

REPORT

**São Paulo,
Brazil
29 August-
2 September
2005**

Seventeenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

TC RPPO-2005/REPORT

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

São Paulo, Brazil, 29 August-2 September 2005

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
2005**

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 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report of the Seventeenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations ...	1
Appendix I	Agenda 9
Appendix II	Work programme of the TC for 2005-2006..... 11
Appendix III	Recommendations of the 17 th TC to the ICPM..... 13
Appendix IV	Participants list 15

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

SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL

29 AUGUST - 2 SEPTEMBER, 2005

Opening of the Seventeenth Technical Consultation

1. Mr Jeffrey Jones, International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat, in his opening address, expressed the gratitude of the Director General of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to the Government of Brazil for accepting the responsibility to host the 17th Technical Consultation (TC) among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs). He stressed the importance of RPPOs and of the Technical Consultations in promoting the objectives of the IPPC.

2. Mr Jones commented on the absence of Mr Ian Smith, Director-General of the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO), due to his imminent retirement, and suggested that the TC recognize his invaluable contribution to the development of global plant protection. He expressed the gratitude of the IPPC Secretariat and the RPPOs to the Comite de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) for organizing the meeting in accordance with the procedures agreed to during the 16th TC.

3. Mr Girabis Evangelista Ramos, Brazilian Plant Protection Director and COSAVE's President, welcomed the participants and expressed his pleasure in hosting the 17th TC. He described the main characteristics of Brazilian agriculture and discussed the activities to be undertaken during the week.

4. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply of Brazil, Dr Luis Carlos Guedes Pintos, expressed the pleasure of his country to coordinate and host the 17th TC. He analyzed the priorities of the Ministerio da Agricultura, Pecuaria e Abastecimento (MAPA), informing the participants that phytosanitary issues were considered by his ministry as being one of the more strategic issues. He gave the main statistics for agriculture in São Paulo State and particularly those for Araraquara, reaffirming the importance of citrus and sugarcane as the main crops in the area.

5. The Deputy Minister described the available areas in Brazil for agricultural purposes, the increase in productivity of currently cultivated areas, the participation of the agricultural sector in the trade activity of Brazil and its main export markets. As a result of the development of agriculture, MAPA had changed its structure at the beginning of this year, reinforcing the operational and regulatory areas of the plant protection services, as well as the coordination with agricultural secretariats at state level. He stated that MAPA was convinced of the importance of phytosanitary issues at the national and international level and recognized the responsibility of countries to internationally market safe products.

6. The Deputy Minister thanked the support received for the organization of the TC and acknowledged the presence of FAO, the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), RPPOs and National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) and declared the 17th TC among RPPOs open.

Election of Chairperson and Rapporteurs

7. Mr Girabis Evangelista Ramos, from Brazil, was elected Chairperson and Mr Odilson Ribeiro e Silva, also from Brazil, Vice-Chairperson and Moderator of the meeting. Mr Jeffrey Jones (IPPC-FAO) was elected Rapporteur.

Adoption of the agenda

8. The agenda was adopted (Appendix I).

Actions arising from the 16th Technical Consultation among RPPOs

9. The IPPC Secretariat reviewed the action points from the 16th Technical Consultation. It noted that explanatory documents for ISPMs No. 7 and No. 12, and for supplement No. 1 to ISPM No. 5 on official control, had been prepared for consideration by the TC. It commented on the adoption by the Seventh session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) of the role and functions of the RPPOs, the status of the recommendation on electronic certification and the IPPC programme of capacity-building in relation to the IPP.

10. The TC discussed at length the continued absence of representation from the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC) and the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) at Technical Consultations. It considered that funding was not the reason to their non-participation.

11. Recommendation

In view of the importance of the TCs, it was recommended that:

- 1. the IPPC Secretariat play a more active role in ensuring the participation of all RPPOs by communicating the importance of the TCs*
- 2. funding be secured for the participation of RPPOs that need financial assistance to attend the TCs*
- 3. the TC meeting should not overlap with other meetings of RPPOs.*

12. With respect to funding RPPO participation in the TCs, the Secretariat said it was unsustainable for RPPOs to depend solely on FAO funding and suggested that RPPOs explore funding from their member governments.

