

***REPORT***

Rome,  
Italy,  
3-7 April  
2006

# **First Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures**



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



**CPM-1 (2006) / REPORT**

**Report of the**  
**First Session of the**  
**Commission on Phytosanitary Measures**

**Rome, 3-7 April 2006**



## CONTENTS

### Report of the First Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

<i>Appendix I</i>	Agenda
<i>Appendix II</i>	Rules of procedure of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
<i>Appendix III</i>	Terms of reference and rules of procedure for the Standards Committee
<i>Appendix IV</i>	Standards Committee: membership and potential replacements
<i>Appendix V</i>	Terms of reference and rules of procedure for the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement
<i>Appendix VI</i>	Membership of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement
<i>Appendix VII</i>	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: ISPM No. 1 (2006) <i>Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade</i>
<i>Appendix VIII</i>	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: ISPM No. 25 (2006) <i>Consignments in transit</i>
<i>Appendix IX</i>	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: ISPM No. 26 (2006) <i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>
<i>Appendix X</i>	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: ISPM No. 27 (2006) <i>Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests</i>
<i>Appendix XI</i>	Revision to the methyl bromide fumigation schedule of Annex I of ISPM No. 15
<i>Appendix XII</i>	IPPC standard setting work programme
<i>Appendix XIII</i>	Criteria for the formation, content and subsequent change of supplements, annexes and appendices in ISPMs
<i>Appendix XIV</i>	Composition of the core group of the Informal working group on strategic planning and technical assistance
<i>Appendix XV</i>	Examples of voluntary assessed contributions
<i>Appendix XVI</i>	Strategic plan
<i>Appendix XVII</i>	Terms of reference for the Working group on the feasibility of international recognition of pest free areas
<i>Appendix XVIII</i>	The role of IPPC contact points
<i>Appendix XIX</i>	Work plan for the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) for 2006
<i>Appendix XX</i>	List of delegates and observers



# **FIRST SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

**Rome, 3-7 April 2006**

## **REPORT**

### **1. OPENING OF THE SESSION**

1. The Secretary of the International Plant Protection Convention opened the meeting and announced that it would proceed under the general rules of FAO until the Rules of Procedures for the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) were adopted. Until a chairperson was elected, the Secretary would chair the meeting.

2. Ms Fresco (Assistant Director-General, FAO Agriculture, Biosecurity, Nutrition and Consumer Protection Department) officially welcomed the delegates on behalf of the Director-General of the FAO. She said that it was a very important occasion for the international phytosanitary community and FAO in general and was the outcome of a process of change that started with the negotiations held in the Uruguay Round. She noted that the IPPC was first adopted by the Conference of the FAO in 1951 and had since been revised in 1979 and 1997. These revisions had been necessary to keep the IPPC up to date with contemporary thinking and to allow it to maintain its role as a dynamic, international treaty covering all aspects of plant health. The most recent revision had included the important clarification that the Convention also covered the protection of forests, wild flora, habitats and ecosystems. She said that the 1997 revision was also necessary to deal with the new reality of the formation of World Trade Organisation (WTO), and the adoption of the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. The IPPC was recognised as the international phytosanitary standard setting body responsible for developing international standards which would ensure that phytosanitary measures were not used as unjustified barriers to trade.

3. Ms Fresco mentioned the challenges ahead of the Commission. She noted the pressure of international trade to reduce phytosanitary measures to increase the possibilities for export and import but that the same rapid expansion of international trade with its ever increasing range of combinations of products and countries increased the opportunity of new pests being introduced into new regions. She also mentioned the need to control all pathways whereby pests could enter a new region such as the rapidly expanding tourist trade, packaging materials, and used cars and machinery. Despite best efforts there were still major pests being introduced into new areas.

4. Ms Fresco acknowledged the work that had been undertaken by the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) and the major effort that had been made to ensure full participation by developing countries in the standard setting process. The roles and functions of the Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) in relation to the ICPM had been identified and they continued to play a very important part in the implementation of the Convention.

5. Mention was made of the very intensive work programme has been implemented during the previous two years. She said that this had been made possible, in that as well as the contributions from the European Community (EC) and the Canadian and New Zealand governments to the various IPPC trust funds, the FAO's allocation of approximately US\$ 3.5 million to the 2004-2005 IPPC budget from its regular programme was increased by a further allocation of nearly US\$ 2 million from a one-off arrears payment fund. This additional allocation had enabled activities to be undertaken that would not otherwise be possible. However the budget that the FAO's members approved for 2006-2007 did not compensate for inflation, with the consequence that during 2006-2007, US\$ 38.6 million has to be absorbed through efficiency savings and programme reductions. The amount allocated from the FAO Regular Programme for 2006 for the IPPC budget at US\$ 1.9 million was greater than last year but without the extra allocation from the arrears fund, there would have to be a greater reliance on contracting parties for extra-budgetary funding.

6. In conclusion, Ms Fresco emphasised the excellent foundation that had been laid through the work of the Interim Commission and strongly encouraged members to try to maintain the progress in the three major areas of standards setting, information exchange and technical assistance. She said that while the FAO recognized the significance of the IPPC as an international treaty, the CPM Members must take ownership of the Commission and as the beneficiaries, take responsibility for the ongoing strategic direction, size and associated funding of the programmes.

## **2. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON<sup>1</sup>**

7. The Secretariat noted that the Chairperson should be elected on a provisional basis, and that subsequently the election of the Chairperson would formally take place at the end of the session.

8. The CPM:

1. *Elected* Mr Kedera (Kenya) as Chairperson of CPM-1.

## **3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

9. The agenda<sup>2</sup> was adopted (Appendix I).

## **4. ADOPTION OF THE RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

10. The Secretariat introduced the draft rules of procedures for the CPM<sup>3</sup>, which were based on those developed for the ICPM.

11. Substantial discussion was held covering all rules but in particular those relating to Observers, Subsidiary Bodies and Expenses. With regard to Rule X, on development and adoption of international standards, it was suggested that the existing annex be updated by the Secretariat and presented to CPM-2.

12. The Rules of Procedures were adopted on a provisional basis. Amendments were submitted and adopted according to Rule XIII of the provisional Rules of Procedure.

13. Subsequently, the CPM:

1. *Adopted* the rules of procedure of the CPM as shown in Appendix II.
2. *Decided* that the annex on development and adoption of international standards should be updated and presented for approval at CPM-2.

## **5. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND APPOINTMENT OF RAPPORTEUR<sup>1</sup>**

14. The CPM:

1. *Elected* Ms Bast-Tjeerde (Canada) and Mr Lopian (Finland) as Vice-Chairpersons; and
2. *Elected* Mr Ashby (United Kingdom) as rapporteur.

## **5BIS. ELECTION OF A CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE**

15. The legal counsel explained that a Credentials Committee was needed in conformity with customary rules. It would be composed of 7 members, one per FAO region, as well as one of the CPM Vice-Chairpersons. The Committee would be assisted by the legal service in determining the validity of credentials.

---

<sup>1</sup> CPM 2006/INF/1

<sup>2</sup> CPM 2006/1/Rev.2

<sup>3</sup> CPM 2006/5



16. The CPM elected the Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Dominican Republic, Libya, Seychelles and USA as members of the Committee. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Mr Lopian) represented the Bureau. The Committee elected the Seychelles as its chair. The Credentials Committee established two lists: list A contained 110 members whose credentials were found valid. List B contained 4 parties which had submitted credentials not in the form required. The credentials committee recommended that credentials of both lists be accepted under the understanding that valid credentials for list B be submitted to the Director-General of FAO as soon as possible.

## 6. ISSUES RELATED TO ENTRY INTO FORCE

17. Three information papers were presented<sup>4,5</sup>. A list of ICPM decisions<sup>4</sup> was presented and it was noted that all decisions by the FAO Conference or the ICPM would continue to be valid until the CPM changed them. However, the Standards Committee (SC) and Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS) had been established as subsidiary bodies of the ICPM and the CPM now had to consider what subsidiary bodies it wanted to establish.

18. The CPM:

1. *Noted* that decisions taken by the FAO Conference and the ICPM were valid until the CPM decided otherwise.

### 6.1 Establishment of a Subsidiary Body for Standard Setting under the CPM<sup>6</sup>

19. The CPM decided to establish a subsidiary body for standards setting. It discussed the establishment, terms of reference and rules of procedure, and composition. The CPM supported the need for continuity of membership of the ICPM-SC. It also noted that the terms of membership would start anew with the creation of the CPM-SC. The CPM agreed to the use of languages for the CPM-SC as provided under agenda item 11.5.2.

20. The CPM:

1. *Established* a subsidiary body on standard setting and named it the 'Standards Committee';
2. *Adopted* terms of reference and rules of procedure as provided in Appendix III; and
3. *Confirmed* the membership and potential replacements of the subsidiary body on standard setting as provided in Appendix IV.

### 6.2 Establishment of a Subsidiary Body for Dispute Settlement under the CPM<sup>7</sup>

21. The CPM decided to establish a subsidiary body for dispute settlement. It discussed the establishment, terms of reference and rules of procedure, and composition. The CPM supported the need for continuity of membership with the ICPM-SBDS. It also noted that the period of membership would start anew. It agreed that qualifications for SBDS members, as agreed at ICPM-3 (Report of ICPM-3, 2001, Appendix XI, section D, paragraph 10, points a) to d), would be included in the terms of reference, and that the issue of languages be reconsidered at CPM-2.

22. The CPM:

1. *Established* a subsidiary body on dispute settlement and named it the 'Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement';
2. *Adopted* terms of reference and rules of procedure, as amended, as presented in Appendix V, and *agreed* that the issue of languages be reconsidered at CPM-2; and
3. *Confirmed* the membership of the subsidiary body on dispute settlement as given in Appendix VI.

---

<sup>4</sup> CPM 2006/INF/2

<sup>5</sup> CPM 2006/INF/5; CPM 2006/INF/15

<sup>6</sup> CPM 2006/3

<sup>7</sup> CPM 2006/4

## 7. REPORT BY THE INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES CHAIRPERSON

23. Mr Kedera presented the ICPM Chairperson's report<sup>8</sup>. He noted that with the entry into force of the revised text of the IPPC, a key issue for the future was the funding of IPPC activities. Activities have to be carried out, but arrears funding is no longer available. Long-term funding options are being considered, and the CPM would need to reach a conclusion on sustainable funding for the IPPC. Continued collaboration with other organizations was essential. He stressed that the IPPC and National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) have an important role to play at national and international levels, in agriculture, environment and trade, but to date had received little recognition. He called upon the Director-General of FAO, NPPOs and the IPPC to promote actively plant protection. Raising the profile of the IPPC would be the only way to obtain sufficient funding to carry out the mandated tasks, whilst providing sufficient resources to ensure participation of all countries.

