

***REPORT***

Auckland,  
New Zealand  
29-31 October  
2001

# **Thirteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations**



**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations**

**RPPO-2001/REPORT**

**REPORT OF THE  
THIRTEENTH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG  
REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS**

**Auckland, New Zealand 29-31 October 2001**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS  
Rome, 2001**

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner. Applications for such permission, with a statement of the purpose and extent of the reproduction, should be addressed to the Director, Information Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report of the Thirteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

<i>Appendix I</i>	Agenda
<i>Appendix II</i>	Procedure for the Recognition of New RPPOs
<i>Appendix III</i>	Rules of Procedure for Representatives of RPPOs Attending WTO SPS Committee Meetings
<i>Appendix IV</i>	List of Participants



## THIRTEENTH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS

### Opening of the Consultation

1. Mr Jeffrey Jones (IPPC Secretariat) opened the Consultation and welcomed the representatives of RPPOs. He regretted the absence of participants from African and American RPPOs (other than NAPPO). Mr Barry O'Neil, Group Director MAF BioSecurity, described the development of a biosecurity strategy for New Zealand, confirmed the New Zealand commitment to regional consultation and to the development of ISPMs, and welcomed the visitors to New Zealand.

### Election of the Chair, Vice-Chair and Rapporteurs

2. Mr Richard Ivess (PPPO) was elected Chairperson. Mr Sione Foliaki (PPPO) was elected Vice-Chairperson. Each RPPO was requested to nominate a representative to serve as a rapporteur.

### Adoption of the Agenda

3. The Agenda was adopted as proposed.

### Actions Arising from the Twelfth Technical Consultation

4. The Chairperson reported that the guidelines for recognition of RPPOs, developed at the Twelfth Technical Consultation, had been adopted by the ICPM. The ICPM asked for procedures to be developed to implement these guidelines. Other actions arising from the Twelfth Technical Consultation were considered under the following items.

### Discussion Papers

#### *Recognition procedure for RPPOs (RPPO-01/3)*

5. Mr Ian McDonell (NAPPO) explained the Procedure for the Recognition of New RPPOs based on consideration of RPPOs by a peer group of RPPOs acting as a Recognition Panel. It had been suggested by FAO that the IPPC Secretariat would assess whether prospective RPPOs would be recognized according to the Procedures. However, the Consultation concluded that a peer group, i.e. the Technical Consultation among RPPOs, is the most suitable body to advise the ICPM on this issue, and recommended the acceptance of the Recognition Procedure by the ICPM. (Appendix II)

#### *Development of Regional Standards by APPPC (RPPO-01/6)*

6. Mr Chong-Yao Shen (APPPC) introduced the procedures newly developed by APPPC for the establishment of regional standards. A proposed work programme was described, including a pest risk analysis (PRA) for *Dothidella ulei* (South American leaf blight of rubber), to precede the development of a regional standard for phytosanitary measures against this pest. Two further regional standards were planned: an import requirement to prevent the introduction of *Ceratitits capitata* (Mediterranean fruit fly) and a guide for training plant quarantine inspectors.

7. Mr Ian McDonell (NAPPO) reminded the Consultation that NAPPO has developed guidelines for developing regional standards, which are available to other RPPOs through the NAPPO website (<http://www.nappo.org>). Mr Ian Smith (EPPO) recalled that EPPO and NAPPO had been approached

to suggest an expert to act as a consultant for the Technical Cooperation Programme on PRA for South American leaf blight. He noted that the probability of establishment and potential economic impact of the pest in the APPPC region were well established, and that the proposed PRA concentrated on the analysis of different pathways, particularly into different APPPC countries. APPPC participants confirmed that the main issue was whether the pest could enter the region via countries in which the risk of establishment and economic impact was negligible or low, and what strength of measures (if any) was appropriate for those countries.

*Collaboration with RPPOs as regards SPS committee meetings (RPPO-01/2)*

8. Mr Jones outlined some problems arising from the participation of RPPO delegates as observers at SPS meetings. The Consultation accepted the IPPC Secretariat's proposal to revise the Rules of Procedure developed at the Eleventh Technical Consultation in 1999, but did not consider it necessary for these to be submitted to and approved by the ICPM. The Consultation adopted the new Rules of Procedure for Representatives of RPPOs attending WTO SPS Committee Meetings. (Appendix III) It declared its appreciation of the reports on the SPS Committee meetings made by the IPPC Secretariat, recognizing their unique content and timeliness, and proposed that the reports should be continued.