Report on Focus Group meetings

13. The Vice-Chairperson of the ICPM informed the TC of the results of the meetings of Focus Groups on the potential funding arrangements for the IPPC and on the international recognition of pest free areas. He reported that in regard to the funding arrangements, the analysis of the Focus Group had concentrated on similar funding models as those discussed in 2004. The Focus Group had not been able to propose new funding arrangements. With regard to the development of Terms of Reference for a working group on the IPPC recognition of pest free areas, the Vice-Chairperson reported that the work of the Focus Group had been very successful and that Terms of Reference had been developed which would be submitted to the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) at its meeting in October 2005.

Evaluation of the IPPC

14. The Vice-Chairperson of the ICPM referred to the evaluation (as directed by ICPM-7) of the IPPC and its structures. He said that the internal audit department of FAO had developed and sent draft Terms of Reference to official IPPC contact points for comment. He invited RPPOs to encourage their members to actively participate in this.

IPPC financial situation

15. With respect to the financial situation of the IPPC, the Vice-Chairperson of the ICPM reported that a 25% decrease in available funding could be anticipated for the IPPC for the next biennium, since the arrears funds which were available to the IPPC in 2004-2005 would no longer be available in 2006-2007. Since budget the proposals of FAO did not include an increase in the IPPC budget to compensate for the loss of the arrears funding, cuts in activities of the IPPC may have to be initiated.

16. **Recommendation**

The TC recommended that RPPOs encourage their member governments to support increased funding for the IPPC at the FAO Conference in November 2005.

17. The representative from the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) welcomed the information given by the Vice-Chairperson of the ICPM and said that it would be of benefit to the TC and RPPOs if the IPPC Secretariat were able to present short reports on developments within the IPPC work programme as these developed.

18. **Recommendation**

The TC recommended that the Secretariat keep RPPOs informed on important issues which could have possible implications for the work programme.

19. The IPPC Secretariat presented an overview of the status of the work programme activities following ICPM-7.

EPPO presentation on official control

20. EPPO presented a paper describing how official control was implemented in the countries of the European Union (EU). It explained that official control applied only to pests which were present but not widely distributed in the region, and commented that regulated non-quarantine pests (RNQPs) were not considered in the presentation since there was no list of RNQPs in EPPO.

21. EPPO explained the use of the plant passport as a phytosanitary document to facilitate the movement of plants for planting mainly between EU member countries, but also within a country. Additional measures were also in place for some regulated pests such as potato pests or fire blight (national regulatory control systems and protected zones). EPPO felt that most requirements for official control were fulfilled by the plant passport system.

22. Considerable discussion focused on issues that related to the reliability of the system, notification of non compliance, the concept and purpose of protected zones, the relationship between protected zones and pest free areas (PFAs), inspection and the use of authorized personnel, and the application of the concept of "widely distributed".

23. EPPO explained that the concept of protected zones predated the concept of PFA as defined by the IPPC. Protected zones were primarily established to protect a given area in an EU country from the introduction of a given pest in that area (through imports or internal movement from infested areas). In case of an incursion, the country concerned should establish an eradication programme in order to keep its protected zone status. The protected zone status could be maintained for a period of two years pending eradication. The situation would be reviewed after this period.

24. COSAVE noted the belief in some countries that the EU protected zones were equivalent to PFAs and that the difference should be made clear because of the implications for imports from the EU. EPPO explained that protected zones where no incursion existed were PFAs. The TC concluded that the document on official control presented by EPPO, even though prepared against the specific use of plant passports in the EU, could have relevance in other regions.

25. **Recommendation**

It was recommended that further elaboration of the EPPO document on official control be undertaken for use by other interested regions.

Analysis of explanatory documents produced by RPPOs (ISPM No. 7: *Export certification system* and ISPM No. 12: *Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*)

26. The TC discussed the paper and identified issues to be addressed. A small working group was appointed and concluded that, as the standards were self explanatory and the concept of re-export was currently being addressed and included in the agenda for next year, a revision of the standards could be undertaken rather than producing explanatory documents. The working group suggested issues to be considered in the revision which included clear accreditation procedures, the impact of the current definition of transit, the need to elaborate on phytosanitary security of consignments after certification, and the relevance and meaning of the term "practically free".