## 8. REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT

24. The IPPC coordinator presented the report of the Secretariat for 2005<sup>9</sup>. Standard setting activities had increased in past years. This had resulted in a complex and extensive standard setting work programme which was currently under development with over 50 draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and diagnostic protocols under development.

25. In relation to information exchange, the Secretariat reported that a substantial outreach programme had been initiated to ensure contracting parties understood their information exchange obligations under the IPPC, and were able to utilize the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) to meet these obligations.

26. The updating of the nominated IPPC contact points continued to be problematic but there had been a substantial improvement in their accuracy in the past year. Contracting parties were urged to ensure IPPC contact points were updated regularly as this was the primary communication point under the IPPC for a contracting party.

27. In relation to dispute settlement, no request for assistance had been received in 2005.

28. Regarding technical assistance, the Secretariat was involved in many projects of FAO Technical Cooperation Programme which included phytosanitary components. A workshop for regional plant protection officers had been organized to increase their participation in capacity building. Seven regional workshops on draft ISPMs had been held with the participation of a large number of countries. Two international workshops had been held in 2005, one on plant health risk analysis and the other on the implementation of ISPM No. 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*).

29. The Secretariat continued to cooperate with other organizations. Some organizations were providing valuable help with the translation of ISPMs.

30. The IPPC work programme benefited from the financial contribution of Canada, New Zealand and the EC, and in-kind contributions by some other countries.

31. Several points were made in relation to standard setting that are addressed under other agenda items.

---

<sup>8</sup> CPM 2006/INF/4

<sup>9</sup> CPM 2006/23

32. The CPM:

1. *Expressed* its gratitude to countries and organizations that provided assistance and resources to the work programme; and
2. *Noted* the information provided by the Secretariat on the progress of the work programme since ICPM-7.

## 9. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS<sup>10</sup>

33. Ms Peralta (COSAVE) reported on the outcome of the 17<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Technical Consultation (TC) among RPPOs, which was held in São Paulo, Brazil, in 2005.

34. The absence of representatives of several RPPOs was noted and the TC had suggested that the IPPC Secretariat should endeavour to facilitate attendance of all RPPOs, especially those that were Commissions of FAO.

35. The issue of funding for the IPPC had been addressed and the TC had agreed that RPPOs should encourage their members to support increasing funding for the IPPC at FAO Conference.

36. The role of RPPOs in regional workshops on draft ISPMs had been discussed. The TC had requested that it be made clear in the invitations to the workshops that observations made during the meeting did not have the status of official country comments and that countries should be encouraged to submit official national country comments.

37. The TC had considered the issue of the use of the terms “should”, “shall”, “must” and “may” in ISPMs and had made recommendations to the CPM.

38. During the workshop on accreditation held during the meeting of the TC, the TC had a long discussion on the interpretation of accreditation in relation to Article V.2a of the IPPC. The TC had recommended that accreditation and quality control should be part of the work programme of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols, and that the FAO legal office give an interpretation of the concepts included in Article V.2a of the Convention for the next TC.

39. The TC had agreed to hold a symposium at the next TC, on the organization of reference laboratories. The next TC would take place in Rome, Italy, in September 2006.

40. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the report.

## 10. REPORT OF OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS

### 10.1 Report of the SPS<sup>11</sup>

41. The WTO representative provided a summary of the activities and decisions of the WTO-SPS Committee during 2005. She noted that a large part of the meetings was spent on issues related to trade concerns of countries. It was noted that only one concern over ISPM No. 15 was raised in 2005. ISPM No. 15 was also mentioned twice in 2005 under the procedure to monitor the use of international standards in the context of the difficulties faced by developing countries in achieving implementation of the ISPM in a timely manner.

---

<sup>10</sup> CPM 2006/INF/8

<sup>11</sup> CPM 2006/INF/13

42. The SPS Committee had discussed the recognition of pest free areas in formal and informal meetings in 2005, as well as in an enhanced informal workshop in January 2006. The two main concerns by countries were that without having a predictable mechanism for recognition of pest free areas, it was difficult to make investments to create these areas, and that duplication by the SPS Committee of efforts made by the IPPC and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) should be avoided.

43. It was noted that the WTO was the administrator of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF), which had approved several projects in relation to plant health.

44. The CPM:  
1. *Noted* the report.

### 10.2 Report of the Convention on Biological Diversity<sup>12</sup>

45. A representative of the CBD was unable to attend the CPM and the report was presented by the IPPC Secretariat.

46. The collaboration with the IPPC was highlighted, and the CPM was reminded of the Memorandum of Cooperation between the IPPC and CBD Secretariats and the decision at ICPM-7 regarding invasive alien species. The two Secretariats had developed a joint work plan and a meeting, which included members of both Bureaus, had taken place in October. Several areas of collaboration had been addressed, such as collaboration at a national level, addressing gaps in the international regulatory framework for invasive alien species, development of ISPMs on topics of mutual interest, capacity building, and information sharing. The Secretariats had agreed to meet again via teleconference in May 2006 to assess progress made on the work programme.

47. The IPPC Secretariat and Bureau had been represented at the CBD working group on gaps and inconsistencies in the international framework for invasive alien species. The Secretariat had also participated in several CBD meetings, including the third meeting of the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the 8<sup>th</sup> Conference of Parties to the CBD.

48. The CPM:  
1. *Noted* the report.

### 10.3 Interventions by other Organizations

49. The representative of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) introduced a paper outlining the activities of the Joint FAO-IAEA Division on Nuclear techniques in Food and Agriculture (the Joint Division) in relation to the phytosanitary application of irradiation<sup>13</sup>. Following approval of ISPM No. 18 (*Guidelines on irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) in 2003, the Joint Division had received an increased number of requests to support members states in issues related to irradiation as a quarantine treatment. There had notably been an increase in requests from countries trying to replace methyl bromide as a phytosanitary treatment. The Joint Division had recognized the need to increase capacity building in that area, and may be able to support the Secretariat with additional resources in the future. The IAEA also noted that the Joint Division had published fruit fly trapping guidelines as a result of an expert working group meeting, and would welcome the possibility to collaborate with the IPPC to update these guidelines under the framework of the IPPC Technical Panel on Fruit Flies (TPFF). The TPFF would decide if the trapping guidelines should be used as an appendix to various fruit fly ISPMs, or as the basis for developing an ISPM on trapping procedures.

---

<sup>12</sup> CPM 2006/INF/7

<sup>13</sup> CPM 2006/CRP/7

50. The representative of OIE indicated that the IPPC and OIE had a common purpose to minimize the international spread of pests and diseases. They were sister organizations under the WTO-SPS Agreement and co-signatories of the Doha declaration. The areas of work of the OIE, such as standard setting, collection and dissemination of disease information, along with capacity building, were similar to those of the IPPC. It was noted that the problems of the two organizations were similar: budgetary issues and participation of developing countries in development and implementation of standards. The IPPC and OIE were currently coordinating on certification, risk analysis, recognition of pest and disease free areas and meeting country demands for official recognition of pest and disease freedom. The OIE was currently implementing a tool similar to the PCE evaluation. He hoped that cooperation between OIE and the IPPC would continue.

51. The representative of the Environmental Investigation Agency encouraged contracting parties to reduce the use of methyl bromide.

## **11. STRATEGIC DIRECTION NO. 1: THE DEVELOPMENT, ADOPTION AND MONITORING OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES (ISPMs) (STANDARD SETTING)**

### **11.1 Report by the Chairperson of the ICPM Standards Committee**

52. The Chairperson of the ICPM-SC, presented the report of the activities of the SC in 2005<sup>14</sup>. The SC had met in April and November of 2005.

53. The April meeting had been the first meeting of the SC with 25 members, and nearly all FAO regions had been fully represented. Due to the large volume of work, the SC had had difficulty in completing its agenda, resulting in the postponement of some agenda items to the next meeting; the main activity had been the review of draft ISPMs. The SC had not split into subgroups.

54. Nine draft ISPMs and one draft annex to an ISPM had been considered. The SC had been able to approve five draft ISPMs and the draft annex for country consultation. The Chairperson noted that the proposed modification to the methyl bromide fumigation schedule in Annex 1 of ISPM No. 15, under the advice of the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine, had been assessed and had been approved to be the first document to go through the fast track standard setting procedure.

55. Draft ISPMs that had not been approved for country consultation included: the draft revision of ISPM No. 2, which had been sent back to an expert working group for further consideration; and the draft on the efficacy of phytosanitary measures, which had been put on hold pending further development of other ISPMs. It had been decided that two other draft ISPMs, on guidelines for formatting pest specific data sheets and commodity specific data sheets, were administrative in nature and should be incorporated into the *Administrative guidelines for the structure of standard setting documentation*.

56. The April SC meeting had also discussed possible improvements of the standard setting process, in particular through extending the time allowed for the development of concept ISPMs. However, due to lack of time, it had been decided to discuss the item further at the November meeting.

57. In November, both the SC working group (SC-7) and SC had met. The SC-7 had considered over 2300 country comments, which indicated the enormous interest in draft ISPMs.

58. The SC had approved four draft ISPMs and the revised methyl bromide fumigation schedule in Annex 1 of ISPM No. 15, for adoption by the CPM, but could not finalize its discussions on the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the submission and evaluation of phytosanitary treatments*. The

---

<sup>14</sup> CPM 2006/INF/6

Chairperson of the SC congratulated the SC-7 for its work in considering country comments and reviewing draft ISPMs.

59. In relation to the proposed modification to the fumigation schedule in Annex 1 to ISPM No. 15, the SC had recommended that wood packaging material, fumigated and marked under the treatment schedule previously approved in the standard, should be considered as validated with no need to be retreated with methyl bromide, re-marked or re-certified.

60. The SC had not had time to review the 16 draft specifications for ISPMs and had decided to finalize these by e-mail prior to making them available for country consultation. It also had not had time to review all administrative documents, such as those returned by ICPM-7, and that work had been postponed to the May 2006 meeting.

61. The Chairperson reported that the SC had discussed the last minute cancellations of participation by stewards and experts selected for expert working group meetings. It had been agreed that when stewards or experts indicated an interest in being involved with the development of an ISPM, they should make a firm commitment to participating.

62. The Chairperson noted that the SC had again performed very well although the working conditions had not always been conducive to the large workload that had been imposed on the SC, and he indicated the excellent cooperation between the Secretariat and SC members.

63. Some delegates thanked the SC Chairperson and SC members for the work accomplished, while some others suggested that the workload of the SC was too large and that ways of reducing it should be found.