*Further considerations on transit and re-export (RPPO-01/9 & RPPO-01/10)*

9. Mr Smith reported that the discussions on transit and re-export at the Twelfth Technical Consultation had led to a review of definitions of the terms "Consignment in transit" and "Re-exported consignment" by the ICPM Glossary Working Group. These new definitions had been accepted by the Interim Standards Committee (ISC) and sent to ICPM members for consultation, in anticipation of their adoption by the Fourth ICPM in 2002. He stressed that the new definitions did not in themselves include any specific phytosanitary component. In relation to global harmonization of measures for consignments in transit, he suggested that further action was needed to follow up the last Technical Consultation's suggestion to develop a specification for a draft ISPM. It was agreed to discuss this under the item Coordinated Activities. Mr Brian Stynes (APPPC) stressed that consignments in transit may still be subject to phytosanitary requirements by the importing country of destination. Mr T.K. Lim (APPPC) also stressed that there are phytosanitary concerns even for very short periods of transit, such as transfer from one aircraft to another in the same airport, because of the risk of reinfestation or contamination.

10. Mr Smith noted that ISPM Pub. No. 7 (*Export certification system*) and ISPM Pub. No. 12 (*Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*) now covered the relevant phytosanitary measures to be taken in relation to re-export. He stressed that ISPM Pub. No. 12 provided for the use of the ordinary Phytosanitary Certificate, and not the Re-Export Certificate, for re-exported consignments that had been exposed to infestation or contamination (provided that the importing country's requirements were satisfied). If the ordinary Phytosanitary Certificate was used for re-exported consignments, it was very important that the country of origin should still be stated on the certificate.

*RPPO seminar series (RPPO-01/4)*

11. Mr McDonnell presented a proposal for a seminar series organized by the Technical Consultation, intended to contribute to the achievement of Article IX of the IPPC (1997). He stressed that RPPOs have access to a great deal of expertise and there is an increasing demand for training in phytosanitary issues. He referred in particular to the International Symposium on PRA that NAPPO is organizing in March 2002. It was felt that the RPPOs could cooperate with the IPPC Secretariat in responding to this demand. Possibilities for financial support through the FAO Technical Cooperation Programme were discussed.

12. Concerns were raised by some participants regarding the potential cost of moving trainees to central locations for training and, alternatively, the cost of presenting the material in various locations

around the world. It was suggested that an electronic version of the material could be distributed. In the end, it was agreed to organize an interactive workshop, rather than a seminar, in conjunction with the Technical Consultation meetings. The workshop will be held at the end of the meeting and the topic will be determined by the hosting RPPO. The topic will be announced to the other RPPOs at least ten months in advance and other RPPOs will be invited to provide speakers. It was also suggested that RPPOs provide each other with operational plans for the coming years.

*Wood packing material (RPPO-01/11)*

13. Mr Smith recalled the circumstances that led to the development of a draft ISPM on guidelines for regulating wood packing material used in the transport of commodities, referring particularly to the possible spread of *Anoplophora glabripennis* (Asian long-horned beetle) and *Bursaphelenchus xylophilus* (pine wood nematode) by this pathway. He recalled that this involved the global recommendation of one or more measures for treatment of wood packing material, sufficiently effective against a wide range of forest pests which might infest the wood, certified by a special mark on the wood. He noted that the present draft ISPM (sent out for country consultation) made a distinction between "long-term" and "short-term" measures for treatment of wood packing material, and suggested that heat treatment at 56°C for 30 min was supposed to provide a long-term protection which methyl bromide fumigation did not. In discussions within EPPO, this point had been considered to lack adequate scientific basis. Accordingly, EPPO countries would be suggesting that these two treatments should be considered as equivalent. The suggestion was also made that other treatments (for example, chemical pressure impregnation) should be assessed and approved as soon as possible.

