

REPORT

**Nairobi,
Kenya
30 August-
3 September
2004**

Sixteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

RPPO-2004/REPORT

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

Nairobi, Kenya 30 August-3 September 2004

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2004**

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.

© FAO 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|--|----|
| Report of the Sixteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations | 1 | |
| Appendix I | Agenda | 11 |
| Appendix II | Recommendations on the roles and functions of RPPOs in their relationships with the ICPM | 13 |
| Appendix III | Practical arrangements for the organization of TCs among RPPOs | 15 |
| Appendix IV | TC among RPPOs - work programme for 2004/2005 | 17 |
| Appendix V | Recommendations of the TC among RPPOs to the ICPM | 19 |
| Appendix VI | List of participants | 21 |

**SIXTEENTH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION
AMONG REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS**

NAIROBI, KENYA

AUGUST 30-SEPTEMBER 3, 2004

1. Opening of the Sixteenth Technical Consultation

1 Ms Sarah Olembo, Assistant Scientific Secretary of the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC), apologized for her Director who could not attend the meeting due to circumstances beyond his control and welcomed participants to Africa on behalf of His Excellency, Professor Alpha Oumar Konare, the Chairperson of the African Union, and acknowledged the cooperation of the Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS) in organizing the 16th Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC). Ms Olembo also mentioned the unexploited potential of Africa in agriculture despite some infrastructure and resource constraints. She invited participants to take part in activities outside the meeting to get to know Kenya.

2 Mr Jeffrey Jones, International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat, also thanked KEPHIS and the IAPSC for hosting the 16th TC. He mentioned that Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) promoted harmonization of the implementation of phytosanitary measures. He noted the presence of five of the nine RPPOs and regretted that the others (i.e. the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC), the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC), the Comunidad Andina (CA) and the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)) were unable to attend. Mr Jones said that one of the main objectives of the 16th TC was to discuss how RPPOs could assist with the work programme of the IPPC.

3 Mr Ralf Lopian, Chairperson of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM), welcomed the participants on behalf of the ICPM and expressed his pleasure at seeing a number of African countries participating. He stressed that this would actively support and raise the profile of the IAPSC. Mr Lopian informed the TC that although the participation of the African region in IPPC activities had been limited to a few countries, the IPPC and its associated International Standards on Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) provided protection from phytosanitary risks and helped expedite market access. He encouraged African countries to adopt/ratify and implement the IPPC and ISPMs, and consequently benefit through better phytosanitary protection and increased market access. Mr Lopian also encouraged the African countries to increase their participation in IPPC activities and standard setting in order to ensure that the needs of the African countries are recognized and accommodated as appropriate.

4 The Honorable Kyato Kaindi, Assistant Minister for Agriculture, officially welcomed participants on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture of Kenya, who had been called out of the country on urgent diplomatic business. He mentioned the importance of plant protection to the Kenyan economy and said that the liberalization of trade had meant an increased emphasis on regional and international cooperation to protect plants and the environment, while recognizing the special needs of developing countries. He noted a number of important items on the agenda, including the role of Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs), which would help with the implementation of agreed phytosanitary measures. The Assistant Minister acknowledged the important contribution made by the technical cooperation programmes of the FAO and, after encouraging the participants to take the opportunity to enjoy the landscape and hospitality of the Kenyan people, officially declared the 16th TC among RPPOs open.

5 Mr Denis Rangi, Commonwealth Agriculture Bureau International (CABI), stressed that customer satisfaction was essential in international markets. He recognized that Africa sometimes had

difficulty in accessing global markets because of limited capacity but said that it was time for Africa to act and exploit its potential.

6 Mr Kedera, Managing Director of KEPHIS, closed the opening session by thanking Mr Jones and Mr Lopian for the support of the IPPC, and Ms Olembo for the support of the IAPSC.

2. Election of Chairperson and Rapporteurs

7 Mr Mike Holtzhausen (South Africa) was elected Chairperson of the 16th TC. Mr Ian McDonell (North American Plant Protection Organization - NAPPO) and Ms Françoise Petter (European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization - EPPO) agreed to be rapporteurs.

3. Adoption of the agenda

8 The agenda (Appendix I) was amended to match the discussion papers and adopted.

4. Actions arising from the 15th Technical Consultation

9 The IPPC Secretariat reviewed actions arising from the 15th TC and noted that many issues from the 15th TC had been included on the agenda of the present meeting.

5. Discussion papers

Problems associated with the implementation of the ISPMs

10 The representative from IAPSC presented a paper highlighting the difficulties experienced by the African countries in implementing ISPMs. She reported that during the 21st General Assembly of the IAPSC (held in Dakar, Senegal, on 24-28 May 2004), 22 countries had discussed implementation problems. Some of the basic problems included absent, inadequate and/or obsolete phytosanitary legislation, capacity building for pest risk analysis (PRA), pest surveillance, inspection and certification, and information sharing. The importance of accepting or ratifying the New Revised Text of the IPPC was also noted.

11 A detailed analysis of the problems had been provided and the IAPSC had proposed some actions to resolve them. The African Union programme on Agriculture had taken steps to promote phytosanitary measures and African governments had been requested to devote 10% of their budgets to agriculture.

