Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

International Plant Protection Convention

# REPORT

# 2025 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia

## Antalya, Republic of Türkiye

## 03–05 September 2025

## IPPC Secretariat

IPPC Secretariat. 2026. *Report of the meeting of the 2025 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia, 03–05 September 2025.* Rome. FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention.

## CONTENTS

# 1. Opening of the meeting

## 1.1 Welcome remarks

### 1.1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat (Video-message from FAO Deputy-Director General)

[1] Beth BECHDOL, Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Deputy Director-General, in a pre-recorded video message, welcomed participants to the 2025 Regional Workshops (RWs) of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), emphasizing the important role of plant protection in building a food-secure world. She underscored the value of the regional workshops in bringing together national plant protection organizations (NPPOs), regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs), FAO regional and subregional offices and partners across international and regional organizations to come together and strengthen collaboration in plant health. The 2025 IPPC RWs serve as a key opportunity to enhance collective capacity to implement International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs), facilitate the exchange of knowledge, and foster cooperation across borders. BECHDOL stressed the urgency of regional dialogue and coordinated action to address current and new threats to plant health effectively. She highlighted the critical role of participant engagement, noting that attendees contribute significantly by reviewing draft ISPMs, tackling implementation challenges, and discussing emerging topics. Furthermore, participants play a key role in shaping the IPPC's future direction, ensuring that it remains fit-for-purpose and responsive to emerging challenges. In closing, BECHDOL wished all participants productive and action-oriented discussions that would yield meaningful and tangible results.

### 1.1.2 Welcome by the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization Director General

[2] Olga TIKKA, Director-General of European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) welcomed all participants and expressed appreciation for their active engagement in the IPPC RW ECA. She highlighted EPPO's long-standing collaboration with the IPPC and its contracting parties in the region, stressing the importance of regional cooperation for harmonizing phytosanitary measures and supporting the development and implementation of ISPMs. She stressed that EPPO has been involved in the organization of this Workshop and she encouraged participants to take full advantage of the workshop to exchange experiences, discuss regional priorities and provide substantive input on the draft ISPMs under consultation.

### 1.1.3 Welcome by FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia

[3] Artur SHAMILOV, agricultural officer of FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (REU), welcomed participants on behalf of FAO REU and underlined FAO's commitment to supporting countries in the region in strengthening their plant health systems and complying with ISPMs. He emphasized that healthy plants are essential for food security, trade and environmental protection, and noted that the regional workshop provides a valuable opportunity to build capacities, share knowledge and identify areas where FAO and the IPPC can further assist countries. He noted that the EPPO Panel on Global Phytosanitary Affairs will meet after the Workshop, in the same location, to finalize the comments from the EPPO countries (regional comments) on drafts ISPMs and draft specifications. He thanked the co-organizers and the host country for their collaboration and support in convening the workshop.

### 1.1.4 Welcome by Antalya Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry

[4] Şakir Firat ERKAL, Antalya Provincial Director of Agriculture and Forestry, welcomed participants to Antalya and expressed satisfaction that the city was hosting the regional workshop, the first to be held in the country. He noted the key role of plant health for the province's agricultural production and export potential, and indicated that the workshop offered an opportunity to present local initiatives to enhance surveillance and phytosanitary capacity. He wished participants productive discussions and a pleasant stay in Antalya.

### 1.1.5 Welcome by General Directorate of Food and Control, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (NPPO of Türkiye)

[5] Yunus BAYRAM, Deputy General Manager of the General Directorate of Food and Control, welcomed participants to the 2025 IPPC RW ECA emphasizing the significance of hosting the event for the first time in the Republic of Türkiye. He expressed pride in hosting esteemed colleagues and appreciation for their participation. BAYRAM underlined that the 2025 IPPC RW ECA represents a strategic opportunity to enhance international visibility, foster collaboration, and support the development of effective plant health policies. He further emphasized that the high-level international participation reinforces the country's leadership in regional cooperation and supports the advancement of national plant health strategies. He extended sincere gratitude to the Antalya Provincial Director of Agriculture and Forestry, the Plant Protection Branch Manager, the Antalya Agricultural Quarantine Manager, the organizing team as well as to all supporting stakeholders, for their valuable contributions to the successful organization of the workshop. In closing, BAYRAM wished all participants a successful workshop and expressed hope that they would return home with positive memories, enriched knowledge, and renewed commitment to strengthening plant health systems.

### 1.1.6 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

[6] Daniel TORELLA, phytosanitary standard setting support specialist of the IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as "the secretariat"), welcomed participants to the 2025 IPPC RW ECA, expressing sincere gratitude to the co-organizers for their outstanding dedication and hard work in successfully bringing the workshop to fruition. He emphasized that regional workshops serve as vital platforms for regions to come together to review ISPMs, discuss regional and national challenges and learn from one another's experiences. Highlighting the importance of strengthening collective capacity to prevent the introduction and spread of plant pests, TORELLA encouraged all attendees to actively engage in discussions, share insights and concerns, and collaborate to advance regional cooperation and plant health capacity. He concluded by wishing everyone a productive and successful workshop.

## 2. Meeting arrangements

### 2.1 Election of the chairperson and the rapporteur

[7] Ringolds ARNITIS (Latvia) was elected as chairperson. ARNITIS thanked the participants for nominating him as chairperson.

[8] Sultan-Makhmud SULTANOV (Uzbekistan) was elected as rapporteur.

### 2.2 Adoption of the agenda

[9] The agenda was adopted (Appendix 1).

## 3. Administrative matters

### 3.1 Participants list

[10] The participants list is attached to this report (Appendix 2).

[11] Three observers from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) International Services, attended the 2025 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia.

## 4. Updates on IPPC governance and strategic issues

### 4.1 Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)

[12] Sam BISHOP (United Kingdom), member of Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau, provided an overview of the IPPC, including its vision, mission, objectives and core activities. He outlined the roles of the IPPC's governing and subsidiary bodies - CPM, CPM Bureau, Strategic

Planning Group (SPG), Standards Committee (SC), Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)) -. He also highlighted key outcomes from latest meetings such as the adoption of the first commodity standard, the launch of the Plant Health Campus and pledged contributions of USD 1.8 million to support global efforts to protect plants. In addition, BISHOP provided brief updates on the ongoing work of the CPM Focus Groups (FGs) and on the outcomes of the meetings of Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs).

## 4.2 Update from IPPC Secretariat on Africa Phytosanitary Programme and Communications (IDPH & Comms' networks)

*[13]* TORELLA provided updates on the IPPC Secretariat Annual Communications Plan 2025, which serves as the basis for communication activities and products, as well as on the monitoring tools and the branding and promotion for CPM-19. He explained that, to enhance communication, the Secretariat adopted a strategic approach aimed at creating greater impact, increasing visibility, and strengthening brand recall and association.

*[14]* TORELLA highlighted the success of the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) events held on 12 May in El Salvador and hosted by Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA), noting that the campaign achieved more than one billion impressions and reached more than 187 million users.

*[15]* TORELLA provided updates on the IPPC Regional Communications Network, approved by CPM-18 in 2024. The initiative aims to widen the reach and strengthen the impact of plant health communications by facilitating information and knowledge sharing, collaboration, cooperation, and capacity development among RPPOs, NPPOs, the secretariat, FAO regional and national offices and other relevant organizations. In December 2025, the CPM Bureau endorsed the secretariat's proposal to conduct a survey of NPPOs and RPPOs to assess their information needs. The objective is to first identify and address existing information gaps before scaling up to more complex communication networks, which may otherwise experience low uptake in certain regions. TORELLA also invited participants to provide feedback, raise queries and offer suggestions on how to improve communication efforts, encouraging them to reach out to the secretariat's communication specialists.

*[16]* TORELLA outlined the Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP) and its objectives: proactive surveillance of plant pests, timely and accurate pest identification and diagnostics, and effective pest data collection, storage and analytics. The programme follows a phased implementation approach, aiming to involve new countries each year until all African countries are included. It will conclude with a maintenance phase designed to empower countries to build on their acquired experience and sustainably expand the programme. Through this approach, countries and regions are expected to enhance their capacity to address additional pests of concern and to collaborate consistently and synergistically. TORELLA reported on the results following the conclusion of the pilot phase and the beginning of the second phase of the programme, during which new additional countries were involved. Each country compiled a list of its top five priority pests and took part in a Train-the-Trainer workshop held in June 2025. He concluded by emphasizing the importance of resource mobilization, noting that the APP relies on grant funding. He encouraged countries to contribute to the programme to ensure its long-term sustainability and to maximize its impact.

## 4.3 Update from Standards Committee (SC)

*[17]* Stavroula IOANNIDOU (Greece), SC member, provided an overview of the role and activities of the secretariat's Standard Setting Unit (SSU), including its composition and the planned work for 2025. IOANNIDOU outlined the role of the SC and presented an update on the draft specifications for ISPMs that were approved for consultation as well as the draft ISPMs approved for first and second consultation. She also noted that two draft diagnostic protocols (DPs) were adopted by the SC on behalf of the CPM, following the closure of the DP notification period.

*[18]* Following the decisions of CPM-19 to transition the *2025 Call for Topics for Standards and Implementation* from a biennial to a year-round within a 2-year trial period, and to explore ways to

enhance the accessibility of ISPMs through the use of simpler language, IOANNIDOU concluded by highlighting two key points:

- the SC agreed on a timeline for reviewing topic submissions during the ongoing 2025 IPPC Call for Topics and encouraged contracting parties (CPs) and RPPOs to submit topics early so they can be reviewed by the SC at their meeting in November 2025; and
- an SC small group was established to explore accessibility, complexity, and plain language in ISPMs and that a paper be submitted to the 2025 SPG meeting and invited participants to provide regional perspectives on the clarity and usability of ISPMs.

## 4.4 Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)

*[19]* Ringolds ARNITIS (Latvia), chairperson of this regional workshop and IC member, explained the role of the IC, its composition, responsibilities and the activities of its subgroups and teams.

*[20]* ARNITIS highlighted the contributions of the IC to the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030:

- electronic data exchange: harmonizing digital phytosanitary certification systems globally to facilitate secure, efficient trade;
- e-commerce pathways: addressing phytosanitary risks in postal and courier channels;
- pest outbreak alert systems: strengthening early detection and rapid response capabilities for emerging plant pests; and
- third-party authorization: developing guidelines for delegating phytosanitary actions to authorized entities.

*[21]* ARNITIS reported on the activities of the IC teams established to work on specific topics: National Reporting Obligations (NROs), Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE), Fusarium TR4, e-commerce, innovative projects, contributed phytosanitary resources, authorization of third-party entities and IPPC guides and training materials.

*[22]* Regarding the IC Subgroup on the IPPC Observatory, ARNITIS highlighted the priorities for 2025:

- finalization of e-commerce and antimicrobial resistance (AMR) study reports:
  - e-commerce study: launched with a survey to all CPs to assess implementation of CPM recommendations on internet trade and establish baseline data for monitoring global phytosanitary e-commerce strategies;
  - AMR surveys: launched to understand phytosanitary risks associated with antimicrobial and antifungal products in plant health;
- conduct of third IPPC General survey; and
- mid-term monitoring of IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030**.**

*[23]* ARNITIS also reported the enhanced collaboration between IC and SC, including strengthened representation and improved communication. This collaboration aims to better integrate standard development with implementation, fostering a more cohesive and coordinated approach to IPPC implementation.

*[24]* ARNITIS concluded by explaining how participants can become involved in the activities of the IC. Opportunities include submitting topics to the call for topics, responding to IPPC Observatory surveys, mobilizing resources and submitting projects, and supporting the translation and proofreading of IPPC implementation material. He specifically highlighted that a call for experts to proofread translations of IPPC guides and training materials in all official FAO languages is currently open, with a particular need for Russian and Spanish.