14. Mr McDonnell recalled that NAPPO already has a regional standard for this purpose, which served as the basis for the development of the draft ISPM. Mr Ian Gear (PPPO) reported that new import health standards for different categories of wood, including wood packing, had been prepared. These import health standards do not require any substantial changes to New Zealand's current import requirements for wood and wood products. Mr Stynes reported that a new PRA on wood packing material was now being performed in Australia, and might lead to changes in existing treatment requirements. Different treatments were required according to the type of wood, and it was not clear that one or two globally recommended treatments could adequately cover all risks. It was noted that the draft standard allowed for countries to make different requirements if they were technically justified by PRA.

*Capacity building in LMO risk analysis (RPPO-01/?)*

15. Mr Mick Lloyd (PPPO) presented a paper highlighting the PPPO's need for capacity building in LMO risk analysis, to complement its programme of PRA training. Mr Jones advised the PPPO to seek TCP funding if it believes the LMO-RA training is technically justified. Mr Smith recalled that an IPPC Working Group had recently developed a specification for an ISPM on the plant pest risks associated with LMOs/products of modern biotechnology. Mr McDonnell suggested that PPPO consult the NAPPO biotechnology standard, available on their website (<http://www.nappo.org>).

*Scope of ISPM Pub. No 11 (RPPO-01/8)*

16. Mr Smith explained that in the last one or two years, developments under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) have led to increased worldwide concern to limit the spread of "invasive alien" species. NPPOs have found that they are the official services that possess the capability to regulate international movement of plants and plant products, to carry out necessary inspections, and to analyse risk. They were able to do so for invasive species as well as for pests of crop plants. The respective responsibilities of NPPOs and of corresponding services in Ministries of the Environment have to be defined within countries. Accordingly, there has been interest in extending the scope of ISPM Pub. No. 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*) to cover the relevant environmental risks. The ICPM called for the establishment of a working group to develop a new standard for this purpose,

as a supplement to ISPM Pub. No. 11. This group had prepared a draft supplement for the Standards Committee in May 2002. It had also stressed that the subject was one of immediate concern, and proposed that the draft should be widely circulated and discussed even before it passed to the Standards Committee. This was the basis for which it was presented to the Consultation. Mr Smith explained that the draft:

- extended the scope of ISPM Pub. No. 11 to pests of all plants, including those in non-cultivated or non-managed environments
- extended its scope to plants that are indirect plant pests in agriculture (weeds), or indirect pests of plants in natural environments (either individually as keystone or endangered species, or collectively as communities)
- concentrated on the main elements of risk analysis, i.e. pathways, probability of introduction, potential economic impact, and management
- targeted pests, i.e. organisms that are already known on the basis of specific scientific evidence to be harmful to plants (without, accordingly, providing a system for evaluating the potential risk from organisms not known to be pests).

The draft also recognized that the extension of the scope to harmful plants also opened the possibility that it would be used not only in relation to the risk of accidental introduction, but also to the effects of deliberate introduction of horticultural plants.

17. The Consultation supported the general approach of the draft supplement to ISPM Pub. No. 11. Participants stressed the need to develop these concepts rapidly and make them available to NPPOs for use in their internal relations with environmental authorities. It was suggested that any comments from countries should be sent to the IPPC Secretariat in time to be taken into account by the Standards Committee in May 2002.

18. Mr Lim reported that the Australian NPPO was already directly responsible for invasive weeds, but had now also to consider exotic insects or microorganisms which might damage plants in natural environments, and in particular the question of their biotypes, strains and races. Mr Smith confirmed that the ISPM supplement would also cover this case. Mr Lloyd regretted that the interaction between plant protection experts and environmental experts operated only at a high political level and the Consultation supported his view that specialists of the two disciplines should work together at the technical level of risk analysis. Mr McDonell reported that in North America, NPPOs are now dealing directly with environmental ministries (including the US Invasive Species Council).

*Coordination of technical assistance to countries in transition (RPPO-1/7)*

19. Mr Jones reported that the IPPC Secretariat had encountered special problems in dealing with requests for technical assistance from the countries in transition, i.e. countries of Eastern Europe and former USSR that were in transition from centrally planned to market economies. Participants queried whether the category of "countries in transition" was limited to that group of countries, and the IPPC Secretariat was asked to provide a full list. The IPPC Secretariat suggested that the Consultation could consider how better coordination of technical assistance to these countries could be achieved, that EPPO could assist the Secretariat in identifying experts who could be contracted to implement projects, and that the possibilities of RPPO membership of these countries should be examined.

