Welcome remarks: - IPPC Secretariat - APPPC Secretariat - Host Country / NPPO	IPPC Secretary IPPC secretariat officer	30	Video In-person
2	Meeting Arrangements		10	
2.1	Election of the Chair and the Rapporteur	All	5	
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	All	5	Doc
3	Administrative Matters	Organizer	5	
3.1	Participants list	Republic of Korea	5	Doc
4.	Updates on Governance and Strategic issues		120	
4.1	Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)	Bureau Member	20	Doc/PPT
4.2	Update from SC	SC Member	15	PPT
4.3	Update from IC	IC Member	15	PPT
4.4	Strengthening Pest Outbreak and	Bureau Member/	20	PPT

	Response Systems (POARS)	IPPC Secretariat		
4.5	CPM FG on Sea Containers	Australia	20	PPT
4.6	CPM FG on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (FGSA) - Comments on the “safe aid pathway diagram”	Australia	30	PPT + comments
Day 1, afternoon Session: (210 minutes)				
5	Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations			
5.2	Draft ISPM under 1 st Consultation: Draft annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)	SC Member	90	Presentation/Doc
5.3	Draft ISPM under 1 st Consultation: Draft revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010)	SC Member	120	Presentation/Doc
Day 2, morning Session: (150minutes)				
5.4	Draft ISPMs under 1 st consultation: Draft annex Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds)	SC Member	90	Presentation/Doc

5.4	Draft ISPM under 2 nd Consultation; Draft annex International Movement of Mango (<i>Mangifera indica</i>) Fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46	SC Member	60	Presentation/Doc
Day 2, afternoon Session: (180 minutes)				
5.5	Draft ISPM under 2 nd Consultation: Draft annex Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood)	SC Member	60	Presentation/Doc
5.6	Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: - Draft specification on holistic revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis standard (2023-037)	SC Member	60	Presentation/Doc
6	Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/RPPOs			
6.1	APPPC activities	RPPO regional rep.	30	Doc + PPT
6.2	APPPC Strategic Plan Implementation	NZ	30	PPT
Day 3, morning Session: (160 minutes)				
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	Sustainable funding mechanism for ePhyto Solution	New Zealand	30	Presentation (PPT)

7.3	Update on TR4 Global and Regional Coordination	IC member / APPPC secretariat	30	Presentation
7.4	E-commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade	IPPC Secretariat / IC member	30	Video / Presentation
7.5	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments	IC member / Philippines	30	Presentation
7.6	IPPC commodity standards: - Key Principles Overview Call for information material for new commodity standards	IPPC Secretariat /TPCS members /SC members	30	PPT
	Advertising slides and video on guides and training materials and standard setting process	10		Presentation /Video
Day 3, afternoon Session: (150 minutes)				
8	APPPC activities			
8.1	APPPC 33 rd Session in China	China	30	Oral report
8.2	RSPM on longan fruit and white rice	Rep. of Korea	30	Oral report
8.3	Review of OCS of regional comment		90	OCS
Day 4 Field visit				
Day 5, morning Session: Closing (90 minutes)				
9	Conclusion of the workshop	Chair	30	
10	Online survey of the workshop	All participants	10	



11	Date and venue of the next regional workshop	Chair	10	
12	Report	All participants	30	
13	Close of the meeting	Chair	10	
Day 5, Afternoon Review of APPPC 33rd Session preparation APPPC Advisory group meeting.				



Attachment 2: List of Participants

List of Participants 2024 IPPC-APPPC Regional Workshop Meeting Seoul, Republic of Korea 2 to 6 September 2024

Australia

Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith
Australian Chief Plant Protection Officer
Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601, Australia
Tel: +61 2 6272 4671
Mobile: +61 481 912 117
Email: gabrielle.vivian-smith@aff.gov.au

Ms Lauren Madden
IPPC Contact point
Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601, Australia
Mobile: +61 403 086 185
Email: lauren.madden@aff.gov.au

Bangladesh

Dr Mohammad Hazrat Ali
Additional Director
Plant Quarantine Wing, Department of Agricultural Extension
Room No. 403, 3'd Floor, Khamarbari, Dhaka-1215, Bangladesh
Tel: +880 2 55028256
Mobile: +880 1716 980 824
Email: hazratali6737@yahoo.com

Bhutan

Mr Sherab Zangpo
Senior Regulatory and Quarantine Inspector
Bhutan Food and Drug Authority
Ministry of Health
Tel: +97502327031
Mobil: +97517242571
Email: szangpo@bfda.gov.bt

Cambodia

Dr Socheath ONG
Deputy Director
Plant Protection Sanitary and Phytosanitary Department/GDA
#54B/49F, Street 395-656, Sangkat Teuk La'ark3,
Khan Toul Kork, Phnom Penh, Cambodia
Mobile: +855 92 622 621
Email: ongsocheath@yahoo.com