## 4.5 Getting in touch about strengthening Pest Outbreak and Response Systems (POARS)

*[25]* Mariangela CIAMPITTI (Italy), member of the SC and CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS), provided an overview of the POARS, outlining its connection to the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030's Development Agenda Item (DAI) on "Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems". She highlighted the establishment of the CPM Focus Group on POARS in 2020 and the subsequent formation of the POARS Steering Group in 2022, along with its mandate. She thanked the European members of this group for their continued engagement.

*[26]* POARS aims to enhance global phytosanitary capacity by improving early detection, strengthening response strategies, and fostering international collaboration to minimize the impact of emerging pests on agriculture, trade, and ecosystems. The system focuses on identifying emerging pests of global concern, issuing alerts to the IPPC community and stakeholders, and supporting countries across four key areas of outbreak response: prevention, preparedness, response and recovery.

*[27]* POARS employs horizon scanning to identify potential emerging pests and applies a clearly defined, three-step assessment procedure and criteria to determine whether these pests qualify as emerging pests of global concern. The criteria are organized into three steps:

- Step 1: Assesses recent geographical spread and current distribution;
- Step 2: Evaluates economic and environmental impact;
- Step 3: Considers the likelihood of introduction into new areas and the potential scale of impacts.

*[28]* Based on this assessment, pests are categorized as:

- emerging pest: a pest that meets the relevant criteria across all three steps;
- non-emerging pest for the watch list: a pest that meets the Step 1 criteria but does not meet all criteria in Steps 2 and 3. These pests require continued observation and may be reassessed as new data becomes available;
- non-emerging pest with no follow-up actions: a pest that does not meet the initial criteria related to distribution and spread.

*[29]* CIAMPITTI cited some examples for each category:

- spotted lanternfly (*Lycorma delicatula*) as emerging pest;
- *Maize lethal necrosis* (MLN) as non-emerging pest for the watch list because information available are currently insufficient; and
- *Halyomorpha halys* as non-emerging pest with no follow-up actions.

*[30]* CIAMPITTI reported on the outcomes of the POARS pilot phase, including an IPPC call for nomination of potential emerging pests from 31 January 2025 until 3 March 2025, with several submissions from CPs and RPPOs, in particular *Synchytrium endobioticum* and *Bactericera cockerelli* from this region. She noted that the first official alert for *Clavibacter nebraskensis* was issued on 3 March 2025 and that EPPO organized an Expert Working Group (EWG) for a pest risk analysis for this pest; following alerts will concern *Orobanche cumana* and *Lycorma delicatula*. She then outlined the next steps of the pilot, including the establishment of a global alert system based on agreed criteria, prioritization of emerging pests that pose a global threat, development of expert networks, and the creation of a global emergency response mechanism to enable rapid support and tool mobilization for affected countries or regions.

*[31]* CIAMPITTI highlighted the successful example of the phytosanitary commandos in Latin America, which are intervention teams that support countries in exclusion, prevention, containment and phytosanitary management against specific quarantine or emerging pests. Upon this concept, the European Commission established the European Union (EU) Plant Health Emergency Team, a group of specialized experts that provides technical, scientific, and managerial support to EU Member States and neighbouring countries facing outbreaks of harmful plant pests and diseases.

### 4.6 Getting in touch about CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers

[32] Thorwald GEUZE (Kingdom of the Netherlands), IC member and co-Chair of the CPM FG on Sea Containers, explained the role and mandate of the focus group. He also reported on recent activities, including:

- the organization of the international symposium on "Optimizing container design to mitigate risks of pest contamination in the international containerized supply chain" held in November 2024, where over 70 participants from various industry organizations, including container manufacturers, container operators and plant health stakeholders, gathered to explore practical container design modifications aimed at minimizing pest risks (e.g. floor designs that eliminate gaps and cracks as 95% of survey findings are related to them);
- the assessment of regulatory and non-regulatory options;
- the revision of the IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU Code), finalized by United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) in February 2025 and currently under consideration by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and International Maritime Organization (IMO), containing a new dedicated chapter on pest contamination and the importance of implementing measures by parties in the containerized supply chains, building on the CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers (R-06); and
- the development of the concept of custodial responsibility.

[33] GEUZE then emphasized the importance of the recently revised CPM Recommendation on *Minimizing the pest risk associated with the sea-container pathway* (R-06) to raise awareness and gather feedback from NPPOs in preparation for the focus group's final recommendations to be presented to the CPM in 2027. In this regard, it was recalled that the focus group continues to collect and assess available data from NPPOs on pest interceptions associated with sea containers. This data supports the evaluation of the impact of CPM Recommendation R-06 and informs other activities of the focus group. It was also noted that a Container Inspection Recording Template is included in the *IPPC guidelines for sea container surveys*.

[34] GEUZE informed participants of the upcoming events and initiatives: the Container Cleanliness Symposium, scheduled for October 2025 in Copenhagen, Denmark, a proposed side session on sea containers during CPM-20 in 2026 and a potential International Workshop in 2026 aimed at determining the impact and uptake of CPM Recommendation R-06. These efforts will support the development of the final focus group recommendations to be presented to CPM-21 in 2027, including whether the development of an ISPM or long-term guidance is necessary.

[35] GEUZE concluded by emphasizing the importance of achieving a globally harmonized framework of measures for sea containers. While containers are not currently perceived as a significant threat in this region, he expressed concern that without global harmonization, individual countries may develop their own requirements, leading to a fragmented and challenging situation. Notably, two regions are already in the process of developing their own regional standards. To support progress toward harmonization, GEUZE underscored the essential role and active involvement of NPPOs.

## 5. Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations

[36] The participants agreed that only the consultation comments on the draft standards and draft specifications for ISPMs highlighted by EPPO stewards will be discussed during the RW.

[37] Following the Regional Workshop, the EPPO Panel on Global Phytosanitary Affairs will additionally review the consultation comments proposed by the countries of the region and decide which comments will be submitted into the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) as regional comments.

## 5.1 The IPPC standard setting process in a nutshell

[38] TORELLA introduced participants to the importance of ISPMs through a video and a presentation, providing an overview of the Standard Setting Procedure (SSP), the process through which ISPMs are developed and adopted.

[39] TORELLA reminded participants that the *2025 Call for Topics for Standards and Implementation* is now open and will remain so throughout the year. He explained that topic proposals may include not only new ISPMs, but also proposal for annexes to existing ISPMs, revisions of adopted ISPMs, new implementation resources (e.g. guides, e-learning courses) as well as topics for conducting surveys and studies on key phytosanitary-related issues.

## 5.2 Introduction to the concept of Commodity Standards

[40] IOANNIDOU introduced the concept of commodity standards (CSs), a key program within the IPPC's Strategic Framework 2020-2030 aimed at supporting the development of phytosanitary import requirements that are technically justified and facilitate safe trade. These standards are developed as annexes to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) and are based on scientific and technical data, ensuring their effectiveness in mitigating pest risks.

[41] The IPPC Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) evaluates technical information submitted by contracting parties, including data on the commodity, relevant pests, and associated phytosanitary measures, using ISPM 46 criteria, to identify pests to be included and corresponding measures.

[42] Key principles guiding the development of commodity standards include:

- only pests regulated by at least one contracting party are considered for inclusion in the pest list;
- a pest is included only if a specific measure to manage its risk is identified;
- measures must be operational between at least two contracting parties and supported by a pest risk analysis (PRA) or similar technical examination; and
- the TPCS does not assess pest risk, and inclusion of a pest in the annex to ISPM 46 does not serve as technical justification for regulation by a contracting party.

[43] IOANNIDOU emphasized the importance of contracting parties engagement as only submitted data on pests affecting the commodity, PRAs, and technical and phytosanitary measures defined by national or regional legislation, can be considered in commodity standards. She highlighted the need for comprehensive documentation on the pest-commodity association (host-pathway), with a focus on the commodity's intended use, and noted challenges related to data accessibility, such as unpublished information or bilateral agreements. Additionally, pests may be regulated because they are associated with a host plant (like citrus species), even if the specific plant part being traded (such as the fruit) is not a host or pathway. Clear and well-referenced measures, including those in system approaches or chemical treatments, are essential, and a new submission form has been introduced to assist contracting parties in this process.

[44] Several benefits of commodity standards were highlighted:

- harmonization could avoid complex commodity-based import requirements and unnecessary impedance of international trade;
- increasing need for international standards to prevent the introduction and spread of pests;
- limited resources to conduct PRA, inspection, monitoring surveillance etc.;
- harmonization of procedures such as inspection, sampling, and testing;
- identification of options of measures; and
- globally agreed requirements could assist developing countries.

[45] IOANNIDOU concluded by highlighting recent progress, including the adoption of the first commodity standard on fresh mango fruit by CPM-19, the ongoing second consultation period for the draft

commodity standards on fresh banana fruit and fresh taro, the development of draft commodity standards on citrus fruits, bean seeds, grapes and apples. An open IPPC call for supporting material on apples is currently underway, with a deadline of 15 October 2025.

*[46]* **Submissions with insufficient or lacking supporting documentation.** Highlighting apples as an important crop for the region, a participant encouraged countries to actively submit relevant requirements and measures. Another participant raised a question regarding the implications of insufficient or lacking supporting documentation for a submitted pest. In response, IOANNIDOU explained that, if such documentation is submitted by an NPPO, it would be difficult for the TPCS to exclude that pest from consideration, even if, for instance, it is not a known pathway for certain commodities. This is due to the need to adhere to the principles and obligations under the IPPC framework. She therefore emphasized the importance of submitting comprehensive and well-supported documentation.

*[47]* **Criteria for inclusion of pests.** Another participant acknowledged the novelty of commodity standards and expressed appreciation for the detailed presentation and submission procedure. When questioned about criteria for including pests in commodity standards or the circumstances under which reference documents are requested, IOANNIDOU explained the TPCS has established criteria for inclusion of measures in commodity standards, as outlined in ISPM 46. She further noted that the TPCS may request additional information and documentation from submitting countries to support their proposals. She concluded by welcoming suggestions for improving the procedure and by mentioning plans to hold a dedicated side-session on commodity standards at CPM-20 in 2026.

*[48]* **Commodity standards and regulations.** The chairperson expressed concern that the adoption of commodity standards might impose regulatory burdens on countries that have not previously regulated or exported those commodities, urging caution to avoid creating additional implementation challenges for such countries. In response to citing ISPM 15, which regulates wood packaging material in international trade, as a kind of commodity standard, a participant clarified the distinction between ISPM 15 and ISPM 46: ISPM 15 is an actual standard whereas ISPM 46 supports countries in the development of phytosanitary import requirements that are technically justified. The participant emphasized that ISPM 46 alone does not justify regulation; countries wishing to regulate shall still conduct a PRA. As an example, the participant noted that a country not producing bananas may not regulate them, but if it grows apples and is interested in commodity standards for apples, a PRA would still be required to justify regulation. In conclusion, he added that commodity standards support PRA by providing a list of pests and effective measures that have been implemented by countries. Additionally, he cautioned that if a country regulates a commodity based solely on a related commodity standard - such as the fresh banana standard - without proper justification, other countries could raise objections through the World Trade Organization (WTO).

*[49]* **Measures related to producing or importing countries.** One participant pointed out that commodity standards include recommended measures for commodities relevant up to the moment of import, implying that these measures primarily apply to producing and exporting countries. In response, another participant clarified that ISPM 46 does not limit the applicability of these measures to producing countries alone; rather, they are also relevant to importing countries. The pest information and associated measures related to the commodity can serve as useful references for countries when conducting PRAs. A third participant further emphasized that ISPM 46 is pertinent to both importing and exporting countries. He explained that ISPM 46 supports technically justified phytosanitary import requirements by guiding exporting countries on the criteria for issuing phytosanitary certificates and helping importing countries understand what is required to facilitate their issuance, while not specifying how inspections or sampling should be conducted.