12 The African countries represented at the TC described the importance of trade (exports and imports) to their respective economies and it was clear that some had more capacity to meet the requirements of importing countries than others. The Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) representative mentioned that members of the Pacific region faced many of the same problems as those faced by the African countries, except that the island nations had natural advantages (i.e. isolated countries with natural (ocean) borders) for preventing the entry of quarantine pests.

13 The representative from the Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) referred to the shared borders in that COSAVE region and provided background on the RPPO activities and the relationship with the Mercosur agreement. The importance of early identification of problems associated with the implementation of ISPMs was highlighted. COSAVE placed great importance on being represented at every IPPC Working Group and Technical Panel in order that their perspective could be considered. COSAVE also held coordination meetings with its members on draft ISPMs. The COSAVE Council of Ministers helped to focus attention on agriculture in the region. COSAVE felt that explanatory documents for ISPMs would be necessary, especially for those affected parties that had no direct involvement in the development of these ISPMs, but were affected by the outcomes.

14 The EPPO representative noted that the EPPO members also had shared borders and stressed that EPPO's main purpose had always been the harmonization of phytosanitary measures among member countries. The 25 EU countries in the EPPO region had a harmonized legislation system that was originally based on EPPO recommendations. The importance of regional cooperation in ICPM-related activities was also stressed.

15 The NAPPO representative referred to ISPM No. 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*) and informed the TC of the intention of NAPPO to hold two regional workshops on implementation of this standard. The workshops would be open to both the public and private sectors and would be presented with simultaneous interpretation in Spanish and English. The first would be held in September 2004 in Mexico for the OIRSA countries and the second would be held in November for the remainder of the Latin American and Caribbean countries. The proceedings would be recorded with the intent of using them as a future training tool. The EPPO representative announced that there were similar plans to hold a workshop in Russia for the EPPO region.

16 The PPPO mentioned that their members were aligning their biosecurity laws with the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) and the IPPC. They had developed a regional biosecurity model law that member countries could use or adapt. Work was being undertaken by a combination of technical and legal experts, together with relevant national agencies responsible for biosecurity and trade facilitation. The PPPO representative said that the next phase would be the production of an electronic biosecurity operations manual.

17 The TC considered that it would be useful to identify three or four ISPMs that could be examined at the next TC (2005) with regard to any specific implementation difficulties. The ISPMs chosen for the purpose were: ISPM No. 6 (*Guidelines for Surveillance*), ISPM No. 19 (*Guidelines on lists of regulated pests*) and ISPM No. 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*). It was agreed that during the next 12 months the RPPOs would consult with their member countries to document any concerns for discussion at the 17th TC. The 17th TC would then review the comments and report to the ICPM in 2006.

18 The TC recognized the difficulties of the African countries with regard to the implementation of the ISPMs and suggested that the IAPSC assembled a document, which could be provided to the next ICPM for information.

Development of a work programme for the preparation of explanatory documents

19 The IPPC Secretariat recalled that the 15th TC had identified that the development of explanatory documents on adopted ISPMs could be a task for the TC. NAPPO commented that although such documents would be very valuable, their drafting would tend to involve the same group of persons (i.e. those involved in the development of ISPMs). EPPO commented that a programme for drafting explanatory documents had been initiated for that region. A first draft on the supplement No. 1 to ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) on official control had been elaborated but needed to be finalized. The PPPO was of the opinion that such documents would be very useful, in particular to inform stakeholders who were usually not familiar with NPPOs activities and responsibilities, such as those related to phytosanitary certification.

20 The IPPC Secretariat commented that it had been approached by other organizations such as CABI and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which were willing to draft explanatory documents for the IPPC on issues such as biological control agents, PRA and the use of irradiation as a quarantine treatment. The IPPC Secretariat was concerned that, unless this activity was coordinated, explanatory documents could be drafted on the same ISPM by several people, resulting in duplication. The Chairperson of the ICPM noted the oversight role foreseen by the ICPM for the Secretariat.

21 The Chairman of the ICPM explained that a process for the elaboration of explanatory documents had been established at the 2004 ICPM and reiterated that the TC had identified that the production of explanatory documents could be a task for the RPPOs. The IPPC Secretariat clarified that explanatory documents should only be prepared for standards that had been adopted by the ICPM and that the documents prepared under the auspices of the IPPC Secretariat would not be officially adopted by the ICPM.

22 The TC agreed to select a standard for which an explanatory document could be prepared and presented to the ICPM in 2006. It was noted that the TC would need to agree on the authorship of such documents coming from the TC for presentation to the ICPM. The PPPO (New Zealand) agreed to prepare a draft explanatory document for discussion at the next TC on the issue of export certification (this would involve ISPM No. 7: *Export certification system* and ISPM No. 12: *Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*). EPPO agreed to present the draft explanatory document on Supplement No. 1 to ISPM No. 5 (*Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests*) at the next TC.

23 COSAVE considered that, while explanatory documents were useful, the specific target audience(s) should be identified, e.g. NPPO officials, affected parties. COSAVE considered that the TC should also consider the status of such documents and the question relating to the formality of the adoption process. The TC was reluctant to implement a formal adoption process.