20. Mr Smith commented that these countries did not form a homogeneous group. They included countries that are applying for EU membership in the near future; other European countries; and non-European countries of the former USSR. The first group and most of the second group were already the target for technical assistance programmes from both the EU and its member states. Most were also FAO members, and nearly all were EPPO members. The third group had common phytosanitary concerns because all had inherited their plant quarantine and plant protection systems from the USSR. Their common language was Russian. The Russian NPPO has continued to act as a central body coordinating interactions within this group, but there were also multilateral agreements among them,

especially in Central Asia. In addition, several of these countries were individually, and in an uncoordinated manner, the recipients of technical assistance through various donor agencies. Though only Kyrgyzstan was at the present time an EPPO member, Mr Smith added that EPPO was involved in the phytosanitary concerns of these countries through its cooperation with the Russian NPPO.

21. It was concluded that the necessary coordination of technical assistance concerned mainly the third group of countries and those of the second group that are not EPPO members (Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Moldova, Yugoslavia). The EPPO Secretariat was ready to discuss with the IPPC Secretariat the individual situations and needs of those countries. The Consultation noted that all the countries concerned were potential EPPO members, which was justified by their trade and cultural links with Russia and the rest of Europe.

#### *Annual work plan*

22. Mr McDonnell proposed that the Consultation should develop a work plan on an annual basis. The purpose would be to allow a more thorough preparation for the meetings and to ensure that tangible results are achieved. The Consultation agreed with the NAPPO proposal and proceeded to develop a work plan for 2001/2002 (see paragraph 27). It was agreed that the IPPC Secretariat should send reminders to participants who had undertaken elements in the work programme.

#### *Quarantine initiatives in the Pacific region (RPPO-01/12)*

23. Mr Lloyd presented a paper that summarized plant quarantine activities in the Pacific. It highlighted a series of national training workshops on import risk analysis, which have been held in the region, and the ongoing reviews of national phytosanitary regulations and procedures. He emphasized that laws currently in force do not meet the transparency obligations of the IPPC. Two major developments were outlined, regarding the harmonization of phytosanitary legislation and the development of a harmonized operational manual. Harmonized regulations and procedures based on efficient decision-support systems will reduce the prospects of NPPOs becoming a constraint to regional trade and, at the same time, maintain the low pest status of the region despite the increased tourism and trade that the region is experiencing.

#### *Complex language of ISPMs (RPPO-01/?)*

24. Mr Elijah Philemon (PPPO) described problems associated with the practical application of ISPMs, in particular for persons whose mother tongue is not English. Mr Smith noted that final editing of draft ISPMs was normally done following the country consultation. The Consultation agreed that simple language should be used in order to facilitate understanding by a wide audience. In particular, the Consultation recommended that this issue should be related to the Standards Committee and the IPPC Secretariat so that a solution can be found (e.g. by introducing an editorial check between the drafting of a standard by a Working Group and its first consideration by the Standards Committee).

#### *Generic heat treatments (RPPO-01/15)*

25. The Chairperson presented a paper prepared by PPPO seeking the support of the Consultation for the development of a regional standard on generic heat treatments (especially Forced Hot Air Treatment or HTFA) against fruit flies. Such a standard could then be submitted to the ICPM for consideration as an ISPM. In discussion, it was pointed out that the efficacy of the treatment would have to be justified (according to the draft ISPM on efficacy of measures, currently under development). Information was also needed on the impact of the treatment on fruit quality, since this would determine the general usefulness of the standard in commercial practice. Mr Smith noted that, once such a standard had been accepted by the ICPM, all contracting parties to the SPS agreement would be obliged to accept its use unless they could technically justify the need for another treatment.

*Diminishing access to methyl bromide for phytosanitary fumigation (RPPO-01/19)*

26. The Vice-Chairperson spoke for PPPO on a paper seeking to focus attention on the implications of diminished access to methyl bromide for pre-shipment and post-entry purposes. He emphasized that any decision by countries to restrict the export of methyl bromide under the Montreal Protocol and to accelerate the withdrawal of methyl bromide would have far-reaching consequences for international trade. In addition, it was recognized that research on alternatives to methyl bromide was yielding little promise of success. The Consultation recognized his concerns and emphasized the need to open discussion at the highest level. It agreed that the ICPM should be urged to include this matter on the agenda of its forthcoming meeting in March 2002, to ensure that methyl bromide remains available for phytosanitary purposes. The preparation of a brief paper on this subject by a PPPO member for the ICPM was subsequently included in the work programme of the Consultation.