*[50]* **ISPMs and legislation.** One participant explained that when his country addressed European Union (EU) legislation, lawyers, together with experts, developed a list of regulations that were deemed appropriate or not, often using ISPMs as a basis. Therefore, stating that one standard is mandatory while another is not can create confusion. The chairperson noted that this is part of the learning process and emphasized that ISPMs are voluntary. Another participant added that the only binding obligation stems

from the IPPC itself, not from the ISPMs, and that this is further clarified in the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS agreement). He also noted that *IPPC procedure manual for standard setting* clarifies what an ISPM does and what a recommendation does, for example. A third participant highlighted that some ISPMs are referenced in EU legislation, thereby making them mandatory for EU Member States.

### 5.3 Draft ISPM under 1st consultation: draft annex International movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)

[51] CIAMPITTI provided background information on the history of the draft annex to ISPM 46, including its scope and intended use. In particular, she clarified that this draft commodity standard applies to the fresh fruit of *Musa* spp. (e.g. in hands or in clusters) but not to bunches because they are not traded internationally. She explained that the draft annex lists the pests regulated on *Musa* fruit by at least one contracting party, based on information material submitted by nine contracting parties. However, CIAMPITTI noted that there are only a few major banana-producing countries globally, such as Costa Rica, and that the draft annex was developed particularly drawing on the supporting documentation provided by Costa Rica, including documents related to requests from several countries to confirm that bananas are free from various pests. She concluded that a pest was only included if there was a specific measure identified to manage its risk. CIAMPITTI emphasized that TPCS do not make assessments of pest risk and that the panel may request additional information from the submitting country in case, for example, technical clarifications are needed. She added that the inclusion of a pest in the annex does not constitute technical justification for regulation by a contracting party.

[52] **Main comments received.** CIAMPITTI briefly introduced the comments received from contracting parties in the region. In response to a comment received from a contracting party expressing concerns about the pest list, specifically regarding the need for enhanced verification on whether the commodity serves as a pathway for the pest. She noted that EU had submitted a paper to the CPM raising the same concerns. It was highlighted that importing countries may establish requirements that, according to the IPPC, must be technically justified. In this context, one of the comments received referred to *Spodoptera frugiperda*, which had been repeatedly requested for removal from the pest list. However, the TPCS was unable to comply with this request, as the pest is referenced in supporting documentation and in several bilateral agreements. CIAMPITTI proposed a potential solution: supporting documents should only be submitted by importing countries, as they are responsible for providing the technical justification for import requirements, while exporting countries are expected to comply with those requirements. Another comment suggested improving the structure of the text, but it was noted that, to maintain consistency with the first commodity standard adopted, the current structure should be retained. A third comment raised concerns regarding the source of information, noting that a very old scientific paper related to low-prevalence areas had been submitted, which may may limit its relevance as a reference for this standard.

[53] **Editorial comments.** CIAMPITTI observed that editorial comments submitted to the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS) require stewards to address each one individually, which can be time-consuming when there are many such comments. She suggested prioritizing technical and substantive comments over editorial ones to streamline the process.

[54] She concluded by inviting consideration of how commodity standards are addressed in communication-related items, noting that while they appear to be based on PRA, they may also support the performance of PRA.

### 5.4 Draft ISPM under 1st consultation: draft annex International movement of fresh taro *Colocasia esculenta* corms for consumption (2023-023) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)

[55] Leonard SHUMBE (European Commission), EPPO steward for this draft commodity standard, provided background information this draft annex, including its history, scope and intended use. He clarified that

commodity standard applies to fresh taro intended for consumption or processing without leaves and lateral buds and does not cover corms that have already been processed. He highlighted the peculiar characteristics of taro, noting that unlike mango and banana, it is a root crop and inherently "dirty", with a rough surface that can easily trap soil and conceal pests, thereby potentially making inspection more time-consuming.

*[56]* SHUMBE introduced the comments received from contracting parties in the region.

*[57]* **Unpublished records as references.** SHUMBE highlighted one comment regarding the relevance of including unpublished records as references.

*[58]* **Taro with or without leaves and lateral buds as requirement**. Regarding the requirement that taro be without leaves and lateral buds, SHUMBE sought clarification on whether this refers to taro marketed after their physical removal or before they have developed. He initially considered this be a measure to prevent corms from being planted or germinating. However, since axillary buds remain covered by the stem base and can still germinate if planted, this measure may not be sufficient. Therefore, he suggested considering broadening the scope of the draft annex, as the fresh corms could still carry the same pests. One participant considered it as a precautionary measure and did not consider it sufficient to warrant broadening the commodity standard's scope. Another participant noted that it should the TPCS to consider whether the removal of lateral buds is a measure that addresses a specific pest in or to reduce risk of diversion from intended use.

*[59]* **Viruses in pest list.** SHUMBE further highlighted the inclusion of viruses in the pest list of taro due to its nature, following the submission from a contracting party. Given the ease with which taro is propagated from the commodity itself, the risk of diversion from intended use was considered greater than for other commodities addressed so far. This concern extends to the possibility that taro intended for processing or consumption could be diverted for planting, which represents a risk not fully addressed by the current standard. One participant noted that taro's intended use can be diverted for planting, which increases the risk of introducing harmful organisms. It was observed that the related proposed phytosanitary measure alone may not be sufficient to fully control this risk. Consequently, it was suggested that the scope of the standard should be adapted to reflect this concern. However, one participant expressed that broadening the scope would necessitate issuing another call for material. Therefore, the proposal was to maintain the original scope and include a clarification in the general remarks that deviation from the intended use may entail additional risks. This view was supported by another participant, who referenced extensive discussions on diversion in ISPM 46, explaining that commodity standards would become unmanageably large if all such risks were addressed. Deviations from intended use are generally considered to be matters for internal measures within countries. Regarding taro specifically, as propagating material, the scope might be broadened, though this could undermine the original intent of the standard. This issue will also require consideration when assessing other commodities that are vegetatively propagated, such as potatoes.

*[60]* **Inclusion of pest free area as a pest-specific measure.** A question was raised about the inclusion of pest free areas (PFAs) in the pest-specific measures table. SHUMBE explained that PFAs can be established either as general or specific measure. One participant noted that the recently adopted revision of ISPM 4 drew attention to inconsistencies across ISPMs: in some cases, PFA is considered as standalone measure, while in others they are considered as part of a systems approach. For example, the mango standard includes PFA but not as a standalone measure, whereas in the taro standard it is listed as such. To address this inconsistency, the SC has established a small working group, which will present a paper to the SC meeting in November 2025. The outcomes of this discussion may also impact on how PFAs are reflected in commodity standards.

## 5.5 Draft ISPM under 2nd consultation: draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies*) (2021-010)

*[61]* IOANNIDOU provided background information on the history of the draft revision of ISPM 26, including its scope and intended use. She also highlighted the main comments received during the consultation period, which led to the following key revisions:

- proposal to annex ISPM 26 to ISPM 4: this suggestion was considered, however the SC decided that it is not appropriate at this time, as the proposal is not included in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* and does not align with Specification 75;
- terminology changes: terms such as "host material", "hosts" and "host commodities" were replaced with "host fruit" for consistency, and the term "transient" was removed where appropriate and replaced with "breeding population" that is established or not;
- additional explanatory text: clarifications were added to specific parts of the draft ISPM, including the use of the Sterile Insect Technique (SIT) in a PFA, the potential for interference of attractants used for trapping, and examples of relevant data to be recorded during the sample handling of samples and species identification;
- removal of references to timeframes for the reporting of detections of fruit flies declaring eradication: there were deleted as such timeframes are not achievable for all NPPOs and may lack technical justification; and
- removal of duplication from Annex 3: to avoid duplication, requirements for packing and packing facilities, storage and storage facilities, and treatment and treatment facilities were combined.

*[62]* IOANNIDOU highlighted that Annex 3 (*Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management*) and Appendix 1 (*Fruit fly trapping (2011)*) and Appendix 2 (*Fruit sampling*) from the adopted ISPM 26 have been retained as attachments to the draft revision, in recognition of their continued value, pending agreement on a suitable long-term location. One participant suggested that the materials be uploaded to the IPP and referenced on the dedicated page of ISPM 26 in all FAO official languages. In response, another participant clarified that while ISPMs are translated into all FAO official languages, guidance materials are not. It was further noted that the work of the IC is project-base and relies on the availability of external funding to support the development and translation of implementation materials. A third participant viewed this revision as a special case, emphasizing that the guidance materials in question have already been adopted in all FAO official languages. The participant proposed that the materials be retained as appendix content, noting the distinction between annexes (which are prescriptive parts of the standard) and appendixes (which are not), until a final decision is made on their placement. The participant also reiterated the continued relevance and importance of these materials.

*[63]* IOANNIDOU provided an overview of the comments received.

*[64]* **Alignment with ISPM 37 terminology**. One contracting party proposed including a statement in the standard to clarify that fruits that are considered as hosts of the target fruit fly in accordance with ISPM 37 are referred to as "hosts." The intention was to promote the use of consistent and commonly accepted terminology, and to avoid the use of multiple terms within the standard. However, it was clarified that this proposal could not be incorporated, as ISPM 37 (*Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) is a separate standard with a different context for the use of the term "host." Specifically, ISPM 37 refers to "hosts" as fruits that are hosts for target fruit flies. In contrast, within the context of this standard, the term "host" refers to the entire plant, not just the fruit.

*[65]* **Modal verbs and obligations.** Regarding the proposal to use the verb "should" when referring to compliance of the Fruit Fly Pest Free Area (FF-PFA) with the procedures outlined in the standard, one participant noted that, while not necessarily in disagreement, the use of "should" introduces new obligations, thereby constituting a significant change to the standard. The representative from the proposing country clarified that this was indeed the intention, aiming to make it clear that the procedures in the standard and its annexes are prescriptive in nature.

[66] **Entrance points vs points of entry.** IOANNIDOU highlighted a question that arose during the translation of the draft ISPM from English into Russian: specifically, whether the term "entrance points" referred to "points of entry", as defined in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). She clarified the distinction, explaining that in this context, "entrance points" refers to locations where goods enter a specific area within a country, whereas "points of entry", as defined in ISPM 5, refers to airport, seaport, land border point or any other location officially designated for the importation of consignments, or the entrance of persons. Therefore, the two terms are not interchangeable in this case. To improve clarity, one participant proposed referring specifically to "entrance points in a PFA", to better reflect the intended meaning.

[67] **Criteria for the area to qualify as a fruit fly pest free area.** IOANNIDOU highlighted a comment indicating that the current draft text may not align with the concept of a pest free area, because such area cannot be considered pest free if any pests are present. Reference was made to the ISPM 5 definition of a pest free area as "an area in which a specific pest is absent as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained". In response, IOANNIDOU noted that this is primarily an implementation issue, pointing to differences in how pest free areas are addressed across various standards. For example, ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) requires pest free areas to be officially established and maintained, while ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies*) includes areas that may be naturally free from pests but need to be maintained as such.

[68] **Presence and absence of target fruit fly from an area.** IOANNIDOU emphasized a comment suggesting the use of the phrase "target fruit fly is absent from the area" instead of "target fruit fly is not present in the area". However, she also recalled another comment underlining the importance of using the correct terminology - specifically, the use of "not present" - to avoid confusion with the concept of pest absence as defined in ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*). The chairperson noted that while the concept of PFA is well established, fruit flies present a special case. IOANNIDOU further recalled that term "transient" had been removed where appropriate and replaced with "breeding population" that is established or not, acknowledging that breeding populations may still be transient, for example, when they do not survive winter conditions. One participant shared a national example where fruit flies are generally present, but survey programmes have confirmed their absence in certain isolated areas. IOANNIDOU noted that similar situations exist in other countries, though these may change due to evolving climatic conditions. It was finally recalled that ISPM 8 now classifies "transient" as a subcategory of pest presence status, providing further clarity on such cases.