China

Mr Hongjun Zhang
Division Chief
Institute for Control of Agrochemicals
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, P.R. China
No. 22 Mai Zi Dian Street, Beijing 100125, China
Tel :+86 001059194257
Mobile: +86 015011522905
Email: zhanghongjun@agri.gov.cn, 1450724278@qq.com

Mr Xiaoliang WANG
Deputy Chief of Plant Quarantine Division
National Agro-tech Extension and Service Center
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, P.R. China
No. 22 Mai Zi Dian Street, Beijing 100125, China
Tel :+86 1059194524
Mobile: +86 15201166875
Email: Wangxiaoliang0116@gmail.com

Ms Jiang Pei
Deputy Chief of Pest Risk Analysis Division
National agricultural technology extension service center
Building 20, Mai zi Dian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China
Tel :+86 1059194547
Mobile: +86 13611010767
Email: jiangp2006@126.com

Indonesia

Dr Aulia Nusantara
Plant Quarantine Analyst
Directorate of standard for Plant Quarantine
Indonesian Quarantine Authority (IQA)
Ministry of Agriculture, E Building 5th Floor, JL. Harsono RM No. 3, Ragunan, South
Mobile : +62812 1881 1577
Email: aulia.nusanta@yahoo.com

Japan

Mr Masahiro Sai
Head, Pest Risk Analysis Division
Yokohama Plant Protection Station,
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), JAPAN
1-16-10 Shin-Yamashita, Naka-ku, Yokohama. 2310801
Tel: + 81 45 6228693
Email: masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp

Ms Natsumi Yamada
Deputy Director
International Affairs Office, Plant Protection Division,



Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), JAPAN
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN. 100-8950
Tel: +81 3 3502 5978
Mobile: +81 90 5991 5682
Email: natsumi_yamada770@maff.go.jp

Ms Natsumi Fujii
Plant Protection Officer
Plant Protection Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), JAPAN
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN. 100-8950
Tel: +81 3 3502 5978
Mobile: +81 90 6976 7251
Email: natsumi_fujii030@maff.go.jp

Laos

Ms Sounaly Sommany
Deputy Director
Plant Quarantine Division
Department of Agriculture
Lanxang Avenue, Patuxay square, Vientiane Lao PDR
Tel: +856 20 28268045
Mobile: +856 20 28268045
Email: nanasounaly@gmail.com

Malaysia

Ms Rosmawati Binti Selamat
Director
Plant Biosecurity Division
Department of Agriculture Malaysia,
3rd Floor, Wisma Tani, Jalan Sultan Salahuddin, 50632 Kuala Lumpur
Tel: +603 2030 1400
Mobile: +6012 3912919
Email: rosmawatis@doa.gov.my

Nepal

Mr Bhoj Raj Sapkota
Chief (Joint Secretary), NPPO Nepal,
Plant Quarantine and Pesticide Management Center,
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development,
Government of Nepal, Hariharbhawan, Lalitpur, Nepal
Tel: +977 15424352
Mobile: +977 9849702794
Email: bhoj.sapkota@nepal.gov.np



New Zealand

Ms Lihong Zhu
NZ IPPC Contact Point
Portfolio Manager for IPPC (International Plant Protection Convention)
Trade Facilitation and Standards
Trade and International Relations
Ministry for Primary Industries - Manatū Ahu Matua
Charles Fergusson Building, 34-38 Bowen Street
Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Telephone: +64-4-894 0261
Mobile: +64-29-894 0261
Email: Lihong.zhu@mpi.govt.nz

Ms Joanne Wilson
Principal Adviser
Office of the Chief Biosecurity Officer
Biosecurity New Zealand - Tiakitanga Pūtaiao Aotearoa
Ministry for Primary Industries - Manatū Ahu Matua
Charles Fergusson Building, 34-38 Bowen Street
Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Telephone: +64-4-894 0528
Mobile: +64-29-894 0528
Email: joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz

Philippines

Mr Gerald Glenn F. Panganiban
Director
Bureau of Plant Industry
692 San Andres st. Malate, Manila,
Philippines
Tel : +82512262
Email: gfpanganiban@gmail.com, bpi.do@buplant.da.gov.ph

Mr Henrick B. Exconde
Supervising Agriculturist
National Plant Quarantine Division-Central Office
Bureau of Plant Industry
692 San Andres st. Malate, Manila
Philippines
Tel : +82512262
Email : pqsmpi@gmail.com, exconde_henrick@yahoo.com

Mr El-Khaled D. Gordolan
Supervising Agriculturist
Region XII PQS Gensan, General Santos City
Bureau of Plant Industry
Makar Wharf F, Labangal, General Santos City, Philippines
Tel : +82512262
Email : pqsmpi@gmail.com, elkhaledgordolan25@gmail.com