64. The CPM:  
1. *Noted* the report.

## **11.2 Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures**

65. The Secretariat introduced four draft ISPMs for consideration by the CPM<sup>15</sup>, which consisted of three new standards (*Consignments in transit*, *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*, *Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) and the revision of ISPM No. 1 (*Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*). The Secretariat thanked countries that had sent written comments two weeks in advance of the meeting, which were made available to members. Some additional comments were also presented in plenary. Open-ended working groups were established to consider the draft ISPMs.

66. It was agreed that the text of the IPPC would be included in the next version of the book of standards.

### **11.2.1 Principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade**

67. The open-ended working group was chaired by Mr Lopian (Finland). Several Spanish-speaking delegates noted that the English version used both “should” and “shall” and that the translation did not render the difference. This would have to be adjusted at a later stage. A few comments on Spanish translation would also be considered. The steward for that ISPM had made a preliminary analysis of the comments and made proposals for modification of the text. In particular, the title was changed to *Principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*.

---

<sup>15</sup> CPM 2006/2

68. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* as ISPM No. 1 (2006), *Principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*, contained in Appendix VII.

#### **11.2.2 Consignments in transit**

69. Morocco noted that its comments had not been included among those presented to the CPM. The Secretariat indicated that comments provided by Morocco at the time of country consultation had arrived after the SC-7 meeting, and it had not been possible to consider them at that time. The CPM was reminded of the ICPM-6 decision that members should endeavour to provide comments to the Secretariat on the draft ISPMs for adoption at least 14 days prior to the CPM.

70. The open-ended working group was chaired by Ms Bast-Tjeerde (Canada). The steward for that ISPM had made a preliminary study of comments and made proposals for modification of the text. The open-ended working group adjusted the text based on comments submitted before the CPM and reviewed the Moroccan comments which had already been covered by modifications made by the SC in November 2005.

71. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* as an ISPM: *Consignments in transit*, contained in Appendix VIII.

#### **11.2.3 Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)**

72. A large number of comments had been submitted by countries in advance of the CPM. An informal working group chaired by Mr de Hoop (Netherlands), facilitated by the steward for that ISPM and composed of delegates with fruit fly expertise had reviewed the comments prior to the open-ended working group and had prepared a redraft of the text. The open-ended working group, chaired by Ms Bast-Tjeerde (Canada), was able to agree on all issues. The group thanked the members of the informal working group for dedicating the time and effort to finding solutions to the comments.

73. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* as an ISPM: *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)*, contained in Appendix IX.

#### **11.2.4 Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests**

74. The open-ended working group was chaired by Ms Bast-Tjeerde (Canada). The steward for that ISPM had made a preliminary study of comments received in advance of the meeting. The open-ended working group adjusted the text based on comments submitted prior to CPM (no further comment had been provided during the plenary).

75. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* as an ISPM: *Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests* contained in Appendix X.

### **11.3 Adoption of International Standards – Fast Track Process**

76. The Secretariat introduced the proposed modification to the methyl bromide fumigation schedule contained in Annex 1 of ISPM No. 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*)<sup>16</sup>. One country had sent comments in advance of the meeting. The steward for that ISPM had made a preliminary study of comments. No formal objections were received. An open-ended working group, chaired by Ms Bast-Tjeerde (Canada) considered the comments and added text to annex 1. Two members announced that they would submit to the Secretariat technical data that might lead to a further revision of the schedule, once these data were considered by the appropriate

---

<sup>16</sup> CPM 2006/7

technical groups. One member called upon members to gather technical data and to provide this to the Secretariat so that improvements could continue to be made to the schedule.

77. The CPM:

1. Adopted the proposed modification to the methyl bromide fumigation schedule contained in Annex 1 of ISPM No. 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*), contained in Appendix XI.

#### 11.4 Topics and Priorities for Standards

78. The Secretariat introduced a paper on topics and priorities for standards that outlined the topics on the IPPC standard setting work programme, the associated priorities and the stages of development. Proposed changes to the work programme were introduced<sup>17</sup>.

79. It noted that draft ISPMs had been developed for all topics for which the SC had approved specifications. In addition, draft specifications on most other topics had been sent for country consultation and were pending approval by the SC.

80. The Secretariat outlined the process for adding and developing topics on the work programme, reminding the CPM that the next call for submissions for topics and priorities would not be until 2007. The CPM was encouraged to consider long-term planning for the standard setting work programme.

81. Some members expressed concerns about the volume of the work programme. Several members suggested modifications and adjustments to the proposed work programme. The proposals were discussed and the work programme was amended. The topic of review of section 3.3 of ISPM No. 12 (*Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*) had been added to the work programme in 2005, but put on hold until the adoption of the ISPM on transit. As the latter ISPM had now been adopted, the topic could be merged with the new topic added by CPM-1 on the revision of ISPMs No. 7 and No. 12.

82. Several members also suggested information to be included in some specifications. These suggestions would be transmitted to the SC for consideration, and were as follows:

- the Technical Panel on Fruit Flies could consider combining some fruit fly ISPMs and could also consider cooperating with IAEA in developing trapping procedures for fruit flies.
- the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments could consider developing Annex 1 (Specific approved treatments) of ISPM No. 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) in cooperation with IAEA.

83. The representative of Japan made suggestions on ways to improve the efficiency of the SC. It suggested that administrative procedures should be reviewed by a working group and not by the SC. It also suggested to make the cycle for the establishment of ISPMs longer. There was a need to ensure that there was a real need for specific new ISPMs, given the limited human and financial resources available for the development of new standards. Japan also made a request for SC reports to be produced and distributed immediately after SC meetings. In addition, it suggested that the SC consider that the Technical Panel on Fruit Flies should strengthen its functions by increasing its membership.

84. The EC and its Member States noted that there was great concern about global emissions of methyl bromide and the need to protect the ozone-layer. There was also concern that containers with consumer goods moving in international trade still contained residues of methyl bromide at arrival at their destination as a result of the application of methyl bromide in loaded containers, which was not in accordance with ISPM No. 15 and with good technical practice. It expected that the forthcoming revision of ISPM No. 15 would address good technical practice and the application of alternatives to the use of methyl bromide.

---

<sup>17</sup> CPM 2006/8



85. The CPM:

1. *Endorsed* the addition of Technical Panel No. 5: Technical Panel for the Glossary, with a high priority. It requested the Standards Committee to report to CPM-3 on the functioning of this TP, for evaluation;
2. *Endorsed* the IPPC standard setting work programme as outlined in Appendix XII;
3. *Endorsed* the deletion from the standard setting work programme of the following topics: formatting/drafting of commodity specific ISPMs; formatting/drafting of pest specific ISPMs; import of organic fertilizers;
4. *Agreed* to submit nominations and curricula vitae of experts to the Secretariat, to participate in developing topics on the IPPC standard setting work programme; and
5. *Referred* to the Standards Committee some points made in relation to draft specifications.

## 11.5 Improvements in the Standard Setting Procedure

### 11.5.1 Use and Translation of the Terms “must”, “shall”, “should” and “may” in ISPMs<sup>18</sup>

86. The CPM discussed and modified the recommendations made both by the TC-RPPOs and the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA).

87. The CPM:

1. *Agreed* that a policy for the use of “must”, “shall”, “should” and “may” in standards should be implemented;
2. *Adopted* the following statement on the use of “should” in ISPMs: “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.”;
3. *Decided* that 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;
4. *Requested* the Secretariat to develop practical guidelines with examples for the use of the terms in ISPMs;
5. *Agreed* that the use of the present tense of verbs (without “should”, “shall”, “must” or “may”) should not be used in ISPMs to express a level of obligation;
6. *Agreed* that the decisions on use and translation would not apply to ISPMs for adoption at CPM-1 (i.e. those in document CPM 2006/2);
7. *Agreed* that the Spanish and French translations to be used consistently for ISPMs be:
  - for *should*: *debería* and *deberá*
  - for *shall*: verb in the future tense
  - for *must*: *debe* and *debe*
  - for *may*: *podrá* and *peut*;
8. *Agreed* that already adopted ISPMs be reviewed for the use of the terms “must”, “shall”, “should” and “may”, and for adjustment of their translations; and
9. *Requested* the Secretariat to undertake an analysis of the translation of “must”, “shall”, “should” and “may” in ISPMs in Arabic and Chinese, and *submit* a proposal to the CPM.

### 11.5.2 Analysis of the Costs of Standards Committee Meetings being held in Several Languages<sup>19</sup>

88. The CPM discussed the use of translation and interpretation for subsidiary bodies, based on figures provided by the Secretariat. The representatives of OIE and the Codex Alimentarius Commission explained that their approaches to translation and interpretation were also constrained by availability of funds. For OIE, official texts, standards and meeting reports were produced in three

---

<sup>18</sup> CPM 2006/17

<sup>19</sup> CPM 2006/12

languages. Five languages were used in the general session. Translation in other languages was done when outside funding was available, and interpretation for expert meetings provided when their membership required. For the Codex Alimentarius Commission, most adopted standards were being made available in the five languages of the Commission (which were both of FAO and the Health Assembly of the World Health Organization). While the Commission operated in five languages, usually three, minimum two, languages were used for subsidiary bodies. Costs of interpretation and translation for subsidiary bodies meetings within a host country were covered by the host country. In Codex meetings, non-official languages can be used only when interested countries provide funds for interpretation.

89. The following points were raised during the CPM discussion:
- the value of using the five FAO languages, and the right for countries to do so;
  - the need for a pragmatic approach linked to financial considerations;
  - the possibility of using English as the language for meetings, until the financial situation enabled the use of further languages;
  - the practical necessity to adopt an intermediate approach between the current situation and the interpretation/translation in all five languages, in view of the current budget situation;
  - the greater need for interpretation, rather than translation, due to the greater difficulty for non-English speaking experts to express themselves in English;
  - the importance of the language issue for the SC; and
  - the need to consider the use of languages as an investment towards ensuring better participation and better outputs.

90. The CPM decided that with the current financial difficulties experienced by the IPPC, SC members who received financial support for travel costs should only receive such for economy class. The CPM agreed that developing countries delegates could request financial assistance to attend sessions of the Commission or its subsidiary bodies as reflected in Rule XI of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM.

91. The CPM:
1. *Noted* the IPPC costs associated with the various translation and interpretation combinations for meetings of the Standards Committee;
  2. *Noted* that, although costs outside FAO may be substantially less, there were associated advantages and disadvantages;
  3. *Agreed* that members of the Standards Committee had the right to use any of the five official FAO languages;
  4. *Agreed* that the need to have interpretation into any specific FAO language should be expressed by a request of a Standards Committee member to the IPPC Secretariat;
    - in writing (with confirmation) and
    - no less than 90 days before the meeting of the Standards Committee; and
  5. *Agreed* that the IPPC Secretariat continue to explore opportunities for the translation of Standards Committee documents.