[69] **Incursion vs outbreak under corrective actions.** IOANNIDOU highlighted a proposal to use the term "outbreak" rather than "incursion" when determining the appropriate, technically justified response to an incursion within the preparation of a corrective action plan by an NPPO. The rationale was that "outbreak" could encompass both scenarios: when a delimiting survey is required for a defined area and when only detection surveys and source investigation are necessary for an incursion. IOANNIDOU noted that both terms are defined in ISPM 5: "incursion" is defined as "an isolated population of a pest recently detected in an area, not known to be established, but expected to survive for the immediate future" whereas "outbreak" as "a recently detected pest population, including an incursion, or a sudden significant increase of an established pest population in an area". Given that the second part of the "outbreak" definition does not apply in this context, it was agreed that "incursion" remains the more appropriate term; therefore, the proponent of the change considered withdrawing the proposal. IOANNIDOU proposed ensuring that investigation of the incursion is explicitly included as part of the response.

[70] **Term "designation".** A question was raised regarding the appropriateness of the term "designation" in section 7, "Suspension, reinstatement or withdrawal of the fruit fly pest free area designation", in particular in the phrase "The designation of the FF-PFA, or the affected part within the FF-PFA, should be suspended". Participants questioned whether it is the FF-PFA itself that is being suspended or merely its designation, emphasizing that designation is not an action and therefore cannot be suspended.

## 5.6 Draft ISPM under 2nd consultation: draft annex *Field inspection* (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)

*[71]* CIAMPITTI provided background on the development of the draft annex to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*), highlighting the main revisions made following comments received during the first consultation. She explained that the structure of the draft annex was revised to improve logical flow and reduce duplication. Key changes included clarifying the objectives of field inspection, strengthening its link with specific surveillance activities, identifying factors to be considered during inspection, and outlining the responsibilities of NPPOs. She further noted that the SC, in its May 2025 meeting, agreed that the draft should continue to be developed as an annex to ISPM 23, rather than as a standalone ISPM.

*[72]* **Phytosanitary requirements vs phytosanitary import requirements.** A question was raised regarding whether the scope section should clarify that field inspection can be used to verify conformity with "phytosanitary requirements" or solely with "phytosanitary import requirements". It was noted that the term "phytosanitary import requirements" is used when referring specifically to the context of import whereas "phytosanitary requirements" is broader and aligns with the ISPM 5 definition of "inspection", where the term is used to refer to various scenarios other than at import (e.g. at place of production or production site or at export). CIAMPITTI cited examples in the EU where field inspection is also used to maintain PFA, emphasizing that it is not limited to imports only. The chairperson acknowledged that phytosanitary measures are typically related to phytosanitary requirements set by importing countries. CIAMPITTI noted that some comments supported reinstating "phytosanitary import requirements" throughout the standard for clarity, given its focus on plants produced for international trade. However, she added that if this is clearly addressed in the scope section, there may be no need to repeat it throughout the text.

*[73]* **Proceed or pause the development of the draft annex.** Participants discussed whether the draft annex should proceed through the Standard Setting Procedure (SSP) or be paused pending revision of the main standard, ISPM 23. The discussion was prompted by a suggestion from a contracting party to consider submitting a formal objection to the adoption of the draft annex (if recommended to CPM). The concern raised was that an annex should be based on the content of the main standard, not the reverse, and that if ISPM 23 were to be substantially revised in the future, the annex, as currently drafted, might no longer be aligned, potentially requiring a full revision process again. They therefore proposed pausing its development to avoid initiating a second lengthy revision process and to ensure coherence between the annex and the revised ISPM 23. It was noted that continuing with the annex as is may result either in having to restart the process later, potentially taking several years, or in having a standard in place that may not fully reflect future updates to ISPM 23. In response, CIAMPITTI noted that such concerns would have been more appropriately raised earlier in the development process. She emphasized that the draft annex is already at an advanced stage, having been approved for a second consultation, with substantial work already completed. She also highlighted that the submitting country remains supportive of the current draft. Additionally, she reiterated that the purpose of draft revision of ISPM 23 is intended to address terminology and ensure consistency among the ISPMs and is not expected to introduce changes that would significantly affect the content of the annex.

*[74]* **Other proposals highlighted**. CIAMPITTI brought forward several comments for participants' consideration. These included:

- replacing the term "pest incidence" with "pest prevalence";
- clarifying whether to retain examples of abiotic factors (e.g. climate, temperature);
- ensuring consistent use of the terms "varieties" and "cultivars", which are sometimes used interchangeably despite having different meanings;
- using the term "tolerance level", which is defined in ISPM 5, in place of "threshold";
- adding "presence of weeds and other plant species" as additional bullet point to consider when field inspection is conducted to verify conformity with other phytosanitary requirements; and
- clarifying whether to refer to official or relevant documents as, during field inspection, some documentation may be official while order documents may not be.

[75] **Detection and recording of new or previously unknown pests.** A proposal was made to include a provision stating that field inspection methods should also be designed to detect and record any new or previously unknown pests, in addition to the pest of concern**.** The rationale was because pests, other than those of concern, may be identified and should therefore be accounted for. CIAMPITTI responded that all pests found in the field should be reported; however, she clarified that phytosanitary requirements are related to the absence of specific pests rather than general pest detection. The chairperson expressed a differing view, suggesting the importance of including such provisions in the standard.

[76] **Sampling and laboratory testing.** Participants engaged in a discussion regarding the inclusion of explicit references to sampling in the draft annex. CIAMPITTI noted that such references had been removed during the review process of the draft annex, despite the efforts to retain them. The only remaining reference is in the scope section, which clarifies that it may be necessary to take samples for examination by a qualified expert or for laboratory testing to confirm the absence of the pest if symptoms are detected during field inspection. However, it was clarified that such phytosanitary actions are outside the scope of this annex.

[77] Several participants expressed concerns about the rationale for its removal, emphasizing that inspection should not be limited to visual examination alone, but should also encompass sampling. The discussion highlighted instances where visual examination of plants in the field may not be sufficient to verify absence of the pest. In such circumstances, the NPPO may carry out field inspection in combination with another phytosanitary measure to provide a level of assurance that plants are free from the pest. The proposal was to explicitly mention sampling and laboratory testing as examples of such phytosanitary measures.

[78] It was noted that the rationale for removing these references might be linked to the different use and scope of laboratory testing, particularly in distinguishing between its use as part of the field inspection method and its application to consignments for export. The chairperson, supporting the inclusion of these references, particularly highlighting the necessity of sampling in cases of viruses and bacteria, recommended that clearer wording be provided to improve understanding and ensure clarity.

[79] **Geographical coordinates**. The reference to “geographical coordinates” was considered an important piece of information in the section of relevant documents. CIAMPITTI reported that the SC-7 had agreed to remove the reference to geographical coordinates, as it was considered to be covered under field-identity documents, though there was a proposal to reintroduce it. It was noted that some countries might not have access to the necessary tools for this purpose, although NPPOs are expected to use GPS technology, which is an essential tool for ensuring the reliability and confidence in the data. The chairperson noted that this approach may be more common in some regions than others. One participant agreed that the correct identification of the field is crucial but pointed out that there are various ways to achieve this, such as using an address, in addition to geographical coordinates.

[80] **Field inspection and appropriate number of plants.** One participant emphasized the importance of inspecting an appropriate number of plants in nurseries, particularly since plant passports or other quality certificates must be issued. CIAMPITTI responded that field inspection is not restricted to nurseries and, when the number of plants to be inspected is relevant, this information is typically specified in the appropriate documentation.

[81] The chairperson summarized the comments and noted that, in principle, the participants are in favour of moving forward with the draft annex.

### 5.7 Draft Specification for ISPM under consultation: Annex *Remote audits* to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*)

[82] IOANNIDOU provided background information on the history of the draft specification, including its scope and purpose. She explained the reasons for its development, in particular because ISPM 47 does not provide specific guidance on conducting remote audits. She further emphasized the intention for the annex to cover remote audits carried out by third parties authorized by the NPPO to conduct such audits on its behalf. She then outlined the tasks assigned to the EWG, as detailed in the draft specification,

which will develop the related draft ISPM if the draft specification is approved by the SC. IOANNIDOU concluded by introducing the comments received.

*[83]* **Purpose vs procedure of remote audits.** One participant shared a national example where remote audits were used as follow-ups to physical audits to ensure ongoing compliance. He emphasized that the annex aims to harmonize the procedures for conducting remote audits rather than dictate how the outcomes or decisions are made, which remain internal to countries. He also noted that audits serve not only for granting market access but also for maintaining it, providing reassurance beyond decision-making alone. IOANNIDOU agreed that the draft ISPM's scope should focus on establishing clear and harmonized procedures for conducting remote audits, rather than defining their purpose. Another participant highlighted that the tasks described in the draft specification address concerns raised by some contracting parties about the potential for remote audits to replace physical audits, emphasizing that remote audits should instead be seen as providing added value in specific cases. A third participant explained that audits operate under bilateral agreements, where the audited country can seek clarification from the auditing country on whether a remote audit will be considered in decisions related to export approval. This was supported by experiences shared by some participants, indicating that such matters are subject to negotiation between countries. A fourth participant remarked that ISPM 47 does not suggest that remote audits are preferable to physical ones and proposed that any such changes should be incorporated into the overarching standard, ISPM 47, rather than in an annex.

*[84]* **Scope of remote audits.** IOANNIDOU highlighted a proposal to clarify the scope of remote audits, specifically that such audits are conducted by an NPPO either within its own territory or within the territory of another NPPO with that NPPO's agreement. This clarification arose from prior discussions aimed at distinguishing these two scenarios, noting that audits are not performed in another country without its agreement. One participant noted that this aspect is indirectly addressed in section 11.1 of ISPM 47, which specifies that audit planning should include, among other elements: defining and agreeing on the purpose, scope, process, and objectives of the audit, as well as identifying both the auditor and auditee. Clarification was also sought regarding whether the annex applies to all audits or only internal audits; it was confirmed that ISPM 47 covers audits conducted both internally and externally, and that annexes and related standards should be interpreted collectively.

*[85]* **"Within" vs "with and in".** IOANNIDOU highlighted one comment questioning whether the phrase: "The annex should provide guidance for conducting remote audits in the phytosanitary context by an NPPO in its own territory, or with and in the territory of another NPPO" should state "within" or "with and in", noting potential political implications. IOANNIDOU clarified that this wording is taken directly from the Scope section of ISPM 47. While considered an editorial matter, participants agreed the clarification is important. She concluded that although this issue might be perceived as a typographical concern, it was recommended not to modify the annex text given its direct reference to ISPM 47. Instead, it was proposed that any ink amendments to this phrasing be applied to the Scope section of ISPM 47 itself rather than to the annex itself.

*[86]* **Plant health audits and documentary audits.** One participant raised a question regarding whether it should be clarified that remote audits can be conducted for phytosanitary purposes, suggesting a distinction between documentary checks and plant health inspections. IOANNIDOU agreed but noted that documentary audits form an integral part of plant health audits, making it challenging to separate them as they represent sequential steps within the same procedure. The chairperson highlighted that one of the tasks refers to hybrid audits, which may encompass both types of checks. Another participant recommended exercising caution in describing audits as merely "checking," especially within the context of market access, emphasizing that audits serve to verify compliance. Furthermore, it was reminded that this document is a draft specification intended to outline considerations for the EWG.

### 5.8 Draft Specification for ISPM under consultation: Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*)

*[87]* John EIVERS (Ireland), EPPO steward, provided background information on the history of the topic and the reasons for the development of the draft specification. He emphasized the need to clarify and

update requirements to reflect the current operational practices of NPPOs, particularly in light of the transition from paper phytosanitary certificates (PCs) to electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhytos). This includes the harmonization of practices and the need for clear requirements in certain cases, such as the re-export of products that have been stored for extended periods or situations where multiple inspections have taken place on different dates. EIVERS then outlined the scope, purpose, and tasks that the expert working group should focus on. EIVERS concluded by highlighting three main issues.