27. EPPO suggested that, for the next TC, each RPPO should prepare papers on the topic of accreditation and re-export.

28. ***Recommendation***

The TC recommended that RPPOs identify possible issues regarding ISPMs No. 7 and No. 12 for consideration at the next TC.

New/developing regional standards and other important activities by each RPPO

29. NAPPO reported on two regional phytosanitary standards being developed by NAPPO Panels on international movement of biological control agents and plants for planting. The activities of the NAPPO Panel on electronic phytosanitary certification were also briefly described and other interested RPPOs were invited to attend a NAPPO panel meeting on that subject.

30. Canada, Mexico and the United States had all been approached by commercial companies for requirements relating to transgenic arthropods, in particular for programmes on pink bollworm, Mediterranean fruit fly and codling moth. To address this need, work would begin in the near future on a standard on transgenic arthropods.

31. NAPPO had received its first requests for the application of the regional dispute settlement mechanism. One case had been settled very quickly with a regulatory change to address the complaining party's concern. The other case had gone to an independent arbiter.

32. The Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) reported on its activities regarding the harmonization of legislation and pest listing. It had proposed the development of a standard regarding the regulation of food aid which was a reality and problem for the region.

33. COSAVE reported that, as explained at previous TC meetings, it was involved not only in the production of regional standards but also in the production of position papers to support the participation of delegates and stewards from the region in expert working group (EWG) and technical panel meetings.

34. With this aim it had produced position papers on regionalization and on classification of commodities by risk category, and was also working on documents on the concept of "not widely distributed". Regarding the production of regional standards, the work was focused on the development of standards for regional pest listing and establishment of tolerances for RNQPs.

35. EPPO presented an overview of its standard setting and approval procedure. It reported on a series of standards, which was essentially the same as those reported in the previous TC, some of which would be submitted to the EPPO Council in September 2005. It reported on 17 diagnostic protocols which dealt with viruses, phytoplasma, chromists, insects and bacteria. EPPO had adopted 74 diagnostic protocols. It was noted that, as methods evolve, revision of the protocols would now be undertaken to ensure that they were kept up to date. A specific procedure for revision including a fast

track procedure had been established. EPPO indicated that the emphasis was now on the revision of approved protocols rather than on the creation of new protocols.

36. There was some discussion on the use of, or need for, ring testing. EPPO reported that 15 of its protocols had been ring-tested, as they had first been drafted in the framework of an EU-funded project (DIAGPRO).

37. The other EPPO standards presented for adoption in 2005 were: Sampling of consignments for visual phytosanitary inspection; Management of plant health risks associated with the use of biowaste of plant origin; Intentional importation of living organisms that are plant pests or potential plant pests; National regulatory control systems: *Diabrotica virgifera*; and Phytosanitary procedures on the requirements for the production of pathogen-free minitubers and microplants of potato (revision).

38. The EPPO standards which had been sent for country consultation were: Guideline for management and technical requirements for laboratories conducting pest diagnostics; Purpose of EPPO diagnostic protocols and Reporting and documentation of a diagnosis; one potato standard on Phytosanitary procedure for *Meloidogyne chitwoodii* and *M. fallax*: sampling of tubers for detection; Export certification and import compliance checking for potato tubers; Guidelines for intentional import of invasive alien plants or potentially invasive alien plants; and two certification schemes for *Sambucus*, and for *Populus* and *Salix*.

39. Draft EPPO standards on national regulatory control systems included *Bactrocera zonata*, potato cyst nematode, potato spindle viroid, *Synchytrium endobioticum*; and draft procedures for inspection of consignments (strawberry, cereal -grain and seeds, tomato seeds).

40. Electronic certification was on the agenda for 2006, and other RPPOs were welcomed to participate in the scheduled meeting.

41. EPPO presented an update on regional cooperation in PRA. It commented on decisions and recommendations made by heads of NPPOs regarding the future role of EPPO, which included:

- EPPO should play a major role in organizing internationally-conducted PRAs in the region;
- PRAs prepared through the EPPO system should include risk assessment as well as risk management options (NPPOs selecting options to be applied);
- PRAs should be done for a clearly defined area.

42. A detailed structure of the PRA process was outlined. It included Terms of Reference of the PRA panel, structure of the panel, expertise, timing of meetings, and selection of potential members.