**Coordinated Activities**

27. Following the decision taken on the annual work plan of the Consultation, the following activities decided by the meeting for 2001/2002 were listed as follows:

	<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timing</b>
1.	Assistance to APPPC in identifying PRA consultants for South American leaf blight of rubber	NAPPO, EPPO	End of December, 2001
2.	Identify a workshop topic for the Fourteenth Technical Consultation	EPPO	January 2002
3.	Share RPPO operational plans and lists of regional standards, accepted or in development	All RPPOs	Beginning of December, 2001
4.	Develop a specification for a standard on phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit	EPPO	October 2002
5.	Letter to the Chairperson of the ICPM declaring the need for the report of the Technical Consultation to be a standing item on the ICPM agenda	Chair of the Thirteenth Technical Consultation	Beginning of December, 2001
6.	Raise the issue of diminished access to methyl bromide at the ICPM, and preparing a paper	Chair of the Thirteenth Technical Consultation to raise the issue	Beginning of December, 2001
		PPPO member to prepare a paper	End of December, 2001
7.	Report on the progress on a regional standard for generic HTFA treatment against fruit flies	PPPO	October 2002
8.	Raise with the Standards Committee and the IPPC Secretariat the problems of complex language in ISPMs	EPPO	November 2001

### **Other business**

28. On behalf of the New Zealand Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Mr Ivess presented the components of the MAF Biosecurity System; Mr Barney Stephenson presented the management procedures for fruit-fly incursions in New Zealand; and Mr Matthew Spence gave a presentation on export certification procedures in New Zealand.

### **Venue and date of the Fourteenth Technical Consultation**

29. The Consultation noted that in recent years meetings had been held in the following locations: 1996 Nouméa (APPPC), 1997 Paris (EPPO), 1998 Brasília (COSAVE), 1999 Rome, 2000 San Diego (NAPPO). It recognized that it would be appropriate for PPPO now to host a meeting, but concluded that this should not immediately follow the present meeting in New Zealand. Accordingly, it was decided to hold the Fourteenth Technical Consultation in a European country at the invitation of EPPO (exact place and date to be settled later).

### **Closure of the meeting**

30. Mr McDonnell and Mr Jones, on behalf of the Consultation, thanked the New Zealand hosts for the excellent organization of the meeting, the generous hospitality offered to the participants, and the very interesting technical visit. In closing the Consultation, the Chairperson emphasized the great contribution of Ms Tina Neumayr and Ms Laraine Beaven in the organization of the meeting.

**AGENDA OF THE THIRTEENTH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS**

1. Opening of the Consultation
2. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and Rapporteurs
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Actions Arising from the Twelfth Technical Consultation
5. Discussion papers
  - Recognition procedure for RPPOs
  - Development of regional standards by APPPC
  - Collaboration with RPPOs as regards SPS Committee meetings
  - Further considerations on transit and re-export
  - RPPO Seminar series
  - Wood packing material
  - Capacity building in LMO risk analysis
  - Scope of ISPM Pub. No. 11
  - Coordination of technical assistance to countries in transition
  - Annual work plan
  - Quarantine initiatives in the Pacific region
  - Complex language of ISPMs
  - Generic heat treatments
  - Diminishing access to methyl bromide for phytosanitary fumigation
6. Coordinated Activities
7. Other Business
8. Venue and Date of the Fourteenth Technical Consultation
9. Closure of the Meeting

### PROCEDURE FOR THE RECOGNITION OF NEW RPPOS

The recognition procedure for new RPPOs should be composed of four steps:

1. The prospective RPPO presents documentation authenticating an inter-governmental agreement and a written request for recognition as an RPPO under Article IX of the IPPC (1997) to the Chairperson of the ICPM.
2. The FAO Legal Counsel reviews the legal status of the submission.
3. The Technical Consultation among RPPOs assesses whether the prospective RPPO meets the ICPM Guidelines for the Recognition of RPPOs. These Guidelines, as adopted by the ICPM, have as a minimum the following functions:
  - coordinate the activities among National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) in the regions covered, in order to achieve the objectives of the IPPC (1997)
  - harmonize phytosanitary measures
  - participate in activities to promote the objectives of the IPPC (1997); and
  - gather and disseminate information.
4. The Technical Consultation submits a recommendation for consideration by the ICPM.

**RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF RPPOs ATTENDING WTO SPS  
COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

1. The representative of the IPPC Secretariat is the spokesperson for the delegation. A representative from an RPPO may be designated by the IPPC Secretariat to make a statement to the meeting.
2. RPPOs inform the IPPC Secretariat of the name of their proposed representative at least two weeks in advance of the Committee meeting, otherwise they shall not be recognized as members of the IPPC delegation.
3. RPPOs are limited to one representative per organization. Funding for attendance is the responsibility of the RPPO. Representatives of RPPOs attending the SPS meetings should conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the role of the IPPC as an invited observer.
4. RPPOs can provide information for the IPPC Secretariat to consider in advance of the Committee meeting and may suggest points to contribute to the meeting.
5. Following the meeting, the IPPC Secretariat prepares a summary report of the meeting for distribution to RPPOs.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION (APPPC)**

Chong-yao SHEN  
Regional Plant Protection Officer  
Executive Secretary  
Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission  
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific  
39 Phra Atit Road, Bangkok  
10200 Thailand  
Tel.: (662) 6974268  
Fax.: (662) 6974445  
Email: [chongyao.shen@fao.org](mailto:chongyao.shen@fao.org)

Nam-Bok LEE  
Director  
International Quarantine Cooperation Division  
National Plant Quarantine Service  
MAF, Republic of Korea  
Tel.: (82) 31 445 1223  
Fax.: (82) 31 445 6934  
Email: [nblee@maf.go.kr](mailto:nblee@maf.go.kr)

Brian STYNES  
General Manager Plant Biosecurity  
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry  
Australia  
GPO Box 858 Canberra, ACT 2601  
Australia  
Tel.: (612) 6272 4042  
Fax.: (612) 6272 3307  
Email: [brian.stynes@affa.gov.au](mailto:brian.stynes@affa.gov.au)

Somchai CHARNNARONGKUL  
Director  
Agriculture Regulatory Division  
Department of Agriculture  
Phaholyothin Rd. Chatuchak  
Bangkok 10900 Thailand  
Tel.: (662) 579-8576  
Fax.: (662) 579-8535  
Email: [somchaic@doa.go.th](mailto:somchaic@doa.go.th)

T.K LIM  
Manager South Asia & Middle East  
Plant Biosecurity  
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry  
Australia  
GPO Box 858 Canberra, ACT 2601  
Australia  
Tel.: (612) 6272 3752  
Fax.: (612) 6272 3307  
Email: [tk.lim@affa.gov.au](mailto:tk.lim@affa.gov.au)

**EUROPEAN AND MEDITERRANEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (EPPO)**

Ian SMITH  
Director-General  
European and Mediterranean Plant Protection  
Organization  
1, rue le Nôtre  
75016 Paris, France  
Tel.: (33) 1 4520 7794  
Fax.: (33) 1 4224 8943  
Email: [hq@eppo.fr](mailto:hq@eppo.fr)

**NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (NAPPO)**

Ian McDONELL  
NAPPO – Executive Director  
Observatory Cres., Bldg. #3  
Central Experimental Farm  
Ottawa, ON KIA 0C6 – Canada  
Tel.: (1) 613 759 6132  
Fax.: (1) 613 759 6141  
Email: [imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca](mailto:imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca)

**PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (PPPO)**

Mick LLOYD  
Secretariat PPPO  
Secretariat Pacific Community  
PM Bag  
Suva, Fiji  
Tel.: (679) 370733  
Email: [mickl@spc.int](mailto:mickl@spc.int)

Ian GEAR  
National Manager Import Health Standards  
Forest Biosecurity  
Biosecurity Authority  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
PO Box 2526  
Wellington, New Zealand  
Tel.: (64) 4 470 2744  
Fax.: (64) 4 470 2741  
Email: [geari@maf.govt.nz](mailto:geari@maf.govt.nz)