*[88]* **Focused vs full revision of ISPM 12.** One contracting party suggested that the revision should be focused, without extending beyond the current tasks of the EWG. Feedback from contracting parties will be gathered during this consultation period.

*[89]* **Inclusion of inspection dates.** The need for an inspection date is currently required when a phytosanitary certificate is issued after dispatch of a consignment, according to section 4 of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*). One reason for this revision is to provide clearer requirements on including inspection dates, especially when multiple inspections have occurred. While this is not a new requirement, further clarification or confirmation with SC members may be needed.

*[90]* **Separating requirements from guidance information.** One contracting party disagreed with the task of separating requirements from guidance, as the discussion on rethinking ISPMs is still ongoing and has not yet reached conclusions or outputs.

*[91]* **Broaden ISPM 12's scope.** Participants discussed the possibility of broadening the scope of the draft specification, such as certifying not only plants. One participant emphasized that this is the intention in some regions, particularly by including non-plant pests, which would extend beyond the current framework of the IPPC. It was agreed that ISPM 12 should remain aligned with the context and scope of the IPPC.

*[92]* **Paper phytosanitary certificates and ePhytos.** One participant proposed explicating in the draft specification that, when a country is not part of the ePhyto Solution, a paper PC can be printed with a QR code. EIVERS responded that this is already addressed, with clear requirements outlined for the transition period and the shift from paper to ePhytos. It was also acknowledged that paper PCs will continue to be issued.

*[93]* **Phytosanitary certificates printed from ePhyto hub.** It was noted that the ePhyto Hub allows for the printing of paper versions of the information contained in an ePhyto. However, these paper PCs differ from the ePhytos in that they lack a signature, a date, and only include a QR code. This presents a divergence from the phytosanitary certificate model contained in the IPPC. Consequently, it was suggested that if the QR code is to become the new standard, efforts should be made to harmonize it with the existing model to ensure consistency and alignment.

*[94]* **Additional comments.** One contracting party proposed including enumeration near each number in PCs, both paper and electronic, to enhance readability. Additionally, concerns were raised about the potential risks associated with compromised QR codes on PCs.

### 5.9 Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)

*[95]* CIAMPITTI provided background information on the history of the topic and the reasons for the development of the draft specification. She also outlined the scope and purpose of the revision of the draft ISPM 23.

*[96]* **Authorization and responsibilities of third parties.** In the section explaining the reasons for the revision of the standard, it was noted that the revision would clarify some of the requirements for inspection procedures, including the authorization and responsibilities of third parties if conducting inspection, and to accommodate modern methodologies and technologies. CIAMPITTI highlighted two comments received, which proposed either to delete the reference to the authorization and

responsibilities of third parties, as this matter was covered by ISPM 45, or reword it to include the reference to ISPM 45. Participants agreed with the first proposal.

*[97]* **Draft annex to ISPM 23 and revision of ISPM 23.** Participants discussed the changes that could arise between the draft annex to ISPM and this draft specification for the revision of ISPM 23, noting that the current text states that "the core text of ISPM 23 also needs to be revised to connect to this annex." A participant noted one reason for pausing development of the draft annex is the difficulty of progressing with two standards simultaneously. It was also questioned about the possibility of developing the draft annex as standalone standard. CIAMPITTI clarified that this issue had been discussed and that a standalone version had been prepared by the steward for SC consideration in May 2025. However, the SC had agreed it should continue to be developed as an annex to ISPM 23, with SC-7 subsequently approving it for second consultation as an annex. She also expressed concerns about such a change, noting the region's support for proceeding as an annex and the substantial revisions proposed by this region. One participant expressed that countries could change opinions due to evolving situations, which is why there are two rounds of consultation, noting that this would not be the first time happening, citing the seeds annex as an example. Another participant recalled that their country submitted a comment during the first consultation stating the draft annex was not aligned with ISPM 23. CIAMPITTI responded that this change should be considered if a technical justification is presented, and recalled that the contracting party proposing the draft annex be a standalone standard did not oppose the decision to have it as an annex during the SC meeting in May 2025. One participant partly agreed with the concerns raised by a contracting party but also recalled that the whole procedure to develop and adopt an ISPM takes approximately seven years. Therefore, he suggested adopting and implementing the draft annex to ISPM 23, while allowing the EWG to revise ISPM 23 later. CIAMPITTI added that only inconsistencies have been identified – and not contradictions – among the draft annex and the revision of its ISPM 23, the overarching standard.

*[98]* **Nomination of former EWG members.** CIAMPITTI highlighted one comment suggesting that specifications do not usually include invitation for former EWG members to apply; she recalled that a similar invitation had been included in another approved specification.

*[99]* **Role of IC members.** It was proposed to clarify that IC members should not simply be invited to attend but should always attend and participate in discussions, excluding the decision-making process.

*[100]* The chairperson summarized that the general feeling of the region is to proceed with the draft annex *Field inspection* to ISPM 23 without postponing it until ISPM 23 is revised.

### 5.10 Rethinking ISPMs

*[101]* CIAMPITTI introduced the ongoing discussion on rethinking ISPMs, recalling comments from the 2023 consultation on the reorganization of the pest risk analysis ISPMs that highlighted challenges in interpretation and compliance due to ISPMs being long and complex, with core requirements often unclear. These comments informed a paper for the SPG, presented in the SPG's 2025 report to CPM-19 (CPM 2025/47). She outlined the key issues identified:

- low readability, because of long, repetitive sentences and highly specialized terminology inconsistent with FAO's plain language principles;
- low translatability into non-FAO official languages, increasing the risk of misinterpretation in linguistically diverse regions; and
- unclear core requirements as standards often include the excessive use of "should," contain complex guidance easily mistaken for mandatory text, and carry potentially misleading titles (e.g. "Requirements for…" vs. "Guidelines for…").

*[102]* CIAMPITTI then presented proposed options from paper CPM 2025/47 for consideration at CPM-19: drafting ISPMs in plain language, introducing visual and digital tools, applying a layered information format (a concise summary followed by detailed guidance) or focusing on core requirements only, and learning from other standard-setting organizations.

*[103]* She invited participants to discuss the regional relevance of these issues, identify possible gaps in the CPM paper, explore implementation barriers and improvement options, and consider whether a regional contribution paper to the SPG should be developed.

*[104]* CIAMPITTI also informed participants that both SC and the IC are preparing papers for the 2025 SPG meeting ahead of CPM-20 (2026) recommendations.

*[105]* **Proposals developed by the SC small working group.** CIAMPITTI reported the SC small working group had developed the following proposals for consideration by the SC:

- enhance editorial support by allowing the copy editor to review draft texts approved by SC and SC-7 to improve clarity and consistency;
- engage a plain-language expert to support ISPM drafting starting from the beginning of the process;
- introduce flexible ISPM structures tailored to different types of standards, such as:
  - presenting core requirements at the beginning, followed by detailed guidance to support NPPOs distinguish obligations from guidance, and
  - developing two versions of DPs: a brief version containing essential diagnostic guidance, and a full version including background, validation data, and hyperlinks,
- clarify the use of obligation terminology by providing plain-language explanations of key modal verbs (e.g. should, shall, must, may, can, could); and
- explore new mechanisms for editorial review of ISPMs drafts to ensure consistency, including: limiting editorial comments to the second consultation round, keeping editorial review in the hands of the copy editor and plain-language expert, and including a disclaimer in the Online Comment System inviting editorial comments only when they affect text comprehension

*[106]* **Report on IC discussion.** A participant provided an update on the IC's discussion on this matter, which focused on the possible removal of implementation guidance from ISPMs and placing its development under the IC's responsibility, ensuring that guidance is developed in parallel with ISPM drafting. However, it was noted that the development of guidance materials remains challenging, as it relies on voluntary funding, is not automatically translated into FAO official languages other than English, and is subject to less rigorous review and consultation procedures compared to ISPMs (for example, in terms of consultation periods). Another participant recalled that the IC was originally established to work in close coordination with the SC on developing both ISPMs and related guidance. However, funding was identified as a challenge and, without such support, it has been difficult to develop accompanying guidance materials in conjunction with the standards.

*[107]* **Translation and language considerations.** Participants agreed that linguistic challenges will persist regardless of the simplicity or complexity of the original English text, as they stem from inherent language differences. It was highlighted that, while English-speaking countries may find the standards easier to interpret, additional efforts are required in countries where FAO official languages are not used. These efforts often include translating ISPMs into local languages to facilitate understanding and implementation. In response to questions regarding translation practices, several participants explained that they translate directly from English and cross-check with other language versions, such as Russian, to ensure accuracy. Some noted that recent Russian translations have been of particularly high quality.

*[108]* **Views on ISPMs simplification.** Some participants queried whether it would be possible - or even appropriate - to simplify, for example, diagnostic protocols or other technical ISPMs to make them easily understandable to non-specialists. One participant observed that the language of ISPMs is suitable for specialized personnel but not for general audiences.

*[109]* **Concerns about oversimplification.** Participants expressed support for improving readability but cautioned against oversimplification, which could lead to a loss of meaning. Others noted that while some standards are vague and others highly specific, ongoing revision and amendment processes can sometimes increase complexity. One participant emphasized that certain provisions may be interpreted

differently across countries and, while some repetition could be reduced, ISPMs are intended for technical experts and must retain precision.

*[110]* **ISPMs implementation**. Participants further discussed perceptions of ISPMs as "guidance" rather than "requirements." Some contracting parties have translated all ISPMs and published them as secondary legislation, using them as important references despite implementation challenges. They also noted difficulties in aligning national legislation due to the non-mandatory nature of ISPMs and issues with terminology. One CP reported that over 30 ISPMs had been implemented by harmonizing national legislation, although understanding some complex standards required consulting international experts. Another participant proposed developing a "layered" presentation of ISPMs: beginning with a concise summary or cover note outlining key requirements, followed by the full text of the standard. It was clarified that the discussion concerns improving language clarity and readability rather than simplifying the technical content.

*[111]* **Overall assessment.** Eventually, most participants agreed that, in principle, the current ISPMs are satisfactory. It was also noted that some ISPMs are inherently more complex due to their subject matter. Participants supported efforts to improve the readability and structure of ISPMs, provided that these efforts do not compromise technical precision. One suggestion was to develop a pilot draft, for instance using ISPM 23 as an example, to explore potential approaches.

*[112]* Participants emphasized that separating requirements from guidance, introducing digital or layered formats, and clarifying terminology could help make standards more user-friendly. However, participants also cautioned that such restructuring could impose additional resource demands, particularly in the developing and translating the separated guidance material.

*[113]* **Development of a paper for SPG**. Participants considered the possibility of drafting a regional paper for the SPG reflecting their collective views on rethinking ISPMs. One participant proposed to discuss this paper at the next EPPO panel, noting that EPPO provides suggestions to members rather than formal positions. The chairperson summarized the discussion and confirmed that the EPPO Secretariat would draft a proposal for a paper on this issue considering the discussion outcomes, circulate it within EPPO panel and then agree whether sending it to SPG.

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

### 6.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities

*[114]* SHAMILOV provided an overview on the three Regional Priority Programmes (RPPs), which focus on: empowering smallholders, family farms and youth through inclusive rural transformation, digitalization and innovation, transforming food systems and facilitating market access and integration, and managing natural resources sustainably and preserving biodiversity in a changing climate. The RPPs offer an integrated, programmatic approach to address the regional priorities and guide the implementation of country programmes. It was noted that most IPPC-related work aligns with the second RPP, highlighting the importance of securing funding through FAO Regional Conferences to support eligible countries' participation in IPPC activities.

*[115]* SHAMILOV also outlined how to stay informed about ongoing FAO REU programmes and projects, which are country-specific and funded either through the Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) or trust funds. Additionally, he explained the procedure for countries to request FAO REU assistance in project development.