Involvement in Regional Workshops on draft ISPMs and comments on draft ISPMs under consultation

43. COSAVE noted that it had not received an official invitation to the workshop on draft ISPMs held in Santiago in 2005 despite the fact that a role had been identified for RPPOs in this activity. There had been much discussion on the status of comments arising from regional workshops versus the status of national comments on draft standards.

44. The Vice-Chairperson of the ICPM clarified the issue, stating that the responses from the NPPOs were considered official and had to be taken into consideration by the Standards Committee, whereas the regional comments were unofficial comments which may be considered. He reported that countries were encouraged to send their comments as NPPOs.

45. It was felt that the regional consultations provided a learning experience for NPPOs and that it could assist NPPOs in preparing their own national responses. Time should be allowed for translation or incorporation of regional comments into national submissions.

46. COSAVE felt that a very clear message should be sent to countries informing them of the unofficial status of the regional comments to discourage reliance on such a regional mechanism as the official medium through which they could submit comments. IAPSC agreed and indicated that many countries in its region do not comment as NPPOs but considered the regional submissions as official.

47. **Recommendation**

The TC recommended that the IPPC and RPPOs should further encourage their members to send their individual comments on draft ISPMs and that a clear statement should inform NPPOs of the non official status of documents produced during the regional workshops on draft ISPMs.

Implementation of the role and functions of RPPOs approved at ICPM-7

48. Each RPPO reported on its activities with respect to the implementation of the role and functions of RPPOs approved at ICPM-7. It was concluded that in general the RPPOs were implementing these recommendations.

Identification of ISPMs implementation problems

49. The TC discussed implementation problems regarding the application of ISPMs and concluded as follows:

- ISPM No. 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*) - The implementation of this standard was in many instances constrained by inadequate human, financial and technical resources.
- ISPM No. 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*) - Most regions were active in the implementation of this standard and projected that by 2006 all countries could be fully implementing it.
- ISPM No. 19 (*Guidelines on lists of regulated pests*) - This standard was being implemented in many regions/countries. Problems faced included technical support for pest diagnoses and resources.
- ISPM No. 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*) - This standard was generally not being implemented. This was either because of:
 - difficulties in the application of the concept
 - lack of interest by NPPOs
 - absence of certification programmes which could form the basis of import requirements
 - difficulties in establishing tolerance levels.

Identification of items for next ICPM

50. COSAVE informed participants of concerns raised by its member countries which it intended to raise at the ICPM-8.

Production of technical papers for the work of expert working groups on priorities for ISPMs approved at ICPM-7

51. The TC considered the list of priorities for standard development approved at ICPM-7. COSAVE queried as to whether any background documents had been prepared by the Secretariat for these. NAPPO commented that a number of NAPPO standards could be used, e.g. *PFA for fruit flies* and *Plants for planting*. EPPO reported that the EPPO standard on the management of plant health risks associated with the use of biowaste of plant origin could be useful for the preparation of the standard on organic fertilizers.

52. The Vice-Chairperson of the ICPM pointed out that not all standards have had background documents prepared and in the past this had often been the case. COSAVE still felt the need for background documents and suggested that RPPOs could assist with the development of these. The

other RPPOs felt that the issue was not of major importance and suggested that COSAVE and the Secretariat could liaise on the topic.

Elaboration of a background document on the use of "should", "shall", "must" and "may" in ISPMs

53. The TC reviewed and discussed a paper, prepared by the IPPC Secretariat with input from FAO legal counsel, which analyzed the obligation associated with different terms currently used in ISPMs, i.e. may, should, shall and must.

54. It was proposed that in the future there be no limitation to the use of the words “shall” and “must” as long as their use was consistent with the text of the Convention (i.e. when it was technically justified and where technical requirements were mandatory, such as “recipes” or when observing the IPPC text). In future ISPMs, the word “should” in English should be interpreted to mean a type of moral or political commitment. It would create the expectation, though non-binding, that something would be done. It was agreed that currently adopted standards would be modified, if required, as they came up for revision.