### **11.5.3 Criteria for the Formation of Supplements, Annexes and Appendices to International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures**

92. The criteria for the formation of supplements, annexes and appendices to ISPMs had been presented at ICPM-7 and had been sent back to the SC for further consideration. Comments from one country had been received. The CPM reviewed the resulting text<sup>20</sup>.

93. The CPM:
1. *Adopted* the *Criteria for the formation, content and subsequent change of supplements, annexes and appendices in ISPMs*, as amended (Appendix XIII).

---

<sup>20</sup> CPM 2006/INF/3

## 12. STRATEGIC DIRECTION NO. 5: THE MAINTENANCE OF AN EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK

### 12.1 Issues Related to Entry into Force

#### 12.1.1 Preparations for Entry into Force

94. This was considered under agenda item 6.

#### 12.1.2 Adjustments in Translation in the Authentic Languages of the Convention

95. The Secretariat presented the process proposed for the review of the authentic languages of the Convention to ensure concordance between versions<sup>21</sup>, as requested at ICPM-7. This process would follow the procedures set out in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and would take account of some of the work already done for some languages. It was also noted that the adjustments should be of a substantial nature, and not be stylistic only.

96. The Chinese delegation offered its assistance in work on this issue. It would create a group of experts to consider Chinese translations of the standards and would give details to the Secretariat in due course. Jordan noted the useful contribution of an Arabic-speaking visiting scientist in the IPPC Secretariat, sponsored by the US, in past activities related to Arabic translations. NAPPO offered its assistance, and that of its review group in Spanish-speaking countries, for the review of the Spanish version of the Convention.

97. The CPM:

1. *Requested* the Director General of FAO to initiate the process for review of authentic languages in the Convention, through appropriate translation services, taking into account recommendations from Glossary Working Group members on definitions in Article 2, information provided by the Chinese authorities, clarifications adopted for some Spanish terms and definitions, and other relevant background information on IPPC terminology;
2. *Noted* the process that would be followed based on Article 79 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, as outlined above; and
3. *Requested* the Secretariat to report to CPM-2 on the implementation of this process.

### 12.2 Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance

#### 12.2.1 Report of the Seventh Meeting of the ICPM Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance

98. The Chairperson of the 7<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SPTA presented the report of the meeting<sup>22</sup> and provided a brief summary of the major topics discussed, and referred to CPM agenda items under which each subject would be discussed in more detail.

99. The SPTA Chairperson emphasised that additional extra budgetary resources were essential to implement the anticipated CPM work programme, as the current FAO regular programme budget was not sufficient for this purpose. The SPTA had noted that resources available for 2006–2007 were considerably lower when compared to 2004–2005.

100. Due to budget constraints, the SPTA had recommended which activities would need to be put on hold or given a lower priority. The main priorities identified included core standard setting functions, three or four regional workshops on draft ISPMs, and the maintenance of the IPP as the

---

<sup>21</sup> CPM 2006/6

<sup>22</sup> CPM 2006/10

official website of the IPPC (with possibly regional workshops on its use subject to availability of resources). Technical assistance activities would in the future increasingly involve FAO regional plant protection officers related to the implementation of the IPPC.

101. The CPM:  
1. *Noted* the report.

#### **12.2.2 CPM Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance**

102. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde), presented a document on the establishment of a CPM body on strategic planning and technical assistance<sup>23</sup>. The ICPM-SPTA had discussed the benefits of an enlarged bureau, consisting of seven members (one from each FAO region, including the CPM Chairperson and two Vice-Chairpersons). She recalled that the SPTA had met on an annual basis since 2000, had remained an informal working group, and that ICPM-7 had adopted interim terms of reference to be in place until a final structure would be agreed.

103. The ICPM-SPTA had considered that the SPTA could continue to function under the CPM as an informal working group under the already adopted terms of reference. As an alternative, the CPM could formalize its approach to strategic planning and technical assistance and establish the SPTA as a formal working group.

104. A further option would be for the CPM to consider an enlarged Bureau, with one member per FAO region, which would carry out the functions allocated so far to the SPTA and Focus Groups. The enlarged Bureau would form the core group of a larger working group on strategic planning, technical assistance, administrative and procedural issues. An enlarged Bureau would improve consistency and wider consultation, and cost savings could be foreseen. The rules of procedure of the CPM would need to be amended to accommodate a larger Bureau, and the CPM would have to decide how this could be done, and how to operate in the interim.

105. The CPM decided the SPTA should be formalized in future and that an enlarged bureau would form the core group of the SPTA. The Chairpersons of subsidiary bodies would also be invited to the SPTA for discussions on relevant topics. The CPM considered the open-ended nature of the SPTA to be of great importance. It therefore also decided that the open-ended nature of the SPTA should be maintained to take advantage of contributions by interested members.

106. The CPM:
1. *Agreed* that the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance would meet in October 2006 under its current interim terms of reference and rules of procedure in order to develop terms of reference and rules of procedures for the formal SPTA and for the enlarged bureau, and to review the rules of procedure of the CPM to envisage amendments in relation to the enlarged bureau;
  2. *Agreed* that the SPTA would retain its open-ended nature; and
  3. *Agreed* to the composition of the core group of the SPTA as indicated in Appendix XIV.

---

<sup>23</sup> CPM 2006/11

## 12.3 Budget

### 12.3.1 Financial Report 2005

107. The Secretariat presented the financial report of the IPPC for 2005<sup>24</sup>. It noted that the figures were not final since the document had been written before the close of the FAO 2005 accounts, which took place at the end of March 2006. The report reflected funding from the FAO Regular Programme, FAO arrears funding, the Trust Fund for the IPPC, the EC Trust Fund, the STDF and the FAO Trust Fund PFL/INF/859. The Secretariat acknowledged the in-kind contributions made by many members and organizations during 2005, which were not reflected in the figures.

108. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the revenues and expenditures of the IPPC Secretariat for 2005.;
2. *Thanked* the European Community for its contribution to help facilitate developing country participation in the standard setting process;
3. *Thanked* the Standards and Trade Development Facility for its contribution to the workshop on ISPM No. 15 and the International Plant Health Risk Analysis workshop;
4. *Thanked* the Government of the United States of America for funding salaries for a visiting scientist; and
5. *Thanked* all the members and organizations that had made in-kind contributions.

### 12.3.2 Budget Plan 2006

109. The Secretariat introduced the 2006 budget plan for the IPPC<sup>25</sup>. Final budget figures for the regular programme were not available and would be finalised by FAO in May 2006.

110. The Secretariat alerted the CPM that several outputs planned for 2006 had started in 2005 and were therefore funded from the 2005 budget; but that the same level of outputs could not be expected in 2007. The budget figures were expected to be some US\$ 75,000 higher than those provided in the document. However, there would be an additional expense of US\$ 50,000 for the ongoing IPPC evaluation.

111. The Secretariat was reducing staff to make allowance for reduced funding. There was a significant decrease of resources available for funding regional workshops on draft ISPMs and for activities enabling countries to participate in information exchange through the IPP.

112. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the anticipated revenues and budgeted expenses for 2006;
2. *Noted* the reduction in outputs compared to 2005 due to a decrease in anticipated revenue from approximately US\$ 3.9 million for 2005 to approximately US\$ 2.3 million in 2006, as a result of the arrears funding having finished and of a reduction in funding provided by FAO;
3. *Noted* that as, a result of the arrears funding no longer being available and no additional contributions to the Trust Fund for the IPPC having been made, various activities planned for 2006 may not be undertaken; and
4. *Thanked* Canada, New Zealand and the European Community for their extra-budgetary contributions.

## 12.4 Trust Fund for the IPPC

### 12.4.1 Trust Fund for the IPPC - Financial Report 2005 for the Trust Fund for the IPPC

113. The Secretariat introduced the financial report for the trust fund for the IPPC for 2005<sup>26</sup>.

---

<sup>24</sup> CPM 2006/26

<sup>25</sup> CPM 2006/27

114. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the contributions to the Trust Fund for the IPPC;
2. *Accepted* the expenditures against the Trust Fund for the IPPC;
3. *Thanked* the Governments of Canada and New Zealand for their contributions to the Trust Fund for the IPPC; and
4. *Encouraged* contracting parties to contribute to the Trust Fund of the IPPC for the year 2006.

#### 12.4.2 Budget 2006 and 2007 for the Trust Fund for the IPPC

115. The Secretariat presented the budget for 2006 and 2007 for the Trust Fund for the IPPC<sup>27</sup>. Certain specific items were higher than the ratios suggested by ICPM-7, but these adjustments were based on specific needs due to the reduction of the IPPC budget in 2006-2007. The Secretariat alerted the CPM that, unless countries contributed to the Trust Fund, the available funds would be exhausted at the end of 2006.

116. Japan informed the CPM that it was in the process of negotiating with FAO to make extra-budgetary contributions available to facilitate the work programme of the CPM.

117. The Republic of Korea stated that it would provide funding to the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission to organize the regional workshop on draft ISPMs for Asia in 2006.

118. The CPM emphasized that adequate FAO regular programme funding was essential for the core activities of the IPPC in 2006-2007. It requested that the IPPC should be retained as a high priority in the Organization and that there be no reductions in real terms in the budget allocated from the FAO regular programme.

119. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the anticipated contributions to the Trust Fund for the IPPC for 2006;
2. *Agreed* to the proposed allocations of the Trust Fund for the IPPC to the various activities as shown in Table 1;
3. *Agreed* to the Secretariat being able to prepare budgets for approval with funds allocated on a priority (needs) basis;
4. *Encouraged* contracting parties to contribute to the Trust Fund for the IPPC;
5. *Thanked* the Governments of Canada and New Zealand for their contributions to the 2006 Trust Fund; and
6. *Thanked* the Governments of Japan and the Republic of Korea for considering extra-budgetary funding of some IPPC activities.

### 12.5 Two Stage Evaluation

#### 12.5.1 Evaluation of the IPPC and its Structures<sup>28</sup>

120. A representative of the FAO evaluation service gave details on the evaluation of the IPPC. She introduced the process, timetable and milestones, and noted that some preliminary findings and issues would be presented at CPM-2, with the objective of receiving feedback in order to see which additional issues should be addressed. She noted that the process was still at an early stage and that the final report was planned for June 2007.

121. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the process.