### 6.2 EPPO activities

*[116]* TIKKA, DG of EPPO, introduced the role of EPPO as RPPO for the Euro-Mediterranean region and its main activities, notably on plant quarantine (EPPO Alert List, EPPO A1 and A2 Lists of pests recommended for regulation as quarantine pests, PRA and diagnostics), plant protection products (with focus on products registration, efficacy evaluation and minor uses), and support to NPPOs.

[117] She explained the EPPO structure, with particular reference to the Working Parties and Panels, and highlighted the work of the EPPO Panel on Global Phytosanitary Affairs, which is composed of experts nominated by member countries who agree on the position of the region on all matters relating to the IPPC, such as the review of ISPMs under the country consultation, preparing EPPO comments on ISPMs and reviewing documents and agendas, especially those linked with the annual meeting of the CPM.

[118] TIKKA also outlined EPPO's contribution to the development of ISPMs, its role as co-organizer of the IPPC Regional Workshops for Europe and Central Asia, and its support for the translation of draft ISPMs and draft specifications into Russian, as well as its role in facilitating the nomination process of regional experts to IPPC bodies.

[119] She detailed additional EPPO's technical activities, including:

- Further development of EPPO activities on PRA to investigate the possibility of models predicting pest spread and include measures related to economic impact to inform decision makers about why a certain pest should be regulated or why a measure should be applied;
- Developing EPPO standards and make recommendations on pest regulations in the region; and
- Horizontal scanning and propose countermeasures.

[120] She highlighted EPPO activities on Biological Control Agents (BCAs), where the panel focuses on safety aspects of introduction and use, develops Standards on regulation, and works toward a "positive list" of "safe" BCAs eligible for simplified import and release procedures in the EPPO region.

[121] TIKKA emphasized EPPO's databases and information exchange platforms:

- EPPO Global Database: constantly updated repository of all pest-specific information produced and collected by EPPO;
- EPPO database on plant protection products (PPP) Standards: more than 300 standards describe the conduct of trials carried out to assess the efficacy of plant protection products against specific pests; EPPO Database on PPP Data Extrapolation; and the EPPO Database on PPP Resistance.
- EPPO Platform on PRAs: single portal aggregating PRAs relevant to the EPPO region (EPPO PRAs, European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) PRAs, national assessments); NPPOs can upload PRAs in English or national languages.

She mentioned the plan to merge all databases into one integrated system.

[122] TIKKA outlined communication activities, including news articles, pest status reporting, and the Platform on Communication Material, a free online platform moderated by EPPO where NPPOs share campaign materials (posters, videos, flyers, pictures) to inspire future plant health campaigns, with active participation of EPPO member countries encouraged.

[123] She also highlighted the importance of:

- EPPO activities on resistance to plant protection products; and
- Euphresco: hosted by EPPO, it is a research network to participate in research projects and apply the outcomes in developing standards (e.g. diagnostic protocols).

[124] TIKKA concluded on the preparation and approval of the new EPPO Strategic Framework 2026-2030 and the plan to support capacity building through trainings.

### 6.3 Host country NPPO activities

[125] Yunus BAYRAM presented an overview of Türkiye's agricultural and plant health context, highlighting the country's position as the largest agricultural economy in Europe and a leading global producer of several key fruits and nuts (e.g. hazelnut, cherry, fig, apricot, quince). He outlined the institutional organization of plant health within the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, the legal framework based on Law No. 5996 and harmonized regulations, and Türkiye's alignment with EU and international

standards, including membership in IPPC since 1952, EPPO since 1965, FAO since 1948 and WTO since 1995.

[126] He further described the national Plant Health Implementation Programme, the main programme on pest and disease control, which includes:

- measures to prevent the introduction of new harmful organisms and the control of 669 harmful organisms that can cause economic, quality and yield losses in plants and plant products;
- an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) programme applied in 29 major crops, involving about 60 000 producers over 4.5 million decares, with application areas expanded six-fold over the last ten years;
- a 15-fold expansion in biological and biotechnical control since 2010, backed by 311.4 million TRY in support payments to producers;
- the use of prediction and warning systems, a plant passport system to ensure traceability, pest reporting and agricultural information systems, and compulsory prescriptions for plant protection products for 33 designated crops;
- survey instructions prepared for 46 harmful organisms subject to quarantine;
- pest free area work on free areas completed for 16 harmful organisms in 29 provinces, in 2024;
- training and publication activities: including technical instructions and materials on plant protection and integrated pest management for various crops and plant group; and
- including books from theory to practice, technical instructions for plant protection, integrated pest management, booklets on controlling diseases and pests for plants and plant groups, leaflets and posters.

[127] Finally, he reported significant advances in ISPM 15 implementation, including 1 060 operational heat treatment facilities, systematic training of around 250 operators per year (3 500 trained in total, with 1 500 currently active), and 248 control officers ensuring regular inspections. He underlined that ISPM 15 non-compliance reports to and from Türkiye have generally declined following regulatory changes introduced in 2019, with further reductions expected after the entry into force of new regulations in 2024, illustrating the impact of enhanced oversight and capacity.

## 6.4 Topics of interest for the region (Group exercise)

[128] TORELLA explained the group exercise: split into three groups and followed by three facilitators, the participants had discussed three topics (phytosanitary situation in the ECA region, ISPMs implementation and related issues (including ISPM 15) and phytosanitary treatments, including implementation of irradiation measures and alternatives to bromide) and had reported to the plenary.

[129] The first group discussed three main topics and identified key challenges:

- identification of the correct pathways for *Tomato brown rugose fruit virus*, in particular seeds, and including the need to clarify import requirements for both seeds and tomato fruits;
- regional support for NPPOs in managing pest outbreaks, especially for high-risk pests such as *Xylella fastidiosa*, *Popillia japonica*, *Agrilus planipennis*, and *Spodoptera frugiperda*; proposals included sharing detailed pest distribution data (beyond simple presence/absence), harmonizing data collection tools (bridging differences between FAO tools and web applications), and receiving technical bulletins with pest control strategies;
- support from expert missions, such as the EU Plant Health Emergency Team assisting countries with outbreaks, with similar initiatives being established in Central Asia and Eastern Europe;
- pest reporting challenges were identified not only as technical but also political, highlighting the need for transparency; proposal was to clearly differentiate between officially confirmed pest reports and unconfirmed ones;

- ISPM 15 implementation gaps were noted, particularly among countries newly engaged in international trade of plant products; training courses were proposed to support implementation efforts;
- a proposal was made to conduct surveys on ISPM implementation status at regional level, categorizing ISPMs as fully, partially, or not implemented; and
- methyl bromide remains widely used due to its cost-effectiveness and efficacy, but there is interest in using phosphine, in particular systems that mitigate its negative effects.

*[130]* Additional points included:

- some countries faced challenges in registering and supervising companies providing treatment services, limiting their ability to inspect these entities effectively; and
- it was proposed to select few of the most dangerous pests and develop common strategies at regional level regarding import requirements, surveys, and shared databases, especially among neighbouring countries.

*[131]* The second group discussed challenges related to the implementation of ISPM 15 and other ISPMs. Participants shared experiences, noting that while most countries rely on heat treatment, US predominantly uses methyl bromide. The group highlighted the need for additional facilities for alternative treatments such as microwave and sulfuryl fluoride. Several countries reported no major difficulties with ISPM 15 implementation, aside from some cases of non-compliance. Countries shared information on their systems in place:

- US destroys or returns non-compliant wood packaging material (WPM), favouring return as the most efficient approach to demonstrate non-compliance;
- Kazakhstan applies a similar system but with additional restrictions, such as retaining goods in a controlled area at the owner's expense;
- Ireland does not apply fumigation but relies on interception and notification systems for high-risk packaging;
- Netherlands employs a similar approach to Ireland and also receives notifications on goods exported from other EU countries via Rotterdam; no treatment is required for internal movement of WPM;
- Bosnia and Herzegovina established a subregional unit for ISPM 15 implementation, primarily using heat treatment;
- Greece highlighted the importance of raising awareness and strengthening cooperation with neighbouring countries such as Romania, which has a crucial role in WPM control as one of the first EU points of entry; and
- Germany reported mainly using heat treatment, while noting issues with stamps and the need for companies to comply with replacement requirements.

*[132]* Challenges related to the implementation of various ISPMs were discussed:

- the implementation of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) was identified as particularly challenging, especially in relation to ePhyto implementation, difficulties with certification for re-export, lack of cloud access for transit countries complicating control, and third-party entities have access to it for information verification;
- ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) was noted as not being fully implemented, with some countries applying phytosanitary measures to low-risk commodities such as sugar;
- greater awareness and understanding are needed for effective implementation of the ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*);
- implementation of ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*) presents challenges for countries in fulfilling pest reporting requirements;

- implementation of ISPM 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*) was reported as problematic due to delayed notifications and limited information provided.

*[133]* It was also noted that not all countries publish lists of approved facilities authorized to conduct WPM treatments, making it difficult to verify the validity of stamp numbers.

*[134]* The third group focused primarily on the implementation of ISPM 15. All countries reported having legislation in place regulating WPM treatment, including authorization of companies involved. Heat treatment is the predominant method used, with one country implementing irradiation treatment. Georgia stated the use of phosphine treatment for wood products. Challenges were noted regarding stamp recognition and issues with repairing wood packaging material. Additionally, soil treatment was mentioned, but only in the context of pre-planting pest control, not related to WPM.

*[135]* The chairperson noted that the issues highlighted will inform the development of the agenda for the next IPPC RW ECA.

## 6.5 IPPC call for topics: lessons learned and future topic submissions

*[136]* TORELLA outlined the purposes of the IPPC Call for Topics for Standards and Implementation, which is to identify phytosanitary issues of global relevance, address gaps in phytosanitary systems through the development of ISPMs or implementation resources and shape the Standards and Implementation work of the CPM in alignment with the Strategic Objectives of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030. TORELLA recalled that, starting in 2025, the Call for Topics is open year-round for a two-year trial (2025–2026), with an assessment to be presented to CPM-21 in 2027 to inform future arrangements, and detailed the next steps for the 2025 cycle: in September, the secretariat compiles submissions and shares them with the SC, IC and relevant technical panels; technical panels review relevant topics and provide feasibility advice and prioritization; in November, the SC and IC review submissions at their face-to-face meeting; in December, the SC and IC finalize recommendations via e-decision; and in 2026, the secretariat submits these recommendations to CPM-20.

*[137]* The Director-General of EPPO emphasized that the trial offers greater flexibility and more opportunities for discussion, while underlining that submitters must provide complete information in the submission form and that EPPO can support them throughout the process. One participant observed that, although the process is now faster, it places more responsibility on submitters, including providing a draft specification when proposing a new ISPM, and indicated that his country was considering proposals such as revisions of ISPM 5 and ISPM 17 and a guide on field inspection. He added that, regarding a possible revision of ISPM 17, they were considering presenting a paper to the SPG to assess the need for revision and clarify the way forward.

*[138]* Another participant suggested considering a dedicated procedure for the review of ISPMs and stressed that the procedure should clarify that ISPMs require specifications, that leads could be clearly identified, and that CPM should decide whether a topic proposal is best addressed through a standard or through implementation material.

## 6.6 Identification of regional IPPC implementation issues to be shared with the IC

*[139]* Following the group exercise (agenda item 6.4), ARNITIS introduced agenda item 6.6, which is closely related. recalled the critical role of ISPMs, which provide a scientifically justified framework for countries to harmonize phytosanitary measures, ensuring consistent approaches to pest control and preventing the introduction of pests through international trade. He highlighted that the secretariat actively supports global implementation through standard development, e-learning, guides, knowledge exchange and forums, while the IC oversees capacity development in infrastructure and legislative enhancement, and dispute avoidance. These efforts aim to enhance the effectiveness of NPPOs and facilitate the global exchange of safe plants and plant products.