55. The TC expressed its gratitude to the IPPC Secretariat for providing such a thorough analysis.

56. Recommendation

The TC recommended, in accordance with the advice expressed by FAO legal counsel, that:

- *in future ISPMs, the word “should” in English be interpreted to mean a type of moral or political commitment. It creates an expectation (though non-binding) that something will be done.*
- *taking into account the above-noted interpretation of the term "should" as a type of moral or political commitment, for the purposes of ISPMs the term should be translated in French by "devrait" and in Spanish by "deberia".*
- *for future ISPMs there would be no limit on the use of "shall" and "must" as long as their use was justified and was within the framework of the Convention and the legal status of the standards.*

57. The TC requested the Secretariat to modify the document accordingly for presentation to the SPTA.

Document on organization of reference laboratories

58. The TC discussed the value of reference laboratories but conceded that a background document could not be elaborated in the TC. It was recommended that a symposium on this subject be organized for the next TC.

59. Recommendation

The TC agreed to hold a symposium on reference laboratories at the next TC and that the symposium address four distinct areas:

- *the rationale for reference laboratories*
- *technical requirements and capabilities of the reference laboratories*
- *organizational structure*
- *analysis of the economic viability.*

Workshop on accreditation

60. New Zealand, NAPPO, EPPO, IAPSC and COSAVE presented their experiences with accreditation. Ms. Veronica Herrera (Biosecurity-New Zealand) explained the new structure approved in her country and the accreditation process for laboratories and inspectors currently in place.

61. NAPPO presented the Authorized Certification Official (ACO) accreditation system for inspectors who sign phytosanitary certificates, the NAPPO laboratory accreditation standard and the specific case of laboratory accreditation for potato pest diagnosis.

62. EPPO presented a draft standard on quality management and technical requirements for laboratories including elements to be taken into account for a quality system and for accreditation based on ISO/IEC 17025:2005 (*General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories*).

63. The IAPSC explained the particularities of the accreditation system of some of its member countries and future actions on the issue. COSAVE explained the evolution of its regional accreditation system and presented the case of current procedures for accreditation of laboratories and inspectors in Brazil.

64. Some differences were identified between presentations regarding:

- interpretation of the term accreditation
- objectives of the accreditation
- accreditation body and types of accreditation
- audit frequency
- quality assurance system in place
- duration of accreditation period.

65. Questions were posed by some RPPOs about the interpretation between Article V.2a of the IPPC and the processes of inspector accreditation to sign phytosanitary certificates, but most RPPOs did not have a problem with the implementation of this article.

66. **Recommendation**

The TC recommended that:

- *the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols should consider including the issue of accreditation and quality management in its work programme;*
- *FAO Legal office give an interpretation of the concepts included in Article V.2a of the Convention for the next TC.*

Other business

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

Next year's meeting venue

68. It was agreed that the IPPC Secretariat would host the 18th TC in Rome, Italy, during the period 4-8 September 2006. The organizing committee would be composed of EPPO, NAPPO and the IPPC Secretariat and would meet during the 2006 ICPM meeting in Rome.

Closure of the Technical Consultation

69. The Chairperson thanked the staff of COSAVE for the excellent administrative and logistical arrangements and the fine hospitality. He thanked all the participants for their efforts and wished everyone a safe trip home.

APPENDIX I

AGENDA

Date/Time	Activity
30/08 – 08:30 – 10:45	Registration and Opening ceremony: Speeches from authorities: MAPA Minister, SFA/SP Superintendent, São Paulo State Secretary of Agriculture, COSAVE President; FAO, IICA, Fundecitrus and ANFFA Representatives
30/08 – 10:45 – 12:30	- Election of Chair Person, Vice Chair and Rapporteurs - Adoption of the Agenda - Actions arising from the 16 th Consultation and VII ICPM
30/08 – 12:30 – 14:00	Lunch
30/08 – 14:00 – 16:00	Technical Session 1: - Presentation of the document on official control produced by EPPO
30/08 – 16:00 – 18:00	Technical Session 2: - Analysis of Explanatory documents produced by RPPOs (Export certification System and Phytosanitary certificates)
31/08 – 8:30 – 10:45	Technical Session 3: - New/developing regional standards and other important activities by each RPPO (Plants for Planting, Clean stock programs) - Involvement in Regional Workshops on draft ISPMs and comments to ISPMs under public consultation - Implementation of the Role and functions of RPPOs approved in the VII ICPM
31/08 – 10:45 – 12:30	Technical Session 4: - Identification of ISPMs implementation problems (ISPM 15, ISPM # 6: <i>Guidelines for Surveillance</i> , ISPM # 19: <i>Guidelines on lists of regulated pests</i> and ISPM # 21: <i>Pest risk analysis for regulated non quarantine pests.</i>) - Identification of items for next ICPM - Production of technical papers for the work of EWGs on priorities for ISPMs approved in ICPM VII
31/08 – 12:30 – 14:00	Lunch
31/08 – 14:00 – 16:00	Technical Session 5: - Elaboration of a background document on the use of should, shall, must and may. - Elaboration of a background document on Organization of Reference Laboratories.
31/08 – 16:00 – 18:00	Technical Session 6 - Coordinated Activities - Other Business - Venue and Date of 18 th TC
01/09 – 08:30 – 12:30	Workshop on Accreditation
01/09 – 12:30 – 14:00	Lunch
01/09 – 14:00 – 16:00	Report of the meeting
01/09 – 16:00 – 18:00	Visit to Fundecitrus facilities
02/09 – 08:30 – 12:30	Field visit: Citrus Canker and Greening Eradication and Control
02/09 – 12:30 – 14:00	Lunch offered by Fundecitrus
02/09 – 14:00 – 18:00	Visit to the “Centro de Citricultura Sílvio Moreira Cordeirópolis/SP”
02/09 – 19:30 – 22:00	Closing of the meeting