24 The TC recommended that a draft explanatory document on export certification covering ISPM No. 7 (*Export certification system*) and ISPM No. 12 (*Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*), and Supplement No. 1 to ISPM No. 5 (*Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests*) be developed for consideration at the 2005 TC.

Information sharing on PRA

25 The EPPO representative described the recent developments on Pest Risk Analysis in the EPPO region. In particular, it was explained that EPPO members consider that the organization should play a major role in organizing internationally-conducted PRA in the region and that detailed structure for the EPPO PRA process should be developed. They also considered that the EPPO regional schemes on PRA should be maintained as they added value to ISPM No. 11 (2004; *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organism*) by following a logical sequence of questions (the decision-scheme was being fully aligned to ISPM No. 11). EPPO stressed that, although management options would be identified at the EPPO level, the decision on which option was the most appropriate would be decided by the individual country. EPPO would also identify endangered areas based on scientific information and subsequently identify which part of the region would require protection.

26 The NAPPO representative identified a number of sources of PRA information that were available through its website at www.nappo.org. In some cases these included completed PRAs (e.g. available through the APHIS link) and in others there were only pest fact sheets.

27 COSAVE continued to work on its PRA database. It was employing one person per member country to work with the NPPOs.

28 There was a brief discussion on the possibility for countries to work together on PRA. Some of the same information could be used for areas with similar ecosystems and pest status. EPPO took a regional approach to utilize expertise and resources.

29 IASPC described the strengthening of sanitary/phytosanitary capacity and infrastructure in Sub-Saharan Africa through PRA training. This was through an African Trade and Investment Programme project funded by USDA-APHIS through Tuskegee University. Its intent was to identify and train a critical mass of trainers in animal and plant health, and food safety. Case studies from

African countries were used to learn the application of qualitative and quantitative risk analyses. To date, 15 countries and 69 participants had been involved. The IAPSC intended to create an expert Working Group on PRA to extend the work into the future.

30 The TC agreed that regional cooperation on PRA activities could be of value and that RPPOs should consider, where appropriate, helping countries in their region to develop capacity and share resources to conduct PRAs.

6. Comments on the proposed role and functions of the RPPOs as discussed in the IPPC working group meeting

31 The Chairman of the ICPM presented the main conclusions and recommendations (ref Annex III) resulting from the discussions in the working group meeting on the role and functions of RPPOs (Rome 2004-07-08). He recalled that in 2003 the informal working group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) had discussed the role and functions of RPPOs and their relationship with the IPPC, especially in relation to Article IX. The SPTA had recommended to ICPM-6 that a small working group should meet in 2004 to discuss this matter. Accordingly a group including three representatives of RPPOs (COSAVE, EPPO and IAPSC) and the members of the Focus Group on SPTA matters met in 2004 to consider the role and function of RPPOs. It analyzed the possible roles and functions of RPPOs in regard to the Convention and considered for which of the ICPM strategic directions and goals RPPOs could provide support. The working group based its discussion on a paper prepared by EPPO and on the report of the 14th TC held in Marrakech, Morocco.

32 The Chairman of the ICPM reminded the TC that most RPPOs were independent organizations, and not under the control or supervision of FAO or the IPPC. It was understood that none of the recommendations to be developed would affect the rights or obligations of members in regard to the IPPC and if appropriate, their RPPOs. The TC fully supported the point. The working group had discussed what form the recommendations should take and decided that they should be in a format which listed the areas of cooperation between the RPPOs and the IPPC.

33 The PPPO commented that the role of the TC had changed since the Interim Commission was created and recalled that, before then, it was the only mechanism for international coordination where ideas such as the creation of a Commission for Phytosanitary Measures and the need for the revision of the IPPC had emerged.

34 The TC acknowledged the excellent analysis and well-structured report of the working group Group and made the following comments:

- (i) The TC considered that as many RPPOs as possible should attend the annual Technical Consultation among RPPOs and urged the IPPC Secretariat to facilitate the attendance of its two Commissions (i.e. the CPPC and the APPPC) at future TCs.
- (ii) The TC considered that a reference to Article IX 3 of the New Revised Text of the IPPC should be included in the recommendations of the working group, to make it clear that the collaboration between the IPPC and the RPPOs had a basis in the Convention. The TC consequently proposed to modify the second sentence of the recommendations as follows: “The Focus Group recommends that areas of cooperation between RPPOs and the IPPC, in accordance with article IX 3 of the New Revised Text of the IPPC, include the following:”

Standard setting process

- (iii) The TC supported a role for RPPOs in the nomination of experts for IPPC working groups and technical panels. It was acknowledged that nominations for these groups could be made by RPPOs and individual countries, and that the selection of the experts was done by the Standards Committee. If countries wished, a pre-selection could be made by their RPPOs.

The TC proposed to redraft the last bullet point as follows:

“As appropriate, provision of technical and administrative support to Standards Committee members in their region”

Information exchange.

- (iv) Regarding the operation of an effective International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP), it was mentioned that not only should the RPPOs themselves contribute to the IPP but they should also encourage their members to be active in its development and functioning.

Technical assistance

- (v) The TC considered that the first bullet point concerning involvement in regional workshops on draft ISPMs was also linked to the standard setting process and hence should also have an asterisk.