[140] ARNITIS emphasized that the 2025 regional workshops serve as key forums for NPPOs, RPPOs and FAO offices to identify practical implementation challenges that emerge after countries apply ISPMs in real-world contexts. He detailed a process linking these discussions to the open Call for Topics: participants identify specific ISPMs with difficulties, document concrete obstacles, propose solutions, and submit well-documented topics for future IPPC guides or training materials. He concluded by inviting participants to discuss and identify challenges to inform targeted IC actions.

[141] Participants discussed some national cases consolidating and integrating NPPOs into broader sectors such as food security, veterinary services, and human health. While these areas receive higher-level attention, the integration often leads to the delegation of core NPPO functions to other entities or agencies, weakening their capacity and potentially undermining the effective implementation of ISPMs and in some cases, diminishing support for NPPOs altogether.

[142] Participants highlighted the importance of maintaining strong NPPOs, as the absence of robust national structures impacts both regional and global coordination. The discussion also recalled past difficulties in assigning responsibilities, such as the issuance of phytosanitary certificates, which underscore the complexity of NPPO roles. It was noted that some of the issues highlighted relate to NROs while others concern the role and responsibilities of NPPOs.

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

### 7.1 The IPPC ePhyto Solution

[143] TORELLA outlined the background, objectives and scope of IPPC ePhyto Solution, an electronic certification system developed by the secretariat to facilitate the secure, efficient and cost-effective exchange of phytosanitary certificates between countries in a digital format. The IPPC ePhyto Solution facilitates the global exchange of electronic certificates, enables countries without the necessary infrastructure to create, send and receive such certificates, and ensures the use of harmonized message formats and contents, including those referenced in the ISPM 12.

[144] TORELLA reported on the recent updates in the implementation roadmap. The Implementation Package standardizes onboarding to the IPPC ePhyto Solution by offering flexible options and a structured assessment to guide country-specific implementation. A regular mechanism will be established to identify issues in ePhyto adoption, implementation, and exchange quality.

[145] Key planned enhancements to the system were also noted, including: the inclusion of mixed commodity definitions in ePhyto to address current digitalization gaps, enhancement and implementation of the non-compliance notification functionality; improvement and modernization of learning tools; and expansion of system reuse and interoperability, including the use of the ePhyto Hub for other types of certificates and improved system interconnections.

[146] TORELLA concluded by reporting key outcomes from CPM-19 meeting related to ePhyto. IPPC CPs were encouraged to continue advocating for ePhyto funding at relevant FAO meetings, including during the FAO strategic framework mid-term review, and to continue supporting the IPPC ePhyto Solution through contributions to the ePhyto Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF). The CPM agreed to remove usage fees for UN-designated least developed countries and World Bank low-income countries starting in 2026. It also confirmed the continuation of the current funding model (two-thirds base fee, one-third usage fee) and the use of the World Bank development classification to differentiate countries' development levels.

### 7.2 IPPC Plant Health Campus

[147] GEUZE presented the IPPC Plant Health Campus, a new online portal that provides easy access to learning materials on plant health. It aims to enhance understanding of plant protection, particularly the roles of NPPOs and relevant international requirements. By increasing awareness of these requirements, the IPPC Plant Health Campus supports improved compliance and contributes to the safeguarding of plants and ecosystems. The portal offers a range of free training resources, including IPPC guides and

more than 14 certified e-learning courses, tailored for NPPO staff and other stakeholders such as PCE facilitators, farmers, exporters, importers, and personnel from governmental and non-governmental organizations involved in the phytosanitary system. It was noted that all IPPC e-learning courses were developed with the technical support of global plant health experts, are self-paced, and currently available in English and French, with Spanish versions forthcoming. Upon completion of a course, learners receive a digital badge or certificate acknowledging their achievement and acquired knowledge. To date, the IPPC Plant Health Campus has engaged over 6,000 learners.

*[148]* It was noted the availability of a participant to translate the e-learning courses in Greek.

### 7.3 E-commerce

*[149]* GEUZE outlined the objectives of the IPPC Observatory study on e-commerce, which aims to establish a baseline for measuring key e-commerce outcomes, assess the extent to which the CPM recommendations on e-commerce have been implemented by IPPC contracting parties, identify the challenges and gaps in managing the phytosanitary risks associated with e-commerce trade, and inform further work on e-commerce and plant protection. The survey was distributed to all IPPC contracting parties and it was noted that the overall response rate exceeded 40%, with more than half of respondents indicating awareness of both CPM Recommendation on internet trade (e-commerce) in plants and other regulated articles (R-05) and the IPPC guide on *E-commerce – A guide to managing the pest risk posed by goods ordered online and distributed through postal and courier pathways*.

*[150]* GEUZE reported on the main recommendations from the draft study: increasing awareness of key IPPC e-commerce resources, addressing gaps in regulatory and non-regulatory frameworks, strengthening border risk management, enhancing monitoring of e-commerce, and reinforcing future IPPC observatory studies on e-commerce. GEUZE informed participants that, once the IPPC observatory study on e-commerce report is finalized, the recommendations arising from it will be presented to CPM-20 (2026).

### 7.4 Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments

*[151]* ARNITIS explained that Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) are multi-phase processes led by NPPOs, facilitated by IPPC-certified PCE facilitators, and supported by the secretariat. PCEs provide a wide range of benefits to assist countries in evaluating and strengthening their phytosanitary capacities. He outlined the three modalities through which countries can access a PCE and described the process, which includes a tailored and modular gap identification assessment to identify and prioritize weaknesses and gaps. The PCE provides a structured framework for evaluation, comprising a situation analysis, strategic planning, and a validation phase. Based on the outcomes of the PCE, countries are able to develop a national phytosanitary capacity development strategy, which leads to the creation or revision of national legislation. ARNITIS also highlighted success stories and key achievements from ongoing projects as well as the main progress in implementing the roadmap to improve the PCE, based on findings from 2023 PCE Desk Study. He also referenced recent PCE-related publications.

### 7.5 IPPC Observatory – The IPPC Third General Survey

*[152]* ARNITIS provided an overview of the IPPC Observatory, a system designed to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs, CPM Recommendations and the Development Agenda Items (DAIs) of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030.

*[153]* Building on the results of the first two IPPC General Surveys, the IPPC Observatory is currently re-designing the Third IPPC General Survey. Its objectives are to assess the extent to which IPPC Contracting Parties are aligned with their obligations and responsibilities under the IPPC and to understand how CPs are adopting and operationalizing core elements of the IPPC, including identifying best practices and challenges in implementation to understand capacity needs and inform the development of resources and tools.

## 7.6 IPPC Workshop on Systems Approaches

[154] TORELLA informed participants about the upcoming IPPC Global Workshop on Systems Approaches, scheduled from 1 to 5 December 2025, in Santiago, Chile, which will provide a platform for NPPOs, RPPOs, industry representatives and other stakeholders developing and implementing systems approach programs as alternatives to stand-alone phytosanitary measures. The workshop will be held in collaboration with the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), the Agriculture and Livestock Service of Chile (SAG-Chile), and the Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE), with the crucial contributions of Government of Canada, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF-Australia).

[155] Participants will deepen understanding of ISPM 14 and related standards through technical sessions, real-world case studies, hands-on exercises with IPPC Systems Approach Assessment Tools, sharing national experiences, programme discussions and a field visit, while discussing challenges, lessons learned and potential revisions to implementation materials.

[156] TORELLA noted that the official call for participants will be launched in September 2025, open to NPPOs, RPPOs and key stakeholders involved in systems approaches, and encouraged applications and submissions of submit national success stories on systems approaches.

## 7.7 National Reporting Obligations

[157] ARNITIS provided an overview of NROs, outlining their purpose, their connection to the IPPC, the distinction between public and bilateral NROs, as well as the key challenges associated with their implementation, including funding constraints and the need for stronger commitment.

[158] ARNITIS further outlined the responsibilities of the IPPC Official Contact Points, who acts as the central point of contact for all official phytosanitary communications, ensuring efficient and timely information flow between contracting parties, the secretariat and RPPOs. Participants were encouraged to actively provide information on NROs to prevent the pests outbreak and spread and contribute to safe trade, and to verify that the contact information for their country's IPPC Official Contact Points is up to date on the IPP.

## 7.8 Getting In Touch About CPM Focus Groups

[159] Bastian HESS (Germany), member of the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues (CCPI), provided an overview of the focus group, established by CPM-15 in 2021 with its mandate extended until 2026. The focus group supports the implementation of the IPPC Action Plan on Climate Change Impacts on Plant Health, aligned with IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. To do so, the focus group created an action plan to address three key objectives:

- raising awareness of climate change effects on plant health;
- enhancing evaluation and management of climate change risks to plant health; and
- increasing recognition of phytosanitary matters in international climate change discussions.

[160] HESS highlighted major activities of the focus group, including a webinar series on "Climate change and phytosanitary measures" covering (i) climate change, plants and pests, (ii) risk assessment, and (iii) pathways and risk management. These webinars attracted between 375 and 740 participants, reflecting broad global engagement. He also informed participants of the available technical resources such as the IPPC publication titled "Climate-change impacts on plant pests: a technical resource to support national and regional plant protection organizations", published in 2024.

[161] Upcoming initiatives include a 2025 webinar series (October 2025), development of factsheets on climate change impacts on pests (December 2025), a side event on the topic at CPM-20 (2026), awareness-raising activities at COP30, integration of climate change aspects in the upcoming PRA standards reorganization, guidance for countries on climate model use (e.g. pests spread and outbreaks),

and enhanced engagement with farmers, agricultural agents and other stakeholders. The group is also considering requesting an extension of its mandate to 2030 to align with the Strategic Framework.

*[162]* In closing, HESS emphasized the focus group's strategic role in fostering cross-sector dialogue and engagement, elevating phytosanitary issues in climate change debates, contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially climate action and zero hunger, and strengthening global phytosanitary resilience.

*[163]* Brief updates on the activities of the other CPM Focus groups were provided:

- CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid: the Specification 77 "Safe provision of humanitarian aid in the phytosanitary context" was approved by CPM-19 (2025), and the call for the experts for the EWG to draft the ISPM is being prepared;
- CPM FG on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination, which aims to coordinate plant-health research and avoid duplication worldwide, surveyed more than 120 networks to assess scope, coverage, phytosanitary and policy relevance, and conducted interviews and a gap analysis with the objective to draft recommendations to CPM-20 (2026);
- CPM FG on Global Diagnostic Laboratory Networks: focuses on the creation of a harmonized lab network for rapid, accurate pest identification; a call for members was issued in the first half of 2025, enabling the establishment of a diverse membership to support global technical input, and preparatory work for the 2026 Focus Group's first face-to-face meeting was undertaken; and
- CPM FG on Plant Health in One Health, established in 2024, its 2025 outputs included a science session during CPM-19 (2025), preliminary study on plant health and One Health linkages, work on antimicrobial resistance-related recommendations, and the development of an engagement plan.

## 8. Online survey of the workshop

*[164]* The chairperson invited participants to complete the final evaluation survey, available in both English and Russian. The secretariat encouraged participants to share feedback and suggestions, highlighting that their input is essential for building on achievements and continuously improving future regional workshops.

## 9. Date and venue of the next regional workshop

*[165]* The venue for the 2026 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia was confirmed as Uzbekistan.

*[166]* The dates of the workshop are tentatively scheduled for first week of September 2026.

*[167]* Georgia reiterated the proposal to host the following IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia in 2027.

## 10. Adoption of the report

*[168]* The chairperson explained that the report would be drafted by the secretariat and subsequently reviewed by the rapporteur. Other figures, such as the chairperson, may also provide inputs. Once finalized, the secretariat will publish the adopted report on the IPP and notify participants of its availability.

## 11. Conclusion of the workshop

*[169]* The chairperson expressed gratitude to all participants, the secretariat, EPPO, the colleagues of the NPPO of Türkiye, the organizers and the interpreters for their contributions to the successful organization of the workshop.