---

<sup>26</sup> CPM 2006/25

<sup>27</sup> CPM 2006/9

<sup>28</sup> CPM 2006/INF/14

### 12.5.2 Potential Funding Arrangements of the IPPC

122. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Mr Lopian) introduced a document on potential funding options<sup>29</sup>. He urged the CPM to examine these options and make recommendations in a careful manner. In 2005, a Focus Group had analysed different funding options and its findings were presented to the SPTA, which had considered the subject, particularly in light of the current budget shortfall. The SPTA had strongly recommended to the CPM the establishment of a voluntary assessed contribution system for funding the IPPC.

123. The CPM recognized that mandatory assessed contributions would result in additional obligations and would probably need an amendment of the IPPC. Members emphasized that such additional obligations should not be created.

124. Many members supported, in principle, the establishment of a voluntary assessed contribution scheme. Many others, however, objected, stressing reservations about using resources to investigate this further. It was noted that the IPPC was a core function of FAO and voluntary assessed contributions should not result in a reduction of FAO's contribution. The CPM considered that the IPPC should have high priority in FAO programme of work and budget, and encouraged its members to express such in the Governing Bodies of the Organization.

125. The CPM:

1. *Invited* contracting parties to support the IPPC by providing in-kind contributions, particularly through sponsorship of meetings;
2. *Invited* SPTA members to make a contribution to the next meeting of the SPTA as to how they could imagine a fee system for the IPPC;
3. *Recommended* that an FAO legal analysis of service charges and fees should be carried out (managed by the Secretariat) and be considered in the framework of the evaluation of the IPPC. If there was a positive outcome to the legal analysis, then such service fees and charges should be investigated further by the Secretariat with the view of reporting to the CPM;
4. *Requested* the Secretariat discuss the use of fees with other organizations that were in similar activity areas (e.g. OIE, International Seed Testing Association) to enquire about their systems of fees;
5. *Recommended* that information collected (including that from the IPPC evaluation) be considered next year and further action taken accordingly;
6. *Agreed* to the further investigation of the use of a voluntary assessed contribution scheme for funding the IPPC, and recommended that an information package, including a schedule of contributions and the likelihood of members making their assessed contributions, be prepared to be presented to CPM-2; and
7. *Agreed* that recommendations made do not imply any advanced acceptance of these potential funding structures.

### 12.5.3 Information on Voluntary Assessed Contributions

126. The Secretariat outlined the need for additional resources by highlighting the financial constraints faced by the Secretariat and the significant staff reductions being experienced.

127. The Secretariat introduced a document on voluntary assessed contributions<sup>30</sup>, and referred to two possible systems for voluntary contributions. The first example was based on an apportionment of the costs to contracting parties to meet an estimated budget requirement of US\$ 2 million for 2006 using the United Nations scale of assessment for 2003, while the second example was based on the financial contributions from OIE Member Countries for 2005.

---

<sup>29</sup> CPM 2006/19

<sup>30</sup> CPM 2006/22

128. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Mr Lopian), emphasized the need for a sustainable budget to work in an effective manner. He felt that there was a need to increase the visibility of the IPPC on a national level and within FAO, and in this context, expressed his disappointment that the Director-General of FAO could not attend the first meeting of the CPM. This could have raised the visibility of the IPPC considerably. He expressed his hope that the Director-General would attend CPM-2.

129. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the examples of voluntary assessed contributions and the OIE category system of contributions (as in Appendix XV).

## 12.6 Strategic Plan and Business Plan

### 12.6.1 Strategic Plan

130. The Secretariat introduced the Strategic Plan as amended by the SPTA in October 2005<sup>31</sup>.

131. The CPM supported a general review and redraft of the Strategic Plan, following entry into force of the new revised text of the IPPC, which would also consider topics that might not be covered adequately. These topics included invasive alien species, electronic certification, compliance, commodity-specific standards and strengthening the scientific work of the organization. It was noted that the Secretariat should liaise with other organizations to clarify the mandate of the IPPC with respect to invasive aquatic plants, and prepare a paper for CPM-2 on this topic.

132. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* the current Strategic Plan as given in Appendix XVI; and
2. *Agreed* to a complete review of the Strategic Plan.

### 12.6.2 Proposed Updates of the Strategic Plan in Relation to Technical Assistance<sup>32</sup>

133. The Secretariat presented the outputs of two informal working groups on technical assistance and phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE) in March 2005. The working groups had provided recommendations for modifications of the Strategic Direction No. 4 of the Strategic Plan. These recommendations had been considered by the SPTA, which felt that the time allocated to discuss the subjects at its meeting did not reflect their importance, and so had submitted them to CPM-1 for advice as to how to proceed with the recommendations.

134. The CPM:

1. *Agreed* that the recommendations should be considered further by the SPTA, with assistance from the informal working groups on technical assistance and PCE, in the context of the complete review of the strategic plan; and
2. *Agreed* that the Informal working group on technical assistance (IWG-TA), already mentioned in the Strategic Plan, should continue to provide guidance in relation to technical assistance.

### 12.6.3 Business Plan<sup>33</sup>

135. The Secretariat noted that the first version of the Business Plan was produced in 2003, and the ICPM had then agreed that it should be reviewed annually. In 2005, the Business Plan, including the strategic plan, had been adopted by the ICPM.

---

<sup>31</sup> CPM 2006/15

<sup>32</sup> CPM 2006/16

<sup>33</sup> CPM 2006/INF/11



136. In view of the start of the evaluation of the IPPC and the entry into force of the 1997 amendments, the Secretariat suggested that the Business Plan be completely revised, and should take account of a realistic funding situation for the IPPC. The CPM noted that the Business Plan should be revised annually, and was a useful tool to promote the IPPC and attract funding.

137. The CPM:

1. *Agreed* that the Business Plan should be completely revised.

### 12.7 Report of the Working Group on Electronic Certification

138. The Secretariat introduced the report of the Working group on electronic certification<sup>34</sup>. Several members wanted to know the costs of implementing an electronic certification system. Other members were concerned about the technologies needed to implement such systems, and whether paper copies of phytosanitary certificates would continue to be accepted.

139. The Secretariat stressed the difference between setting a standard for the *format* for the international exchange of certificates and designing the *technology* to generate certificates. The document presented to CPM, and the work envisaged for the Secretariat, was primarily concerned with the standard format for exchange, while decisions on which technologies to adopt in order to generate and transmit messages using this standard format were the responsibility of those NPPOs that decide to implement a system of electronic certification.

140. The CPM:

1. *Thanked* the Government of the Netherlands for hosting and funding the working group on electronic certification;
2. *Noted* the active participation of the representatives of OIE and Codex Alimentarius in the working group;
3. *Noted* the challenges associated with the implementation of electronic phytosanitary certification;
4. *Agreed* that the IPPC Secretariat keep informed of the challenges associated with the global introduction/implementation of electronic phytosanitary certification and assist with addressing these as required and appropriate, and also develop cost estimates for the implementation of electronic certification;
5. *Endorsed* the basic principle of the policy recommendations made by the working group and noted the recommendations on standardization as made by the working group;
6. *Stated* that the IPPC Secretariat should encourage and be actively involved in the UN/CEFACT process on electronic certification for phytosanitary purposes; and
7. *Stated* that contracting parties or NPPOs shall bilaterally agree on the use of electronic certification.

### 12.8 Composition of, and Terms of Reference for, a Working Group on the Feasibility of the International Recognition of Pest Free Areas<sup>35</sup>

141. In accordance with a decision from ICPM-7, a Focus Group had developed terms of reference for a working group on the feasibility of the international recognition of pest free areas (PFAs), which were then reviewed by the SPTA. The SPTA had been informed that the Expert Working Group convened to develop the draft ISPM on the recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence had found very little information on what PFAs had been established around the world and for which pests. The SPTA had suggested that this information should be compiled prior to convening a working group on the feasibility of recognition.

142. The CPM recognized the importance of the issue of international recognition of PFAs for many countries, and that a preliminary study regarding existing PFAs should be conducted. However,

---

<sup>34</sup> CPM 2006/18

<sup>35</sup> CPM 2006/14

it also noted the financial situation of the IPPC, and there was disagreement as to when the work could start. Regional groups were invited to consult among their members and the following outcomes were recorded.

143. The Latin America and Caribbean regional group supported the need for a feasibility study, which should not overlap with activities carried out in the framework of the SPS Agreement. Funding of this activity should not affect funding of other priorities already set by the CPM. The outcome of any study should be subject to approval by the CPM.

144. The Southwest Pacific regional group strongly urged the CPM to progress the work in this area by accepting the recommendations made in the document CPM 2006/14.

145. The Near East regional group gave priority to this activity, which affected all importing and exporting countries. It supported the view that it should start as soon as possible.

146. The EC and its Member States agreed to the terms of reference on the basis that a review of the terms of reference should be undertaken at CPM-2 to take account of the experience gained from the collection of data to be made by the Secretariat, and considering from a broader perspective the advantages and disadvantages of all four headings of the annex of the document CPM 2006/14. The EC and its Member States believed that the feasibility study should be undertaken only after the budget period 2006-2007.

147. The Africa regional group considered that this activity was very important for developing countries, and should start as soon as possible.

148. Some members suggested that the feasibility and necessity of international recognition of PFAs should be carefully considered by all contracting parties. They also suggested that membership of the working group should be more extended than in the proposal in CPM 2006/14 and its outcome should be circulated to all contracting parties.

149. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the report of the Focus Group (as modified by the SPTA);
2. *Adopted* the terms of reference for the working group as amended (see Appendix XVII), to be reviewed at CPM-2;
3. *Agreed* that data on existing PFAs be assembled by the Secretariat in 2006, and the outcome presented at CPM-2; and
4. *Agreed* that CPM-2 would then decide on how to proceed.

## 13. STRATEGIC DIRECTION NO. 2: INFORMATION EXCHANGE

### 13.1 Information Exchange under the IPPC

150. The Secretariat introduced a paper on information exchange under the IPPC<sup>36</sup> and noted that the intent was to provide clarity on specific information exchange issues and further clarifications in areas where they were needed. For example, many contracting parties had requested clarification on the role and function of the IPPC contact point.

151. The CPM discussed information exchange for countries that were not contracting parties. The CPM supported the information on the IPP being accessible to all countries. In addition, countries that were not contracting parties could also be involved in training on the use of the IPP, in anticipation of their possible adherence to the IPPC, provided that resources were available.