Funding

- (vi) The TC considered that the last bullet point (funding by the IPPC Secretariat of the participation of FAO commissions at the annual TC) was not related to roles and functions of RPPOs and proposed that there be a separate paragraph to deal with this issue.

The detailed changes are integrated in Appendix II.

7. Organization and preparation of the TC

35 The Focus Group had also discussed the organization of the TC. Timing, location and frequency of TCs were proposed for discussion during the TC. The TC concluded that holding the TC six months before the ICPM was appropriate to enable the TC to contribute fully to the ICPM programme (e.g. to present comments on implementation difficulties of ISPMs, to propose solutions to resolve ISPM implementation difficulties, and to provide support to the ICPM on other matters on a timely basis). It was felt that for the same reason, the TC should be held on an annual basis.

36 The TC considered there was a benefit in rotating the meetings among the RPPOs in order to provide an opportunity for member countries of the host RPPO to be involved in IPPC activities. Normally there were few opportunities for NPPOs to participate directly in IPPC activities. Meetings could also be held at FAO headquarters in Rome, if appropriate.

37 The TC considered the practical arrangements involved with organizing a technical consultation and listed them in table form (Appendix III). The TC recommended that the arrangements be forwarded to the ICPM for consideration and adoption.

8. New and developing regional standards and other important activities of RPPOs

38 EPPO reported that their standards were consistent with ISPMs but adapted to regional needs and that there was no obligation on the part of member countries to implement them. The framework for drafting and approving the two categories of EPPO standards, Plant Protection Products and Phytosanitary Measures, was presented. The diagnostic protocols were developed by Panels of specialists. However they had not all been validated or ring-tested and EPPO was currently investigating possibilities as to how this could be achieved.

39 NAPPO presented its list of approved standards and standards under development. Particular emphasis was placed on standards under development and a brief description of the scope and content was provided.

40 COSAVE provided a list of approved standards, standards under revision, pest datasheets and diagnostic protocols. The procedures for approval of its regional standards was outlined. The Steering Committee approved standards which dealt with the work and functions of COSAVE. Other standards,

after approval by the steering committee, underwent public consultation. A third category of standards, after passing the above processes, were required to be approved by COSAVE's Council of Ministers.

41 Both NAPPO and COSAVE had a system for the derogation of regional standards once ISPMs on the same topic were approved. Both RPPOs also used decision documents on particular issues of international importance.

42 Standards under development that were considered of interest by the TC included:

- the NAPPO standard on plants for planting
- the EPPO standard on technical requirements for laboratories (quality assurance)
- the EPPO standard on the importation of live organisms that are plant pests or potential plant pests.

43 COSAVE commented that the accreditation of laboratories was a difficult issue. During discussions it became evident that the term accreditation was used differently in different regions. The TC agreed to place the general concept of accreditation on its work programme as the subject for the symposium at the 17th TC.

44 There was a brief discussion over the legal/copyright issues concerning the use of diagnostic keys and pictures, and the need for the consent of the author in order to use them.

45 Candidates for fast-track standards protocols, mostly RPPO diagnostic protocols, had already been proposed to the IPPC.

46 Other regional standards as candidates for ISPMs included the NAPPO and EPPO potato standards. The TC felt that the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) work on safe germplasm movement could also be developed into an international standard through IAPSC, since the FAO/IPGRI (International Plant Genetic Resources Institute) guidelines were at times implemented inconsistently with the IPPC and FAO no longer participated in their development.

47 The TC briefly discussed the recognition of pest free areas and the meaning of the term regionalization. It was concluded that this topic would be raised at the ICPM and therefore there was no need to progress the issue further.

48 The ICPM Chairperson reminded participants of the need to develop a longer term view for the development of standards in order to smooth out the peaks and valleys of the ICPM work programme and to provide time for the development for specifications. This would be included in the work programme of the TC for the foreseeable future.

9. Electronic certification

(Presentation by Mr Ashley Mudford, Programme Manager (E-cert) New Zealand Food Safety Authority)

49 Electronic certification was primarily intended for government to government interactions although there were spin-off commercial benefits. Some of the main benefits from a phytosanitary point of view included a reduction in fraud, documenting pre-clearance, reduced costs and advanced notice of arriving consignments.

50 APEC estimated savings of \$60 billion US per year for international trade costs. The United States alone estimated a \$4.4 billion annual savings with the implementation of the new Customs application.

51 E-cert was in use on a limited bilateral basis but interest was growing. The World Customs Organization and the SPS were working together to harmonize data elements. The SPS data standards

were expected to be signed off by June 2005 under the UN/CEFACT project. Some of the international challenges to make E-cert work included applying international standards and aligning border activities such as Customs, Agriculture and Commerce. Some of the benefits included improved relationships because of reduced fraud, reduced costs and increased speed.

52 The domestic challenges included organizational alignment, information technology capacity, funding and a dedicated person to push things forward. The domestic benefits included early notification, improved supply chain, streamlined decision making and government/industry partnerships. It was noted that industry was totally funding the development and implementation of E-cert in New Zealand.

53 Security features were built into the system to limit user access to information they had been approved to read, input or change. The use of encrypted data ensured a level of security which was equal to that in force for international banking.