APPENDIX II

**WORK PROGRAMME OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION
AMONG RPPOS FOR 2005/2006**

	Activity	Responsible body
1	Elaboration of explanatory doc. prepared by EPPO on ISPM No. 5-Supplement No. 1: Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests (<i>paragraph 25</i>)	EPPO
2	Identification of possible issues regarding ISPMs No. 12 and No. 7 to be looked at during the next TC (<i>paragraph 28</i>)	All RPPOs
3	Preparation of papers for a symposium on reference laboratories (<i>paragraph 58</i>)	All RPPOs
4	Legal interpretation of Article V.2a of the IPPC (<i>paragraph 65</i>)	IPPC Secretariat
5	Organization of the 18 th TC (<i>paragraph 68</i>)	NAPPO, EPPO IPPC Secretariat

APPENDIX III

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOs**Actions arising from the 16th Technical Consultation among RPPOs**

In view of the importance of the TCs, it was recommended that:

1. the IPPC Secretariat play a more active role in ensuring the participation of all RPPOs by communicating the importance of the TCs
2. funding be secured for the participation of RPPOs that need financial assistance to attend the TCs
3. the TC meeting should not overlap with other meetings of RPPOs.

IPPC financial situation

The TC recommended that RPPOs encourage their member governments to support increased funding for the IPPC at the FAO Conference in November 2005.

Secretariat communication

The TC recommended that the Secretariat keep RPPOs informed on important issues which could have possible implications for the work programme.

EPPO presentation on official control

It was recommended that further elaboration of the EPPO document on official control be undertaken for use by other interested regions.

Analysis of explanatory documents produced by RPPOs (ISPM No. 7: *Export certification system* and ISPM No. 12: *Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*)

The TC recommended that RPPOs identify possible issues regarding ISPM No. 7 and No. 12 for consideration at the next TC.

Involvement in Regional Workshops on draft ISPMs and comments to ISPMs under public consultation

The TC recommended that the IPPC and RPPOs should further encourage their members to send their individual comments on draft ISPMs and that a clear statement should inform NPPOs of the non official status of documents produced during the regional workshops on draft ISPMs.

Elaboration of a background document on the use of "should", "shall", "must" and "may" in ISPMs

The TC recommended, in accordance with the advice expressed by FAO legal counsel, that:

- in future ISPMs, the word "should" in English be interpreted to mean a type of moral or political commitment. It creates an expectation (though non-binding) that something will be done.
- taking into account the above-noted interpretation of the term "should" as a type of moral or political commitment, for the purposes of ISPMs the term should be translated in French by "devrait" and in Spanish by "deberia".
- for future ISPMs there would be no limit on the use of "shall" and "must" as long as their use was justified and was within the framework of the Convention and the legal status of the standards.

Document on organization of reference laboratories

The TC agreed to hold a symposium on reference laboratories at the next TC and that the symposium address four distinct areas:

- the rationale for reference laboratories
- technical requirements and capabilities of the reference laboratories
- organizational structure
- analysis of the economic viability.