---

<sup>36</sup> CPM 2006/28

152. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* with amendments “The role of IPPC Contact Points” as given in Appendix XVIII;
2. *Urged* contracting parties to provide official contact points and to ensure that, if that information changed, it would be communicated to the Secretariat in a timely manner;
3. *Agreed* to the use, wherever possible, of electronic communications between official contact points and the Secretariat for official communications;
4. *Encouraged* contracting parties, that were in a position to do so, to inform the Secretariat that paper copies of CPM documents were no longer required;
5. *Urged* contracting parties to increase their utilization of the IPP to ensure national information exchange obligations were met in a timely manner;
6. *Recommended* that high priority be given to the continued improvement of the IPP; and
7. *Decided* that countries that were not a contracting party should be allowed to post information on the IPP, but to ensure contracting parties were provided with support before non-contracting parties.

### **13.2 Information Exchange Work Programme for 2006**

153. The Secretariat introduced the information exchange work programme for 2006<sup>37</sup> and noted that it was based on the strategic plan. It was emphasised that it was highly unlikely that all the expected outputs could be met due to resource limitations. However, the Secretariat would ensure that the IPP was maintained at least with its current functionality so that contracting parties could continue to use it. One concern was the ability to maintain navigation in the current three FAO languages due to staff and budget constraints. Efforts were being made to access extra-budgetary resources to deliver at least the primary components of this work programme. The Secretariat noted that programming of the IPP in preparation for the translation into the two remaining languages had been completed.

154. The CPM noted that the work programme was very ambitious and identified the training of IPP editors as a priority. One member noted that, once the budget resources allocated to information exchange had been spent, no further information exchange activity should be undertaken within the financial year unless extra-budgetary resources were found. Developing capacity-building tools should proceed in coordination with other bodies that undertook the same type of activities.

155. The CPM:

1. *Endorsed* the information exchange work plan in Appendix XIX.

## **14. STRATEGIC DIRECTION NO. 3: THE PROVISION OF DISPUTE SETTLEMENT MECHANISMS**

### **14.1 Report of the ICPM Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (ICPM-SBDS)**

156. The Chairperson of the ICPM-SBDS, reported on the meeting which had taken place immediately prior to the CPM. He noted that five of the seven members of the ICPM-SBDS had been present, along with members of the Bureau and IPPC Secretariat.

157. In 2005, there had not been requests for dispute settlement, despite some enquiries from one FAO region. The SBDS had discussed the lack of use of the IPPC dispute settlement system and had concluded that the CPM be asked to make contracting parties aware of the system and to run some form of promotional program.

158. The SBDS had considered the dispute settlement manual and made several changes. The Secretariat noted that the manual would be finalized after CPM-1, and be made available on the IPP

---

<sup>37</sup> CPM 2006/13

and in printed form only upon request. Owing to the lack of funds it would only be available in English.

159. A dispute settlement advocacy document had been developed and would also be finalised after CPM-1.

160. It was hoped that resources would be available for translation and printing of both the advocacy document and the dispute settlement manual. Comments and suggestions on these documents were invited for a period of 30 days, after which they would be finalized and published on the IPP.

161. As requested by ICPM-7, specific guidance for clarification of ISPMs had been developed by the ICPM-SBDS. The advice had been seen as clarification of the application of the IPPC and ISPMs for specific circumstances or situations at a particular time. This had not been considered to be the same as interpretation and it was noted that such clarification should not be used in subsequent dispute settlement processes.

162. As requested by ICPM-7, the SBDS had considered the subject of compliance and prepared possible options for the CPM to consider. It was noted that compliance mechanisms were usually a component of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) where it complemented dispute settlement systems. Compliance mechanisms were essentially non-adversarial, pro-active and looked to the future. In this context, the ICPM-SBDS Chairperson stated that compliance would refer to the fulfilment of IPPC requirements by contracting parties, and not the certification and documentation requirements described in ISPM No. 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*).

163. The ICPM-SBDS believed that there was merit in investigating further the issue of compliance within the IPPC framework and a compliance system would be of use in helping contracting parties to meet their obligations under the IPPC. A paper on enhanced structures to review and support compliance was submitted to the CPM for consideration and guidance. The CPM felt that the issue of compliance needed further close scrutiny. It also noted considerable concern about placing it on the work programme due to the significant resource limitations.

164. The CPM:

1. *Emphasised* that the issue of compliance needed to be investigated carefully, particularly with respect to legal issues and compatibility with the IPPC Dispute Settlement process;
2. *Decided* to place this subject on the agenda of the SPTA for consideration with the view to making recommendations to CPM-2; and
3. *Recommended* that should extra budgetary funds become available, an open ended working group be held to explore the subject appropriately.

## **15. STRATEGIC DIRECTION NO. 4: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY OF MEMBERS BY PROMOTING THE PROVISION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

### **15.1 Analysis of the application of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool (PCE)**

165. A status report on the analysis of the PCE commissioned by ICPM-6 (2004) was presented and discussed<sup>38</sup>. The meeting considered the elements of the study. Some French-speaking countries noted that because the questionnaire was only in English, this had limited their response and participation in the exercise. The Secretariat agreed to provide an electronic version of the questionnaire in French.

---

<sup>38</sup> CPM 2006/20

166. The meeting acknowledged the value of the tool and discussed its use in focusing technical assistance projects for developing countries and noted the possible use of the results of its application to define areas of collaboration with potential partners and donors.

167. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the progress report and *looked forward* to the full report on the analysis at CPM-2.

### **15.2 Technical assistance activities by region (2001-2005)**

168. The report on technical assistance activities undertaken during the period 2001-2005 was presented and discussed<sup>39</sup>. Syria, Guinea, the Seychelles, Panama, Nigeria, Zambia, Sudan, Eritrea and Bahrain, which had received assistance under the FAO Technical Cooperation Programme, expressed their appreciation to the IPPC Secretariat and FAO for assisting in the development of their national phytosanitary systems. The CPM expressed its satisfaction with the scope of the work undertaken by the Secretariat.

169. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the report.

### **15.3 Technical Assistance Work Programme**

170. The Secretariat presented the technical assistance work programme for 2006<sup>40</sup>. It stressed the importance of the regional workshops on draft ISPMs in the development of standards. It acknowledged the generous offer of the Republic of Korea to fund one regional workshop in the Asia region and encouraged similar contributions from other member countries to ensure that workshops on draft ISPMs were held in as many regions as possible. It was noted that developing countries may request technical assistance through their FAO Office.

171. The CPM:

1. *Noted* and *approved* the report.

## **16. STRATEGIC DIRECTION NO. 6: PROMOTION OF IPPC AND COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

### **16.1 Report of the Informal Working Group on Liaison with Research and Education Institutes**

172. The Secretariat presented the report<sup>41</sup> and noted that the work had been undertaken as extra-budgetary resources had become available. The working group had been able to consider the data generated through a pilot project undertaken by the Secretariat early in 2005. The informal working group had emphasized that this work should be viewed as developing the scientific foundation for the implementation of the IPPC. It had recommended that the activity be placed on the work programme of the CPM and be addressed as additional resources became available.

173. Some countries noted that this area of work was important and should be considered when revising the IPPC Strategic Plan.

174. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the report of the informal working group on liaison with research and education institutes; and

---

<sup>39</sup> CPM 2006/INF/10

<sup>40</sup> CPM 2006/21

<sup>41</sup> CPM 2006/24

2. *Referred* the report to the SPTA for its consideration and for presenting further recommendations to CPM-2.

## 16.2 Report on Cooperation with Relevant Organizations

175. The Secretariat presented the report on cooperation with other relevant organizations<sup>42</sup>, including: RPPOs, CBD, WTO-SPS, STDF, OIE, Codex Alimentarius Commission, International Forest Quarantine Research Group, IAEA, International Seed Federation, ISTA, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, and the United Kingdom's Foresight initiative.

176. The Seychelles stated that, in line with collaborative work with the relevant organizations, the Seychelles formed the National Invasive Alien Species Committee. All the stakeholders form part of this committee.

177. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Mr Lopian) reported specifically on joint activities between the CBD and the IPPC. Following a joint meeting of the Bureaus and Secretariats of both conventions, a side event on IPPC matters was organized at the 8th meeting of the Conference of Parties to the CBD. The report of the side-event would be placed on the IPP. This report discussed international and national strategies for the control of invasive alien species, possible cooperation between the IPPC and the CBD, and between phytosanitary and environmental authorities. It had been suggested that parties to the CBD may consider recognizing the IPPC as the standard setting organization for invasive alien species that were pests of plants.

178. One member expressed concerns in relation to joint activities on invasive alien species, which were not defined in the IPPC, nor were equivalent to quarantine pests. The member was concerned that possible problems could arise in international trade due to different criteria and interpretations applied, and requested that CPM members be kept well informed of any common activity in this area.

179. The representative from the WTO expressed appreciation for the valuable contribution of the IPPC Secretariat in SPS discussions, and noted that WTO members had expressed support for the IPPC contribution in relation to the recognition of pest free areas. She also noted value of IPPC participation in SPS workshops to provide technical expertise, noting that the impact of these workshops depended very much on the participation of the standard-setting organizations.

180. The representative of the Environmental Investigation Agency stressed the value of cooperation with the Montreal Protocol, in particular in relation to capacity building for developing countries to implement ISPMs and develop alternatives to methyl bromide. The Montreal Protocol had funds available to help developing countries develop such alternatives. However, these funds were not available for projects related to quarantine use. He recommended that the IPPC approached the Secretariat of the Montreal Protocol to help developing countries access funds in relation to implementation of ISPM No. 15.

181. The Secretariat noted that a paper was being developed on cooperation between the IPPC and the Montreal Protocol as to how funds could be made available to assist developing countries build an infrastructure for heat treatment facilities<sup>43</sup>.

182. The CPM:  
1. *Noted* the report.

## 17. CALENDAR

---

<sup>42</sup> CPM 2006/INF/9

<sup>43</sup> CPM 2006/CRP/27

183. The Secretariat presented a tentative IPPC meeting calendar but noted that the dates and venues of meetings still needed to be confirmed, and that all meetings were subject to the availability of resources. Due to the late finalization of the standard-setting programme and the lack of SC-approved specifications, expert working groups meetings for 2006 had not been included. The Secretariat noted that the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int>) should be checked regularly as this was where the Secretariat regularly updated the IPPC meeting calendar. The Secretariat confirmed that it also planned a SPTA in 2006.

184. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the IPPC meeting calendar.

## 18. OTHER BUSINESS

185. The Seychelles announced that they needed a heat treatment facility to meet the requirements of ISPM No. 15 and would welcome discussions with donors.

186. There were no other points raised.

## 19. DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

187. The CPM:

1. *Agreed* that the next session of the CPM would be held at FAO, Rome, Italy, on 26-30 March 2007.