Republic of Korea

Mr Kyung Bong Koh

Director

Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs

177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea 39660

Tel: +82 54 912 0621

Mobile: +82 10 9301 6321

Email: ko3201@korea.kr

Ms Mi Chi Yea

Deputy Director

Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs

177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea

Tel: (+82) 54-912-0627

Email: kittymc@korea.kr

Ms Donam Kim

Assistant Director

Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs

177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea

Tel: (+82) 54-912-0628

Email: dongam75@korea.kr

Sri Lanka

Ms Kamani Priyadarshani Siyambalapitiyage Dona

Deputy Director of Agriculture

National Plant Quarantine Service

Department of Agriculture

PLNAT Quarantine Station, Bandaranike, International Airport, Katunayake

Tel: +94112252575

Mobil: +94715164358

Email: kamanipriya@gmail.com, sdkamanipriya@gmail.com

Thailand

Mr Prateep Arayakittipong

Standards Officer, Senior Professional level

The National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)

50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900

Tel: +662 5612277

Email: prateep_ming@hotmail.com; ippcthailand@gmail.com

Ms Wasana Ridhaisong

Agricultural Research Officer, Senior Professional Level

Department of Agriculture

50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900

Tel: +66 2561 1680

Mobil: +66 8 6994 3878

Email: wasana_rid@yahoo.com



Ms Viengvisas Kunsiri
Standard Officer, Professional Level
The National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900
Tel: +662 5612277
Mobile: +6681 323 1868
Email: pupu_077@hotmail.com

Vietnam

Ms Thi Thu Thuy Trinh
Plat Quarantine Officer
Plant Protection Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
149 Ho Duc Di street- Dong Da district-Ha Noi Capital-Viet Nam
Tel: +00842436825355
Mobile: +0084 912306028
Email: thuytt74@gmail.com, thuytt.bvtv@mard.gov.vn

Facilitator

Ms Kyu-Ock Yim
Chair of Standard Committee
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Email: koyim2022@gmail.com
Mobil: +82 10 8752 3132

IPPC Secretariat

Mr Avertik Nersisyan
IPPC Secretariat
Standard Setting Unit Leader
Standard Setting Unit (SSU)
International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00513 Roma Italy
Email: avetik.nersisyan@fao.org, avetik.nersisyan@gmail.com

Mr Emmanuel Plarhar Krah
IPPC Secretariat
Phytosanitary Standard Setting Support Specialist
Standard Setting Unit (SSU)
International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00513 Roma Italy
Email: emmanuel.krah@fao.org



Attachment 3: List of acronyms used in this report

APPPC	Asia Pacific Plant Protection Organization
APQA	Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency of the Republic of Korea
CODEX	Codex Alimentarius Commission
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
CPM	IPPC Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
CRP	Conference room paper
CTU code	Cargo Transport Units code
DIA	Development agenda items of the IPPC Strategic Framework
ePhyto	Electronic phytosanitary certificate
EU	European Union
EWG	Expert working group
FAO	The Food and Agricultural Organization: a United Nations organization
FF-PFA	Fruit fly pest free area
FG	IPPC Focus Group
GEF	Global Environment Facility (FAO regional regular programme)
GeNS	Generic ePhyto National System
GLDN	IPPC focus group on Global Laboratory Diagnostic Networking
GPRC	IPPC focus group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination
Gy	Gray (the unit of ionizing radiation dose in the international system of units)
HWIT	Hot water immersion treatment
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IC	IPPC Implementation and Capacity Development Committee
IFU	IPPC Implementation and Facilitation Unit
IPP	International Phytosanitary Portal (the official website of the IPPC)
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISPM	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
NAPPO	North American Plant Protection Organization
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
OCS	The IPPC Online Commenting System
PCE	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations
PFA	Pest Free Area
POARS	Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems
PPPO	Pacific Plant Protection Organization
PRA	Pest Risk Analysis
RIG	Regional Implementation Guide
RSPM	Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
SAFE	The framework of Standards to Secure and Facilitate Global Trade
SALB	South American leaf blight of rubber
SC	IPPC Standards Committee (comprises 25 members from each of the seven FAO regions)
SC-7	Standards Committee 7 (comprises seven members, one from each FAO region)



SF	IPPC Strategic Framework
SIT	Sterile insect technique
SPG	IPPC Strategic Planning Group
TC-RPPO	Technical Consultations among Regional Plant Protection Organizations
TPCS	Technical Panel on Commodity Standards of the IPPC
TPG	IPPC Technical Panel for the Glossary
TR4	<i>Fusarium</i> tropical race 4, Panama wilt disease
VHT	Vapour heat treatment
WCO	World Customs Organization
WFP	World Food Programme
WOAH	World Organization for Animal Health