Workshop on accreditation

The TC recommended that:

- the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols should consider including the issue of accreditation and quality management in its work programme;
- FAO Legal office give an interpretation of the concepts included in Article V.2a of the Convention for the next TC.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

COMITE DE SANIDAD VEGETAL DEL CONO SUR (COSAVE)

Mr Girabis E. RAMOS
 Director, Plant Protection Department and
 COSAVE President
 Esplanada de Ministérios, Bloco "D" –Anexo B -
 Sala 304
 70043-900 Brasilia, DF
 BRAZIL
 Tel: +55-61-3218.2172/3218-2675/3322-3250
 Fax: +55-61-3224-3874
 E-mail: girabis@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Eduardo COSENZO
 Plant Protection Department
 Direction Nacional de Protección Vegetal -
 SENASA
 Paseo Colón 367 – 7° Piso
 Buenos Aires
 ARGENTINA
 Tel: + 5411 43316041/49
 Fax: + 5411 43316041
 E-mail: ecosenzo@senasa.org.ar

Ms Ana Maria PERALTA
 Coordination Secretary
 Esplanada de Ministérios, Bloco "D" -Ed. Sede
 Sala 032
 70043-900 Brasilia – DF
 BRAZIL
 Tel: +55-61-218.2982/2986
 Fax: +55-61-218.2980
 E-mail: anaperalta@agricultura.gov.br ;
 cosave@cosave.org

Mr Ernesto GALLIANI
 Director, Plant Protection Department
 Direccion de Proteccion Vegetal
 Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal y
 de Semillas – SENAVER
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganaderia
 Ruta Mcal. Estigarribia Km 10,5
 San Lorenzo, Paraguay
 Tel: +595 21 570513
 Fax: + 595 21 574343/570404
 E-mail: dpv_senave@telesurf.com.py;
 dpv_senave@yahoo.com

Mr Marcos Paulo G. ROSA
 Consultant
 Esplanada de Ministérios, Bloco "D" -Ed. Sede
 Sala 032
 70043 Brasilia-DF
 BRAZIL
 Tel: +55-61-218.2982/2986
 Fax: +55-61-218.2980
 E-mail: marcospaulo@agricultura.gov.br;
 cosave@cosave.org

Mr Humberto ALMIRATI
 Director General, Plant Protection Department
 Direccion General de Servicios Agrícolas
 Ministerio de Ganaderia, Agricultura y Pesca
 Av. Millan 4703
 Montevideú
 URUGUAY
 Tel: +5982 3092219
 Fax: +5982 3092074
 E-mail: almirati@mgap.gub.uy

Mr Orlando MORALES
 Director, Plant Protection Department
 Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero
 Av. Bulnes 140
 Santiago
 CHILE
 Tel: + 562 3451200
 Fax: +562 3451203
 E-mail: orlando.morales@sag.cl

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
 E-mail: hq@eppo.fr

AFRICAN UNION/INTER-AFRICAN PHYTOSANITARY COUNCIL (IAPSC)

Ms Sarah OLEMBO
IAPSC Assistant Director
B.P. 4170 Yaounde
CAMEROON
Tel +237 221969
Fax: +237-221 1967
E-mail: ahono_olembo@yahoo.com

ORGANISMO INTERNACIONAL REGIONAL DE SANIDAD AGROPECUARIA (OIRSA)

Mr Raúl RODAS
Agrisanitary Officer
Col. Las Lomas del Guijarro
Calle Alfonso XIII, # 3735
P.O.Box 3369
Tegucigalpa
HONDURAS
Tel +504 2390316
Fax: +504 2399315
E-mail: rrodas@oirsa.org.hn

NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (NAPPO)

Mr Ian R. MCDONELL
Executive Director - NAPPO
1431 Merivale Road, 3rd. Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
CANADA K1A 0Y9
Tel: +613 2282535
Fax: +613 2282540
E-mail: imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca

PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (PPPO)

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
E-mail: sidneys@spc.int

Ms Veronica HERRERA
Ministry of Agriculture & Forestry
PO Box 2526
Wellington
NEW ZEALAND
Tel: +64 4 4702767
Fax: +64 4 498 9888
E-mail: veronica.herrera@maf.govt.nz

INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES (ICPM)