## 20. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON

188. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde) took the chair for the election of the CPM Chairperson. She explained that the Chairperson had been elected for the meeting at the beginning of the session, and that the CPM needed to elect its Chairperson.

189. The CPM:

1. *Elected* Mr Kadera (Kenya) as CPM Chairperson.

## 21. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

190. The CPM *adopted* the report.





**COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****3 – 7 April 2006****AGENDA**

1. Opening of the Session
2. Election of the Chairperson
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Adoption of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
5. Election of Vice-Chairpersons and Appointment of Rapporteur
- 5bis. Election of a Credentials Committee
6. Issues Related to Entry into Force
  - 6.1 Establishment of a Subsidiary Body for Standard Setting under the CPM
  - 6.2 Establishment of a Subsidiary Body for Dispute Settlement under the CPM
7. Report by the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures Chairperson
8. Report by the Secretariat
9. Report of the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations
10. Report of Observer Organizations
  - 10.1 Report of the activities of the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Committee and other relevant WTO activities in 2005
  - 10.2 Report of the Convention on Biological Diversity
11. Strategic Direction No. 1: The Development, Adoption and Monitoring of the Implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) (Standard Setting)
  - 11.1 Report by the Chairperson of the ICPM Standards Committee
  - 11.2 Adoption of international standards - regular standard setting process
  - 11.3 Adoption of international standards - fast track process
  - 11.4 Topics and priorities for standards
  - 11.5 Improvements in the standard setting procedure
    - 11.5.1 Use and translation of the terms "must", "should", "shall" and "may" in ISPMs
    - 11.5.2 Analysis of costs for the Standards Committee meetings being held in several languages
    - 11.5.3 Criteria for the formation of supplements, annexes and appendices to International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
12. Strategic Direction No. 5: The Maintenance of an Effective and Efficient Administrative Framework
  - 12.1 Issues related to entry into force
    - 12.1.1 Preparations for entry into force
    - 12.1.2 Adjustments in translation in the authentic languages of the Convention
  - 12.2 Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance
    - 12.2.1 Report of the seventh meeting of the ICPM Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance
    - 12.2.2 CPM Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance

- 12.3 Budget
  - 12.3.1 Financial report 2005
  - 12.3.2 Budget plan 2006
- 12.4 Trust Fund for the IPPC
  - 12.4.1 Financial report 2005 for the Trust Fund for the IPPC
  - 12.4.2 Budget 2006 and 2007 for the Trust Fund for the IPPC
- 12.5 Two stage evaluation
  - 12.5.1 Evaluation of the IPPC and its structures
  - 12.5.2 Potential funding arrangements of the IPPC
  - 12.5.3 Information on voluntary assessed contributions
- 12.6 Strategic Plan and Business Plan
  - 12.6.1 Strategic plan
  - 12.6.2 Proposed updates of the strategic plan in relation to technical assistance
  - 12.6.3 Business plan
- 12.7 Report of the working group on electronic certification
- 12.8 Composition of working group and terms of reference for working group on the feasibility of the international recognition of pest free areas
- 13. Strategic Direction No. 2: Information Exchange
  - 13.1 Information exchange under the IPPC
  - 13.2 Information exchange work programme for 2006
- 14. Strategic Direction No. 3: The Provision of Dispute Settlement Mechanisms
  - 14.1 Report of the ICPM Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement
- 15. Strategic Direction No. 4: The Development of the Phytosanitary Capacity of Members by Promoting the Provision of Technical Assistance
  - 15.1 Analysis of the application of the phytosanitary capacity evaluation tool (PCE)
  - 15.2 Technical assistance activities by region (2001-2005)
  - 15.3 Technical assistance work programme
- 16. Strategic Direction No. 6: Promotion of IPPC and Cooperation with Relevant International Organizations
  - 16.1 Report of the working group on liaison with research and education institutes
  - 16.2 Report on cooperation with relevant organizations
- 17. Calendar
- 18. Other Business
- 19. Date and Venue of the Next Meeting
- 20. Adoption of the Report

## **RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

### **RULE I MEMBERSHIP**

1. Membership of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (hereafter referred to as “the Commission”) consists of all contracting parties to the International Plant Protection Convention (hereafter referred to as “the IPPC”).
2. Before the opening of each session of the Commission, each contracting party (hereafter referred to as “member of the Commission”) shall communicate to the Director-General (hereafter referred to as “the Director-General”) of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (hereafter referred to as “the Organization”) the names of all the persons (the head of the delegation, as well as alternates, experts and advisers) appointed by such member of the Commission to represent it during the session mentioned above. For the purpose of these Rules, the term “delegates” means the persons so appointed.

### **RULE II OFFICERS**

1. The Commission shall elect a Chairperson, not more than two Vice-Chairpersons (hereinafter collectively referred to as “the Bureau”), and a rapporteur, from among the delegates; it being understood that no delegate shall be eligible without the concurrence of the respective head of delegation. The Bureau shall be elected under FAO Rules and Regulations at the end of a regular session and shall hold office for a term of two years. The Chairperson, or in the absence of the Chairperson another member of the Bureau, shall preside at all meetings of the Commission and shall exercise such other functions as may be required to facilitate the work of the Commission. A Vice-Chairperson acting as Chairperson shall have the same powers and duties as the Chairperson.
2. The Chairperson shall declare the opening and closing of each plenary meeting of the session. He/she shall direct the discussions in plenary meetings, and at such meetings ensure observance of these Rules, accord the right to speak, put questions and announce decisions. He/she shall rule on points of order and, subject to these Rules, shall have complete control over the proceedings at any meetings. He/she may, in the course of the discussion of an item, propose to the Commission the limitation of the time to be allowed to speakers, the number of times each delegation may speak on any question, the closure of the list of speakers, the suspension or adjournment of the meeting, or the adjournment or closure of the debate on the item under discussion.
3. The Chairperson, or a Vice-Chairperson acting as Chairperson, shall not vote but may appoint an alternate, associate or adviser from his/her delegation to vote in his/her place.
4. The Chairperson, in the exercise of his/her functions, remains under the authority of the Commission.

### **RULE III SECRETARY**

1. The Secretary of the IPPC shall be responsible for implementing the activities assigned to the Secretariat in accordance with the policies of the Commission. The Secretary shall report to the Commission on the activities assigned to the Secretariat.

### **RULE IV SESSIONS**

1. The Commission shall hold one regular session each year. Special sessions shall be held as considered necessary by the Commission or at the written request of at least one third of the members of the Commission.

2. Sessions of the Commission shall be convened by the Chairperson of the Commission, after consultation with the Director-General.
3. Notice of the date and place of each session of the Commission shall be communicated to all the members of the Commission at least two months before the session.
4. Each member of the Commission shall have one representative, head of delegation, who may be accompanied by one or more alternates, experts and advisers. An alternate, expert or adviser shall not have the right to vote except when substituting for the head of delegation.
5. Meetings of the Commission shall be held in public unless the Commission decides otherwise.
6. A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

#### **RULE V AGENDA AND DOCUMENTS**

1. The Director-General, in consultation with the Chairperson of the Commission, shall prepare a provisional agenda.
2. The first item on the provisional agenda shall be the adoption of the Agenda.
3. Any member of the Commission may request the Director-General to include specific items in the Provisional Agenda.
4. The Provisional Agenda shall normally be circulated by the Director-General at least two months in advance of the session to all members of the Commission and to all observers invited to attend the session.
5. Any member of the Commission, and the Director-General, may, after the despatch of the Provisional Agenda, propose the inclusion of specific items on the Agenda with respect to matters of an urgent nature. These items should be placed on a supplementary list, which, if time permits before the opening of the session, shall be dispatched by the Director-General to all members of the Commission, failing which the supplementary list shall be communicated to the Chairperson for submission to the Commission.
6. After the Agenda has been adopted, the Commission may, by a two-thirds majority of the members of the Commission present and voting, amend the Agenda by the deletion, addition or modification of any item. No matter referred to the Commission by the Conference or Council of the Organization may be omitted from the Agenda.
7. Documents to be submitted to the Commission at any Session shall be furnished by the Director-General to all the members of the Commission and to observers invited to the session, at the time the Agenda is despatched or as soon as possible thereafter.
8. Formal proposals relating to items on the Agenda and amendments thereto introduced during a session of the Commission shall be made in writing and handed to the Chairperson, who shall arrange for copies to be circulated to all delegates.

#### **RULE VI VOTING PROCEDURES**

1. Subject to the provisions of Article II of the Constitution of the Organization, each member of the Commission shall have one vote.
2. The Commission shall make every effort to reach agreement on all matters by consensus. If all efforts to reach consensus have been exhausted and no agreement has been reached, the decision shall, as the last resort be taken by a two-thirds majority of the members of the Commission present and voting.
3. For the purpose of these Rules, the phrase “members present and voting” means members of the Commission casting an affirmative or negative vote. Members who abstain from voting or cast a defective ballot are considered as not voting.
4. Upon the request of any member of the Commission, voting shall be by roll-call vote, in which case the vote of each member shall be recorded.

5. When the Commission so decides, voting shall be by secret ballot.
6. The provisions of Rule XII of the General Rules of the Organization shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to all matters not specifically dealt with under this Rule.

#### **RULE VII OBSERVERS**

1. Any country that is not a contracting party but is a Member of the Organization, as well as the United Nations, any of its specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, may, upon request communicated to the Director-General, attend sessions of the Commission, and its subsidiary bodies, as an observer. Any such observer may submit memoranda and participate in discussions without a vote. Any country that is not a contracting party and is not a Member of the Organization, but is a Member of the United Nations, any of its specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency, may, upon request and subject to the provisions relating to the granting of the Observer Status in respect of Nations as provided for by the Basic Texts of the Organization, be invited to attend, in an observer capacity, sessions of the Commission or of its subsidiary bodies. The status of such Nations shall be governed by the relevant provisions of the Basic Texts of the Organization.
2. Representatives of Regional Plant Protection Organizations shall be invited to attend all sessions of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies as observers. Any such observers may submit memoranda and participate in discussions without a vote.
3. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 4 of this Rule, the Director-General, taking into account guidance given by the Commission, may invite international (intergovernmental and non-governmental) organizations to attend sessions of the Commission in an observer capacity.
4. Participation of international organizations in the work of the Commission and the relations between the Commission and such organizations shall be governed by the relevant provisions of the Constitution and other pertinent Basic Texts of the Organization. All such relations shall be dealt with by the Director-General, taking into account guidance given by the Commission.