[170] BAYRAM also extended thanks to the participants and shared hopes that they would leave with positive memories of the event, reaffirming a commitment to further international cooperation, scientific exchange, and progress in plant health.

[171] The secretariat echoed these sentiments, underscoring the value of regional workshops as key platforms for collaboration and knowledge sharing.

[172] The 2025 IPPC RW ECA was officially closed by the chairperson.

# Appendix 1: Agenda

**Day 1: Wednesday 03 September**

| Registration | |
|---|---|
| **Time** | **Description** |
| 8:30 – 9:00 | Registration of participants |

| Time | No | Item | Presenter / Facilitator | Document |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | Opening of the Session | | |
| 9:00 – 9:30 | 1.1 | Welcome remarks: | | |
| | | IPPC Secretariat (Video from FAO Deputy-Director General) | Bechdol | Video |
| | | European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) | Tikka | In-person |
| | | FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (FAO REU) | Shamilov | In-person |
| | | Antalya Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry | Erkal | In-person |
| | | NPPO of Türkiye | Bayram | In-person |
| | | IPPC Secretariat | Torella | In-person |
| | 2 | Meeting Arrangements | | |
| 9:30 – 9:35 | 2.1 | Election of the Chair and the Rapporteur | All | |
| 9:35 – 9:40 | 2.2 | Adoption of the Agenda | All | Doc |
| | 3 | Administrative Matters | | |
| 9:40 – 9:45 | 3.1 | Participants list | Organizer | Doc |
| | 4 | Updates on Governance and Strategic issues (this will involve presentations, discussion, and questions from workshop's participants) | | |
| 9:45 – 10:05 | 4.1 | Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau) | Bishop | PPT |
| 10:05 – 10:35 | 4.2 | Update from IPPC Secretariat on APP and Communications (IDPH & Coms Networks) | Torella | PPT |
| 10:35 – 10:50 | 4.3 | Update from Standards Committee (SC) | Ioannidou | PPT |
| 10:50 – 11:05 | 4.4 | Update from Implementation and Capacity development Committee (IC) | Arnitis | PPT |
| 11:05 – 11:15 | 4.5 | Getting In Touch About Strengthening Pest Outbreak and Response Systems (POARS) | Ciampitti | PPT |
| 11:15 – 11:30 | 4.6 | Getting In Touch About CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers | Geuze | PPT |
| 11:30 – 11:45 | **Coffee break** | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 | Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations (this will involve presentations, discussion, and questions from workshop's participants) | | |
| 11:45 – 12:05 | 5.1 | The IPPC standard setting process in a nutshell | Torella | Link to video + PPT |
| 12:05 – 12:15 | 5.2 | Introduction to the concept of Commodity Standards | Ioannidou | PPT |
| 12:05 – 13:05 | 5.3 | Draft ISPM under 1st consultation: Draft annex international movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) | Ciampitti | PPT |
| 13:05 – 14:05 | **Lunch** | | | |
| 14:05 – 15:05 | 5.4 | Draft ISPM under 1st consultation: Draft annex international movement of fresh *Colocasia esculenta* corms for consumption (2023-023) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) | Shumbe | PPT |
| 15:05 – 15:30 | 5.5 | Draft ISPM under 2nd consultation: 1. Draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies*) (2021-010) | Ioannidou | PPT |
| 15:30 – 15:45 | **Coffee break** | | | |
| 15:45 – 16:50 | 5.5 | Draft ISPM under 2nd consultation: 1. Draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for tephritid fruit flies*) (2021-010) (continuation) | Ioannidou | PPT |
| 16:50 – 17:50 | 5.6 | Draft ISPM under 2nd consultation: 2. Draft annex *Field inspection* (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) | Ciampitti | PPT |
| 18:00 | **End of the day** | | | |

**Day 2: Thursday 04 September**

| **Registration** | |
|---|---|
| **Time** | **Description** |
| 8:30 – 9:00 | Registration of participants |

| Time | No | Item | Presenter / Facilitator | Document |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09:00 – 10:00 | 5.7 | Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: | Ioannidou | PPT |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Annex *Remote audits* to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*) | | |
| 10:00 – 11:00 | 5.8 | Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) | Eivers | PPT |
| 11:00 – 11:30 | 5.9 | Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) | Ciampitti | PPT |
| 11:30 – 11:45 | **Coffee break** | | | |
| 11:45 – 12:15 | 5.9 | Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Revision of ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection) (continuation) | Ciampitti | PPT |
| 12:15 – 13:00 | 5.10 | Rethinking ISPMs | Ciampitti | PPT |
| 13:00 – 13:30 | **Lunch** | | | |
| **Field Trip** | | | | |

**Day 3: Friday 05 September**

| **Registration** | |
|---|---|
| **Time** | **Description** |
| 8:30 – 9:00 | Registration of participants |

| Time | No | Item | Presenter / Facilitator | Document |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 6 | Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs. This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants | | |
| 9:00 – 9:30 | 6.1 | Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities | Shamilov | PPT |
| 9:30 – 10:00 | 6.2 | EPPO activities | Tikka | PPT |
| 10:00 – 10:20 | 6.3 | Host country NPPO activities | Bayram | PPT |
| 10:20 – 11:30 | 6.4 | Topics of interest for the region<br><br>**Group exercise** | Organizer / Group exercise to discuss different issues and share to the plenary | Group Exercise |
| 11:30 – 11:45 | **Coffee break** | | | |
| 11:45 – 12:05 | 6.4 | Topics of interest for the region<br><br>**Group exercise** (continuation) | Organizer / Group exercise to discuss different problems and share to the plenary | Group Exercise |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12:05 – 12:35 | 6.5 | IPPC call for topics: lessons learned and future topic submissions | Torella | PPT + Discussion |
| 12:35 – 13:05 | 6.6 | Identification of regional IPPC implementation issues to be shared with the IC | IC Regional representative | PPT + Discussion |
| 13:05 – 14:05 | **Lunch** | | | |
| | 7 | Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session) | | |
| 14:05 – 14:35 | 7.1 | The IPPC ePhyto Solution | Torella | PPT |
| 14:35 – 14:55 | 7.2 | IPPC Plant Health Campus | Geuze | PPT + Demo |
| 14:55 – 15:15 | 7.3 | E-commerce | Geuze | PPT + Video |
| 15:15 – 15:30 | 7.4 | Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments | Arnitis | PPT |
| 15:30 – 15:45 | **Coffee Break** | | | |
| 15:45 – 16:00 | 7.4 | Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments (continuation) | Arnitis | PPT |
| 16:00 – 16:30 | 7.5 | IPPC Observatory – The IPPC Third General Survey | Arnitis | PPT |
| 16:30 – 17:00 | 7.6 | IPPC Workshop on Systems Approaches | Torella | PPT + Discussion |
| 17:00 – 17:15 | 7.7 | National Reporting Obligations | Arnitis | PPT |
| 17:15 – 17:30 | 7.8 | Getting In Touch About CPM Focus Groups:<br>- Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues<br>- Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (FGSA)<br>- Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (FG GPRC)<br>- Global Diagnostic Laboratory Networks (FG DLN)<br>- Plant health in the context of One Health | Hess/Torella | PPT |
| 17:30 – 17:35 | 8 | Online Survey of the Workshop | All participants | Link to the survey |
| 17:35 – 17:40 | 9 | Date and Venue of the Next Regional Workshop | Chair | |
| 17:40 – 17:45 | 10 | Procedure on the Adoption of the Report | Chair | |
| 17:45 – 18:00 | 11 | Conclusion of the Workshop | Chair | |

## Appendix 2: Participants list

| Country | Name | Organization |
|---|---|---|
| **Azerbaijan** | JAFAROVA Jeyhuna (Ms) | Food Safety Agency of Republic of Azerbaijan<br>jeyhuna.jafarova@afsa.gov.az |
| **Belarus** | BALASHOVA Tatsiana (Ms) | Main State Inspectorate for Seed Breeding, Quarantine and Plant Protection<br>rastenfito@ggiskzr.by |
| **Bosnia And Herzegovina** | PREDRAG Jovic (Mr) | Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations<br>predrag.jovic@uzzb.gov.ba |
| **Czech Republic** | KLAILOVÁ Táňa (Ms) | Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture<br>tana.klailova@ukzuz.cz |
| **EPPO** | TIKKA Olga (Ms) | EPPO Director-General<br>olga.tikka@eppo.int |
| | LUCCHESI Valerio (Mr) | EPPO Scientific Officer<br>lucchesi@eppo.int |
| **European Commission** | SHUMBE Leonard (Mr) | European Commission<br>leonard.shumbe@ec.europa.eu |
| **FAO** | DONDERALP Veysel (Mr) | FAO Türkiye Office<br>veysel.donderalp@fao.org |
| | SHAMILOV Artur (Mr) | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations<br>artur.shamilov@fao.org |
| **IPPC** | TORELLA Daniel Lorenzo (Mr) | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations<br>daniel.torella@fao.org |
| **Georgia** | NUTSUBIDZE Lasha (Mr) | National Food Agency, Ministry of environment protection and Agriculture<br>lasha.nutsubidze@nfa.gov.ge |
| | REKHVIASHVILI Bezhan (Mr) | National Food Agency, Ministry of environment protection and Agriculture<br>bezhan.rekhviashvili@nfa.gov.ge |
| **Germany** | HESS Bastian (Mr) | Julius Kühn-Institut, Institute for National and International Plant Health<br>bastian.hess@julius-kuehn.de |
| **Greece** | IOANNIDOU Stavroula (Ms) | Hellenic Ministry of Rural Development and Food<br>stioannidou@minagric.gr |
| **Ireland** | EIVERS John (Mr) | Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine<br>john.eivers@agriculture.gov.ie |
| **Italy** | CIAMPITTI Mariangela (Ms) | Regione Lombardia<br>mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it |
| **Kazakhstan** | SARSENBIN Askar (Mr) | Ministry of Agriculture of Kazakhstan<br>sarsenbin.0101@mail.ru |
| **Latvia** | ARNITIS Ringolds (Mr) | State Plant Protection Service<br>ringolds.arnitis@hotmail.com |
| **North Macedonia** | DZERKOVSKA Nadica (Ms) | Head of Plant Health Department, Phytosanitary Directorate in the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy<br>nadica.dzerkovska@mzsv.gov.mk |
| **Netherlands (Kingdom of the)** | GEUZE Thorwald (Mr) | Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority<br>t.geuze@nvwa.nl |
| **Türkiye** | BAYRAM Yunus (Mr) | General Directorate of Food and Control, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry<br>yunusbayram@tarimorman.gov.tr |
| | AŞIKOĞLU Taha (Mr) | Plant Health of Quarantine Directorate of Antalya, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry<br>taha.asikoglu@tarimorman.gov.tr |
| **Ukraine** | BONDAR Alina (Ms) | State Service of Ukraine on Food Safety and Consumer Protection<br>a.bondar@dpss.gov.ua |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | CHAIKOVSKYI Vadym (Mr) | State Service of Ukraine on Food Safety and Consumer Protection<br>v.chaikovskyi@dpss.gov.ua |
| **United Kingdom** | BISHOP Sasmuel (Mr) | Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA)<br>sam.bishop@defra.gov.uk |
| **Uzbekistan** | SULTANOV Sultan-Makhmud (Mr) | The Agency of Plant Protection and Quarantine Under the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Uzbekistan<br>sm.sultanov@mail.ru |
| **Observers** | | |
| **United States of America** | AUSTIN Jeffery (Mr) | US Department of Agriculture - Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service<br>jeffery.austin@usda.gov |
| | OZBAG Nergiz (Ms) | Foreign Agricultural Services/USDA<br>ozbagn@state.gov |
| | TOUBIA Hala (Ms) | US Department of Agriculture - Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service<br>hala.toubia@usda.gov |