Mr Ralf LOPIAN (ICPM Vice- Chairperson)
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
E-mail: 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
E-mail: jeffrey.jones@fao.org

Mr Allan J. HRUSKA
Oficial de Proteccion
FAO - Oficina Regional para América Latina y el
Caribe
Dag Hammarskjöld 3241, Vitacura
P.O. Box 10095 Santiago
CHILE
Tel: +562 3372237
Fax: +562 3372101
E-mail: Allan.Hruska@fao.org

Mr Richard IVESS
Coordinator, 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 34 08561580
Fax: +39 06 5705 6347
E-mail: richard.ivess@fao.org

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE (IICA)

Mr Juan Carlos BRESCIANI
Representacion en Brasil
SHIS QI 3 Lote A Bloco F
Centro Empresarial Terracotta
71605-450 Brasilia, DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +5561 21065426
Fax: +5561 21065429
E-mail: juan.bresciani@iica.int

Mr Victor Arrúa MAIDANA
South Regional Specialist, Agricultural Health and
Food Safety
Bernardo de Irigoyen 88 St. Floor 5°
(C1072AAB) Buenos Aires
ARGENTINA
Tel: +5411 43348282/43451210
Fax: +5411 43451208
E-mail: varrua@iica.org.ar

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, LIVESTOCK AND FOOD SUPPLY / BRAZIL

Mr Odilson RIBEIRO E SILVA
Secretariat of Agribusiness International Relations
Department of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Matters
Esplanada dos Ministerios - Bloco D – Ed. Sede –
Sala 352
70043-900 Brasilia – DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +5561 32182308/32182731
Fax: +5561 32254738
E-mail: odilson@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Patricia de Freitas LIMA
Plant Protection Department
Coordenação de Fiscalização do Trânsito Vegetal
Esplanada dos Ministerios - Bloco D – Anexo B –
Sala 308
70043-900 Brasilia – DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +5561 32182694
Fax: +5561 32243874
E-mail: patricialima@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Denize de Fátima BORGATTO
Secretariat of Agribusiness International Relations
Department of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Matters
Coordination of Phytosanitary Matters
Esplanada dos Ministerios - Bloco D – Ed. Sede –
Sala 347
70043-900 Brasilia – DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +5561 32182834
Fax: +5561 32254738
E-mail: denize@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Dilson da Cunha COSTA
General Coordination of Laboratorial Support
Esplanada dos Ministerios - Bloco D – Anexo B –
Sala 428
70043-900 Brasilia – DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +5561 32182535
Fax: +5561 32255098
E-mail: dilsoncosta@agricultura.gov.br

Mr José Geraldo Baldini RIBEIRO
Plant Protection General Coordination
Esplanada dos Ministerios - Bloco D – Anexo B –
Sala 322
70043-900 Brasilia – DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +5561 32182700
Fax: +5561 32182667
E-mail: baldini@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Marilde Amaral VIEIRA
Plant Protection Department
Esplanada de Ministérios, Bloco "D" –Anexo B -
Sala 304
70043-900 Brasilia, DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +55-61-3218.2172/3218-2675/3322-3250
Fax: +55-61-3224-3874

Ms Milva Girón ROSA
Plant Protection Department
Esplanada de Ministérios, Bloco "D" –Anexo B -
Sala 304
70043-900 Brasilia, DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +55-61-32182716/3322-3250
Fax: +55-61-3224-3874

Ms Sandra Brasil SILVA
Plant Protection Department
Esplanada de Ministérios, Bloco "D" -Ed. Sede
Sala 032
70043 Brasilia-DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +55-61-218.2982/2986
Fax: +55-61-218.2980
E-mail: sgbsilva@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Alexandre Moreira PALMA
Plant Protection Department
Esplanada de Ministérios, Bloco "D" -Ed. Sede
Sala 032
70043 Brasilia-DF
BRAZIL
Tel: +55-61-218.2982/2986
Fax: +55-61-218.2980
E-mail: apalma@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Rosivaldo A. ILLIPRONTI JR.
Superintendência de Agricultura, Pecuária e
Abastecimento do Estado de São Paulo
Chefe do Serviço de Sanidade Agropecuária
Rua 13 de Maio 1558
01327-002 São Paulo-SP
BRAZIL
Tel/Fax: +5511 32846333
E-mail: illipronti@agricultura.gov.br