54 Mr Mudford considered that the next steps for the IPPC to consider would include:

- Endorsing the approach - join with the CODEX working party
- Establishing stewards
- Monitoring UN/CEFACT progress.

55 The TC recognized the benefits of electronic certification but also acknowledged the resource problems associated with its implementation which could cause difficulties for many countries.

56 The TC recommended that the IPPC should work jointly with CODEX and OIE on electronic certification in order to avoid overlap, save resources, enhance synergy and establish a harmonized system in the SPS area. In order to implement this recommendation the TC recommended that the ICPM established a work programme including:

- Presentation of the electronic certification model to ICPM-7
- Contact CODEX and OIE to establish a common agenda on electronic certification to be approved by ICPM.
- Identify potential resources to support the implementation of electronic certification.
- Include electronic certification in IPPC technical assistance programmes.

10. International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)

(Presented by Mr David Nowell, IPPC Secretariat)

57 The IPP had been operational for 2 years and the IPPC Secretariat was currently working with the IPP Support Group (SG) to improve navigation and functionality. The review process was initiated with at the SG meeting in January 2004 to provide guidance and input in the design and implementation of the IPP.

58 A work programme had been developed to implement these changes in FAO. The SG had been consulted at all stages of development and had helped substantially with the development of the new interface. It was anticipated that the new IPP would be launched on 27 September 2004. The next month would involve fine tuning the work that had been done. The SG would assist in the process.

59 A substantial capacity building programme would be launched later in 2004 with the primary focus of building awareness of national phytosanitary information exchange obligations, the development of regional and national work plans, and the need to enter this information in the IPP.

60 The anticipated work plan for the workshops was outlined and the RPPOs were requested to provide assistance in that regard. It was agreed that such a capacity building programme was necessary before NPPOs could fully participate in the IPP.

61 A brief demonstration of the main features of the IPP and a preview of the revised IPP were provided. Some participants noted there was substantial variation in national capacity to participate in the IPP and this would need to be considered in any capacity building programme. It was noted that the scientific name for pest reporting should be obligatory (which was not the case). The PPPO (SPC) noted their willingness to participate in the process as they had already initiated a related capacity building programme.

11. Invasive species

62 EPPO presented its activities on invasive plants. A Panel on invasive alien species had been established. The work programme includes data collection on the invasive alien species occurring in the EPPO region (including weeds) and on phytosanitary measures. PRAs for invasive alien species should also be developed. The EPPO Panel on invasive alien species had made a preliminary evaluation of invasive plants potentially important for the EPPO region which would be studied further. This had been done on the basis of questionnaires returned by member countries and data compiled by the Secretariat.

63 NAPPO was also considering more in-depth involvement on the topic of invasive alien species. A document was presented which described the many government agencies in North America which had an interest in invasive species. The three member countries of NAPPO were coordinating national activities but there was no regional forum available at present. A proposal on NAPPO's possible role as a coordinating body for North America would be considered by the NAPPO Executive Committee in October, 2004.

12. Dispute settlement

64 NAPPO presented a draft document on Dispute Settlement which was proposed for application in its region. Despite the development of many international and regional standards, there remained frustrations in both the public and private sectors in North America that the standards were not being adhered to. A number of bilateral irritants had gone on for several years. Those issues for the most part had reached a standstill. Bilateral discussions may have broken down and the disputing parties may have been reluctant to initiate a formal dispute settlement process under the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Committee of the North American Free Trade Agreement or the WTO.

65 NAPPO had drafted a mechanism to involve an independent expert who could study the issue and provide timely recommendations as to how to resolve it.

66 COSAVE provided a handout describing the dispute settlement mechanism which was established in its region in 1992. A dispute arose in 1999 and the mechanism was applied, although the dispute was never resolved. It was considered a negative experience and COSAVE had not used the mechanism since.

13. Involvement of RPPOs in regional workshops on draft ISPMs

67 The PPPO informed the TC that a workshop on draft ISPMs had been organized in August 2004 and that the workshop had been very successful. The IAPSC representative had also attended two workshops on draft ISPMs in Africa.

68 COSAVE advised that for the past two years, it had not received a timely invitation to participate in the workshop on draft ISPMs. It was recommended to the ICPM that the IPPC Secretariat directly invite the RPPOs to attend workshops in their region in order to ensure that the invitations reached the proper authorities on a timely basis.

14. Other business

69 The RPPOs briefly exchanged general comments on draft ISPMs sent for country consultation. Not all RPPOs had yet consulted with their NPPOs on this topic.

70 The work programme for the TC in 2004/2005 and recommendations from the TC to the ICPM, arising from the above discussions, are compiled in Appendices IV and V.

15. Next year's meeting venue

71 It was agreed that COSAVE would host the 17th TC in Brazil (Sao Paulo State) on 29 August-2 September 2005. The organizing committee would be composed of COSAVE, the PPPO and NAPPO. The organizing committee for the 17th TC would meet on an ad hoc basis at the time of the 2005 ICPM meeting in Rome.