Laraine BEAVEN  
Technical Adviser Plant Imports  
Plants Biosecurity  
Biosecurity Authority  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
PO Box 2526  
Wellington, New Zealand  
Tel.: (64) 4 474 4126  
Fax.: (64) 4 474 4257  
Email: [beavenl@maf.govt.nz](mailto:beavenl@maf.govt.nz)

Richard IVESS  
Director, Plants Biosecurity  
Biosecurity Authority  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
PO Box 2526  
Wellington, New Zealand  
Tel.: (64) 4 474 4127  
Fax.: (64) 4 498 9888  
Email: [ivessr@maf.govt.nz](mailto:ivessr@maf.govt.nz)

Barney STEPHENSON  
National Adviser Plant Pest Surveillance  
Plants Biosecurity  
Biosecurity Authority  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
PO Box 2526  
Wellington, New Zealand  
Tel.: (64) 4 474  
Fax.: (64) 4 474 4257  
Email: [stephensonb@maf.govt.nz](mailto:stephensonb@maf.govt.nz)

Joseph KERAGE  
Export Program Manager  
National Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection  
Authority (NAQIA)  
PO Box 741  
Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea  
Tel.: (675) 325 9977  
Fax.: (675) 325 1674 or 325 9310  
Email: [naqia@dg.com.pg](mailto:naqia@dg.com.pg)

Elijah C PHILEMON  
Chief Plant Protection & Chief Quarantine  
Officer (Plants)  
National Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection  
Authority (NAQIA)  
PO Box 741  
Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea  
Tel.: (675) 325 9977  
Fax.: (675) 325 1673 or 325 1674  
Email: [naqia@dg.com.pg](mailto:naqia@dg.com.pg)

Cameron ETA  
Director  
Agriculture Quarantine Service  
Ministry of Agriculture and Primary Industries  
PO Box G13  
Honiara, Solomon Islands  
Tel.: (677)  
Fax.: (677)  
Email: [dor.solomon@welkam.solomon.com](mailto:dor.solomon@welkam.solomon.com)

Chris BARBER  
Senior Plant Protection Officer  
Vanuatu Quarantine & Inspection Service  
PMB 095  
Port Vila, Vanuatu  
Tel.: (678) 23519  
Fax.: (678) 23185  
Email: [chrisbarber@vanuatu.com.vu](mailto:chrisbarber@vanuatu.com.vu)

Jean Paul GOEPFERT  
Acting Director  
|Service de L'Economie Rurale  
BP 9  
Mata-utu  
Wallis et Futuna  
Tel.: (681) 72 04 01  
Fax.: (681) 72 04 04  
Email: [jpgoepfert@hotmail.com](mailto:jpgoepfert@hotmail.com)

#### **INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION SECRETARIAT (IPPCS)**

Jeff JONES  
Plant Quarantine Officer  
IPPC Secretariat  
Plant Production and Protection Division  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome, Italy  
Tel.: (39) 06 5705 2040  
Fax.: (39) 06 5705 6347  
Email: [jeffrey.jones@fao.org](mailto:jeffrey.jones@fao.org)

Kirifi POUONO  
Assistant Director for Quarantine and Regulations  
Quarantine and Regulatory Division  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forest, Fisheries and  
Meterology  
Apia, Samoa  
Tel.: (685) 20103  
Fax.: (685) 20103  
Email: [kpouono@lesamoa.net](mailto:kpouono@lesamoa.net)

Sione FOLIAKI  
Quarantine and Quality Management Division  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
PO Box 14  
Nuku'alofa, Tonga  
Tel.: (676) 24 922  
Fax.: (676) 24 257  
Email: [maf-qqmd@kalianet.to](mailto:maf-qqmd@kalianet.to)

Timothy TUMUKON  
Principal Plant Protection Officer  
Vanuatu Quarantine & Inspection Service  
PMB 095  
Port Vila, Vanuatu  
Tel.: (678) 23519  
Fax.: (678) 23185  
Email: [vqisvila@vanuatu.com.vu](mailto:vqisvila@vanuatu.com.vu)

Matairangi PUREA  
Plant Protection Officer  
FAO Sub Regional Office for the Pacific  
Apia, Samoa  
Email: [mat.purea@fao.org](mailto:mat.purea@fao.org)