16. Closure of the Technical Consultation

72 The Chairperson thanked the staff of KEPHIS and the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council for their willingness to host the 16th TC, the excellent administrative and logistical arrangements and the fine hospitality. He thanked all of the participants for their efforts and wished everyone a safe trip home.

APPENDIX I

AGENDA

1. Opening of the Consultation
2. Election of the Chairperson and Rapporteurs
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Actions arising from the Fifteenth Technical Consultation
5. Coordinated activities
6. Discussion papers
7. Other business
8. Venue and date of the Sixteenth Technical Consultation
9. Closure

APPENDIX II

RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF RPPOS IN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE ICPM

This list is presented recognizing the following points:

- None of the following recommendations limit the rights or obligations of members or affect the role of RPPOs.
- This list is not a comprehensive list of the activities that RPPOs may undertake.
- Collaboration or information exchange between RPPOs and the IPPC does not substitute for the obligations of contracting parties under the IPPC.

The Focus Group recommends that areas of cooperation between RPPOs and the IPPC, in accordance with article IX 3 of the New Revised Text of the IPPC, include the following:

Standard setting process

- participation in the development of standards (such as providing comments in the consultation phase, identifying topics for standards, etc.)
- identification of regional standards that could be proposed as ISPMs
- nomination of experts for IPPC expert working groups and technical panels
- action as collaborators/hosts for standard setting meetings
- preparation of explanatory documents on ISPMs according to paragraph 111 of the Report of the Sixth Session of the ICPM
- as appropriate, provision of technical and administrative support to Standards Committee members in their region.

Information exchange

- operation of an effective International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP)
- assistance to member countries in meeting IPPC obligations in relation to information exchange
- provision of information on regional IPPC-related activities (such as pest interceptions, pest status, pest reports, regional standards, regulations, etc.)
- provision of translations of IPPC documents in languages other than the five official FAO languages.

Technical assistance

- involvement in regional workshops on draft ISPMs in their region (such as participation and logistical and technical support)*
- facilitation of the implementation of ISPMs and identification of implementation difficulties*
- report on implementation difficulties to the Technical Consultation among RPPOs and the IPPC*
- as appropriate, cooperation with the IPPC Secretariat in the delivery of technical assistance.

Dispute settlement

- assistance in obtaining nominations for expert rosters
- assistance, as appropriate, in the settlement of disputes (according to the report of ICPM-3, Appendix 11.L).

Funding issues

- assistance to the IPPC in obtaining funding to support its work plan.

[separate paragraph] Depending on the availability of funds, the IPPC Secretariat should fund the participation of the Secretaries from RPPOs that are FAO commissions for their participation in the annual TC among RPPOs.

APPENDIX III

**PRACTICAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE ORGANIZATION OF
TCS AMONG RPPOS**

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Timing: | TCs shall be held annually, well in advance of the meeting of the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (preferably at the end of August and beginning of September) |
| Location: | TCs shall be held at locations situated in the geographical areas of RPPOs or at the FAO headquarters in Rome. The TC shall decide each year on the location of the TC in the following year. |
| Structure of TCs: | Usually TCs shall consist of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a three day business meeting - a one or two day workshop on a subject specified by the host RPPO in consultation with the others. The workshop may include technical components and visits. |
| Organization: | A TC shall be organized by a group of three RPPOs. This organizing committee shall consist of the RPPO in which the TC shall take place and two RPPOs which have been appointed by the preceding TC. When the TC is held at the FAO headquarters, the organizing committee shall consist of the IPPC Secretariat and two RPPOs which have been appointed by the preceding TC. |
| Organizing Responsibilities: | The organizing committee of RPPOs should be responsible for the establishment of the agenda in consultation with other RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat. The organizing arrangements for a TC may be discussed between RPPOs at informal meetings during the ICPM. The IPPC Secretariat should organize in consultation with RPPOs the production of papers to be discussed and presented at the TC. The RPPO functioning as the host to the TC shall be responsible for the local arrangements of the TC, with assistance from other RPPOs if necessary. |
| Agenda: | The standard agenda of a TC should contain the components as identified by the 14 th TC among RPPOs. It should also contain administrative arrangements for the preparation of the next TC as well as topics identified by RPPOs as being of importance. The agenda shall be finalized and sent to the IPPC Secretariat no later than 12 weeks before the TC. The IPPC Secretariat shall convey an official invitation to the TC with the accompanying agenda no later than 10 weeks before the TC. |
| Meeting Documentation: | Papers (including a summary) and submissions to the TC should usually be provided four weeks before the TC to the IPPC Secretariat. They should be submitted by the IPPC Secretariat to RPPOs and the participants in the official IPPC format if possible, not later than two weeks before the TC takes place. |
| Reports: | At each TC the host RPPO shall appoint a rapporteur who shall be responsible for the production of the report. The report should be finalized by the host RPPO and sent to the IPPC Secretariat no later than four weeks after the TC. The IPPC Secretariat shall format the report into the official IPPC format and publish it on the IPP not later than eight weeks after the TC and subsequently submitted it in its entirety to the next ICPM. |

APPENDIX IV

**TC AMONG RPPOS
WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2004/2005**

1 Over the next year RPPOs will consult with their member countries to document difficulties with implementation of three ISPMs: ISPM No. 6 (*Guidelines for Surveillance*), ISPM No. 19 (*Guidelines on lists of regulated pests*) and ISPM No. 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*). These will be discussed at the 17th TC with comments and/or recommendations forwarded to the ICPM in 2006.

2 The TC recommended that explanatory documents be developed on two ISPMs for the 17th TC. The PPPO (New Zealand) agreed to prepare a draft explanatory document on the issue of export certification. This would involve ISPM No. 7 (*Export certification system*) and ISPM No. 12 (*Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*). EPPO agreed to present the draft explanatory document on Supplement No. 1 to ISPM No. 5 (*Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests*).

3 The TC agreed that regional cooperation on PRA activities could be of value and that RPPOs should consider, where appropriate, assisting countries in their region to develop capacity and share resources with each other to conduct PRAs.

4 The TC agreed that the general concept of accreditation be the subject of the symposium at the 17th TC.

5 The TC will consider subjects for future ISPMs in preparation for discussion at the 17th TC, with recommendations going forward to the ICPM in 2006.

6 The organizing committee for the 17th TC will meet on an ad hoc basis at the time of the 2005 ICPM meeting in Rome

APPENDIX V**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TC AMONG RPPOS TO THE ICPM**

1. The TC considered that as many RPPOs as possible should attend the TC and urged the IPPC Secretariat to facilitate the attendance of its two Commissions, the Caribbean Plant Protection Organization (in its present or future form) and the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission, at future TCs.

2. Recognizing the benefits of electronic certification but also acknowledging the resource problems associated with its implementation which could cause difficulties for many countries, the TC recommended that the IPPC should work jointly with CODEX and OIE on electronic certification in order to avoid overlap, save resources, enhance synergy and establish a harmonized system in the SPS area. In order to implement this recommendation, the TC further recommended that the ICPM establish a work programme including:

- Presentation of the electronic certification model to ICPM-7
- Contact CODEX and OIE to establish a common agenda on electronic certification, to be approved by ICPM.
- Identify potential resources to support the implementation of electronic certification.
- Include electronic certification in IPPC technical assistance programmes.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

COMITE DE SANIDAD VEGETAL DEL CONO SUR (COSAVE)

Ms Ana Maria PERALTA
 Technical Secretary
 Esplanada de Ministérios, Bloco "D" -Ed. Sede Sala 032
 70043 Brasilia
 BRAZIL
 Tel: +55-61-218.2982/2986
 Fax: +55-61-218.2980
 Email: anaperalta@agricultura.gov.br/ cosave@cosave.org

EUROPEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (EPPO)

Ms Françoise PETTER
 Assistant Director
 EPPO
 1 rue le Nôtre
 75016 Paris
 FRANCE
 Tel: +33 1 45 20 77 94
 Fax: +33 1 42 24 89 43
 Email: hq@epo.fr

INTER-AFRICAN PHYTOSANITARY COUNCIL (IAPSC)

Ms Sarah OLEMBO
 IAPSC Assistant Director
 B.P. 4170 Yaounde
 CAMEROON
 Tel +237 221969
 Fax: +237-221 1967
 Email: olembo-hapl@au-appo.org

Mr Chagema J. KEDERA
 Managing Director
 Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
 P.O. Box 49592
 00100 Nairobi
 KENYA
 Fax: +254 20 882265
 Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Mr Peter Olubayo AGBOADE
 Head, Nigeria Plant Quarantine Service (NPQS)
 P.M.B. 5672
 Moor Plantation
 Ibadan
 NIGERIA
 Fax +234 2 2313842
 Email: agboa@yahoo.co.uk

Ms Esther KIMANI
 Officer-In-Charge, Plant Quarantine Station
 Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
 P.O. Box 4942
 Nairobi
 KENYA
 Fax: +254-66 33565
 Email: pqs@nbnet.co.ke

Mr Michael HOLTZHAUSEN
 Manager
 Department of Agriculture
 South Africa Agricultural Food, Quarantine and
 Inspection Services
 Private Bag X258
 Pretoria 0001
 SOUTH AFRICA
 Tel: +27 12 3196100
 Fax: +27 12 3196350
 Email: mikeh@nda.agric.za

Mr Benson KURIA
 Plant Inspector
 Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
 P.O. Box 49592
 00100
 Nairobi
 KENYA
 Fax: +254-20-882265
 Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Ms Gladys MAINA
General Manager, Quality Assurance
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 49592
00100 Nairobi
KENYA
Fax: +254-20-882265
Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Ms Ann MIDECHA
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 49592
00100
Nairobi
KENYA
Fax: +254 20 882265
Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Mr Francis NANG'AYO
General Manager
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 49592
00100 Nairobi
KENYA
Fax: +254-20-882265
Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Ms Margaret NJUGUNA
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 49592
00100
Nairobi
KENYA
Fax: +254 20 882265
Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Ms Rachel NTOYAI
Plant Inspector
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 49592
00100
Nairobi
KENYA
Fax: +254-20-882265
Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Mr Wilson NYAKUNDI
Plant Inspector
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 19164
Nairobi
KENYA
Fax: +254 20 822110
Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Ms Osifodunrin OLUTOSIN
Assistant Director (Pre-Entry)
Nigeria Plant Quarantine Service
P.M.B. 12026
Lagos
NIGERIA
Email: tosajiks@yahoo.com

Ms Jane OMARORO
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 49592
00100
Nairobi
KENYA
Fax: +254 20 882265
Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Mr Kennedy ONCHURU
OiC, Plant Inspection Unit, JKIA
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 19164
00501 Nairobi
KENYA
Fax: +254 20 822110
Email: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Mr Arundel SAKALA
National Coordinator
Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Service
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
MT Makulu Res. Station
Private Bag 07
Chilanga
ZAMBIA
Tel: +260 1 2788141 / 278130
Fax: +260 1 278141
Email: pqpsmt@zamtel.zm/ nlccp@zamtel.zm

Ms Pumeza SKEPE
Plant Health Officer
SAAFQIS
Private Bag X258
Pretoria 0001
SOUTH AFRICA
Fax: +27 12 3196101
Email: pearls@nda.agric.za

Mr James WAHOME
Regional Manager, KEPHIS Mombasa Region
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)
P.O. Box 80126
Mombasa
Fax: +254-41 311233
Email: kephiscg@africanonline.co.ke

NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (NAPPO)

Mr Ian R. MCDONELL
 Executive Director - NAPPO
 Observatory Crescent, Bldg.3
 Ottawa, Ontario
 CANADA K1A 0C6
 Tel: +613 759 6132
 Fax: +613 759 6141
 Email: imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca

PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (PPPO)

Mr Sione FOLIAKI
 Chairman - PPPO
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Food
 Quarantine & Quality Management Division
 Hq, Vuna Road, P O Box 14
 Nuku'alofa
 TONGA
 Tel: +676 24257
 Fax: +676 24922
 Email: maf-qcmd@kalianet.to

Mr Richard IVESS
 Director, Plants Biosecurity
 Biosecurity Authority
 Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry
 PO Box 2526
 Wellington
 NEW ZEALAND
 Tel: +64 4 474 4127
 Fax: +64 4 498 9888
 Email: richard.ivess@maf.govt.nz

Mr Sidney SUMA
 Biosecurity Officer
 Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
 Private Mail Bag Service, SUVA
 FIJI ISLANDS
 Tel: +679 337 0733 / +679 337 9231
 Fax: +679 337 0021
 Email: sidneys@spc.int

Mr Ashley MUDFORD
 Programme manager - E-certification
 New Zealand Food Safety Authority
 PO Box 2835
 Wellington
 NEW ZEALAND
 Tel: +64 4 463 2500
 Fax: +64 4 463 2643
 Email: ashley.mudford@nzfsa.govt.nz

INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES (ICPM)

Mr Ralf LOPIAN
 ICPM Chairman
 Senior Advisor, International Affairs
 Food and Health Department
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 P O Box 30 (Mariankatu 23)
 FIN-00023 Government
 Helsinki
 FINLAND
 Tel. +358 9 1605 2449
 Fax. +358 9 1605 2443
 Email: ralf.lopian@mmm.fi

**INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION SECRETARIAT
 FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)**

Mr Jeffrey JONES
 Plant Quarantine Officer
 IPPC Secretariat
 Plant Production and Protection Division
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
 Nations (FAO)
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00100 Rome
 ITALY
 Tel: +39 06 5705 2040
 Fax: +39 06 5705 6347
 Email: jeffrey.jones@fao.org

Mr David NOWELL
 Agricultural Officer / Information Exchange
 IPPC Secretariat
 Plant Production and Protection Division
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
 Nations (FAO)
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 00100 Rome
 ITALY
 Tel. +39 06 5705 2034
 Fax. +39 06 5705 6347
 Email: dave.nowell@fao.org

OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS**CAB INTERNATIONAL**

Mr Dennis RANGI
Director
CABI Africa
P.O. Box 633
00621
Nairobi, Kenya
Fax: +254 2 524462
d.rangi@cabi.org

Mr George ODOUR
CABI
P.O. Box 633
00621
Nairobi, Kenya
Fax: +254 20 52 2150

Mr Roger DAY
Co-ordinator
CABI
P.O. Box 633
00621
Nairobi, Kenya
Fax: +254 20 52 2150
Email: r.day@cabi.org

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE

Mr Jackie HUGHES
Research for Development Council
IITA
c/o L.W. Lambourn Co.
26 Dingwall Rd, Croydon CR9 3EE
UK
Email: j.hughes-iita@cgiar.org

FRESH PRODUCE EXPORTERS ASSOCIATION OF KENYA

Mr Cosmas N. KYENGO
Agronomist
Fresh Produce Exporters Association of Kenya (FPEAK)
P.O. Box 40312
Nairobi, Kenya
Fax: +254-20 4451 489
info@fpeak.org

KENYA AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr Paddy W. LIKHAYO
Research Officer
Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI)
P.O. Box 14733
Nairobi, Westlands, Kenya
Email: cpp@africaonline.co.ke

PEST CONTROL PRODUCTS BOARD OF KENYA

Mr Wilson SONGA
Secretary
Pest Control Products Board (PCPB)
P.O. Box 13794
00800
Nairobi, Kenya
Fax: +254 20 4449072
Email: pepboard@todays.co.ke