#### **RULE VIII RECORDS AND REPORTS**

1. At each session, the Commission shall approve a report embodying its views, recommendations and conclusions, including, when requested, a statement of minority views. Such other records, for its own use, as the Commission may on occasion decide, shall also be maintained.
2. The report of the Commission shall be transmitted at the close of each session to the Director-General who shall circulate it to all members of the Commission and observers that were represented at the session, for their information, and, upon request, to other Members and Associate Members of the Organization.
3. Recommendations of the Commission having policy, programme or financial implications for the Organization shall be brought by the Director-General to the attention of the Conference and/or of the Council of the Organization for appropriate action.
4. Subject to the provisions of the preceding paragraph the Director-General may request members of the Commission to supply the Commission with information on action taken on the basis of recommendations made by the Commission.

#### **RULE IX SUBSIDIARY BODIES**

1. The Commission may establish such subsidiary bodies as it deems necessary for the accomplishment of its functions.
2. The terms of reference and procedures of the subsidiary bodies shall be determined by the Commission.

- 3 Membership in these subsidiary bodies shall consist of selected members of the Commission, or of individuals appointed in their personal capacity as respectively determined by the Commission.
- 4 The representatives of subsidiary bodies shall be specialists in the fields of activity of the respective subsidiary bodies.
- 5 The establishment of subsidiary bodies shall be subject to the availability of the necessary funds in the relevant chapter of the approved budget of the Organization. Before taking any decision involving expenditure in connection with the establishment of subsidiary bodies, the Commission shall have before it a report from the Director-General on the administrative and financial implications thereof.
- 6 Each subsidiary body shall elect its own officers, unless appointed by the Commission.

#### **RULE X DEVELOPMENT AND ADOPTION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS**

1. The procedures for the development and adoption of international standards are set out in the Annex I to these Rules and shall form an integral part thereof.
2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Rule VI.2, where consensus is not reached on a proposal for the adoption of a standard which has been introduced before the Commission for the first time, the proposed standard shall be referred back to the appropriate body of the Commission, together with its comments thereon, for further consideration.

#### **RULE XI EXPENSES**

1. Expenses incurred by delegates when attending sessions of the Commission or of its subsidiary bodies, as well as the expenses incurred by observers at sessions, shall be borne by their respective governments or organizations. Developing countries delegates may request financial assistance to attend sessions of the Commission or its subsidiary bodies.
2. Any financial operations of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies shall be governed by the appropriate provisions of the Financial Regulations of the Organization.

#### **RULE XII LANGUAGES**

1. Pursuant to Rule XLVII of the General Rules of the Organization, the languages of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies shall be the languages of the Organization.
2. Any representative using a language other than one of the languages of the Commission shall provide for interpretation into one of the languages of the Commission.

#### **RULE XIII AMENDMENT AND SUSPENSION OF THE RULES**

1. Amendment of or additions to these Rules may be adopted by a two-thirds majority of the members of the Commission present and voting, provided that not less than 24 hours notice of the proposal for the amendment or the addition has been given.
2. Any of the above Rules of the Commission, other than Rule I.1, Rule IV.2 and 6, Rule V.6, Rule VI.1 and 2, Rule VII, Rule VIII.3 and 4, Rule IX.2 and 5, Rule XI, Rule XIII.1 and Rule XIV may be suspended by a two thirds majority of the members of the Commission present and voting, provided that not less than 24 hours notice of the proposal for suspension has been given. Such notice may be waived if no representative of the members of the Commission objects.

#### **RULE XIV ENTRY INTO FORCE**

1. These Rules and any amendments or additions thereto shall come into force upon approval by the Director-General of the Organization.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

### Terms of reference

#### 1. Scope

The SC manages the standard-setting process and assists in the development of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) which have been identified by the CPM as priority standards.

#### 2. Objective

The main objective of the SC is to prepare draft ISPMs according to the standard-setting procedures in the most expeditious manner for adoption by the CPM.

#### 3. Structure of the Standards Committee

The SC consists of 25 members drawn from each of the FAO regions. The distribution for each region will be:

- Africa (4)
- Asia (4)
- Europe (4)
- Latin America and the Caribbean (4)
- Near East (4)
- North America (2)
- Southwest Pacific (3)

Temporary or permanent working groups, and drafting groups consisting of SC members, may be established by the SC as required. SC working groups are selected by the SC from its membership.

A SC working group of 7 members, the SC-7, is selected by the SC from its membership.

The functions of the SC-7 and other SC working groups are determined by the SC.

#### 4. Functions of the Standards Committee

The SC serves as a forum for:

- examination and approval or amendment of specifications;
- review of specifications;
- designation of members of SC working groups and identification of tasks of the groups;
- establishment and disestablishment of expert working groups and technical panels as appropriate;
- designation of membership of expert working groups, technical panels and drafting groups as required;
- review of draft ISPMs;
- approval of draft standards to be submitted to CPM Members under the country consultation procedure;
- establishment of open-ended discussion groups where appropriate;
- revision of draft ISPMs in cooperation with the IPPC Secretariat taking into account comments of CPM Members and RPPOs;
- approval of final drafts of ISPMs for submission to the CPM;
- review of existing ISPMs and identification and review of those requiring reconsideration;
- identification of priorities for ISPMs under development;
- ensuring that language used in draft ISPMs is clear, simple and focused;
- assigning stewardship for each ISPM ; and
- other functions related to standard setting as directed by the CPM.

## 5. IPPC Secretariat

The Secretariat provides administrative, technical and editorial support as required by the SC. The Secretariat is responsible for reporting and record keeping regarding the standard-setting programme.

### Rules of procedure

#### **Rule 1. Membership**

Members should be senior officials of National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPO), designated by contracting parties, and have qualifications in a scientific biological discipline (or equivalent) in plant protection, and experience and skills particularly in the:

- practical operation of a national or international phytosanitary system;
- administration of a national or international phytosanitary system; and
- application of phytosanitary measures related to international trade.

Contracting parties agree that SC members dedicate the necessary time to participate in a regular and systematic way in the meetings.

Each FAO region may devise its own procedures for selecting its members of the SC. The IPPC Secretariat is notified of the selections that are submitted to the CPM for confirmation.

The SC is responsible for selecting the SC-7 members from within its membership. Members selected for the SC-7 will meet the above-mentioned qualifications and experience.

#### **Rule 2. Replacement of members**

Each FAO region shall, following its own procedures, nominate potential replacements for members of the SC and submit them to the CPM for confirmation. Once confirmed, potential replacements are valid for the same periods of time as specified in Rule 3. These potential replacements should meet the qualifications for membership set forth in these Rules. Each FAO region shall identify a maximum of two potential replacements. Where a region nominates two, it should indicate the order in which they would serve as replacements under this Rule.

A member of the SC will be replaced by a confirmed potential replacement from within the same region if the member resigns, no longer meets the qualifications for membership set forth in these Rules, or fails to attend two consecutive meetings of the SC.

The national IPPC contact point should communicate to the Secretariat any circumstances where a member from its country needs to be replaced. The Secretariat should inform the relevant FAO regional chair.

A replacement will serve through the completion of the term of the original member, and may be nominated to serve additional terms.

#### **Rule 3. Period of Membership**

Members of the SC shall serve for terms of three years. Members may serve no more than two terms, unless a region submits a request to the CPM for an exemption to allow a member from within its region to serve an additional term. In that case, the member may serve an additional term. Regions may submit requests for additional exemptions for the same member on a term-by-term basis. Partial terms served by replacements shall not be counted as a term under these Rules.

Membership of the SC-7 lapses with membership of the SC or upon resignation.

Replacements to the SC-7 are selected by the SC.



**Rule 4. Chairperson**

The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the SC are elected by the SC from its membership and serve for three years, with a possibility of re-election for one additional term of three years. The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson may serve in these capacities only when a member of the SC.

The Chairperson of the SC-7 is elected by members of the SC-7. The term is for three years with the possibility of re-election for one additional term of three years. The Chairperson of the SC-7 may serve in this capacity only when a member of the SC.

**Rule 5. Sessions**

Meetings of the SC are normally held at FAO Headquarters in Rome.

The SC meets at least once per year.

Depending on the workload and resources available, the SC or the Secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau of the CPM, may request additional meetings of the SC. In particular, the SC may need to meet after the CPM meeting in order to prepare draft standards for country consultation.

Depending on the workload and resources available, the SC, in consultation with the Secretariat and the Bureau of the CPM, may authorize the SC-7 or extraordinary working groups of the SC to meet.

A session of the SC shall not be declared open unless there is a quorum. The presence of a majority of the members of the SC is necessary to constitute a quorum.

**Rule 6. Approval**

Approvals relating to specifications or draft standards are sought by consensus. Final drafts of ISPMs which have been approved by the SC are submitted to the CPM without undue delay.

**Rule 7. Observers**

For observer status, Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM will apply.

**Rule 8. Reports**

SC meeting records shall be kept by the Secretariat. The report of the meetings shall include:

- approval of draft specifications for ISPMs
- finalization of specifications with a detailed explanation including reasons for changes
- reasons why a draft standard has not been approved
- a generic summary of SC reactions to classes of comments made in the country consultation
- draft standards that are sent for country consultation and draft standards recommended for adoption by the CPM.

The Secretariat shall endeavour to provide to CPM Members upon request the rationale of the SC for accepting or not accepting proposals for modifications to specifications or draft standards.

A report on the activities of the SC shall be made by the Chairperson of the SC to the annual session of the CPM.

Reports of SC meetings shall be adopted by the SC before they are made available to Members of the CPM and RPPOs.

**Rule 9. Language**

The business of the SC shall be conducted in the five FAO working languages.

**Rule 10. Amendments**

Amendments to the Rules of Procedures and the Terms of Reference may be promulgated by the CPM as required.

## STANDARDS COMMITTEE: MEMBERSHIP AND POTENTIAL REPLACEMENTS

## A - Members

FAO region	Country	Name	Nominated	Current term / Duration	End of current term
<b>Africa</b>	Morocco	Abdellah CHALLAOUI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Nigeria	Gabriel Olayiwola ADEJARE	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	South Africa	Michael HOLTZHAUSEN	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Uganda	Robert KARYEJJA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Asia</b>	China	Fuxiang WANG	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	India	Prabhakar CHANDURKAR	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Japan	Motoi SAKAMURA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Malaysia	Mazlan SAADON	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Europe</b>	European Commission	Marc VEREECKE	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Germany	Jens-Georg UNGER	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Israel	David OPATOWSKI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Latvia	Ringolds ARNITIS	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Latin America and Caribbean</b>	Argentina	Diego QUIROGA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Barbados	Michael PHILIP	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Brazil	Odilson RIBEIRO E SILVA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Costa Rica	Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Near East</b>	Iran	Ali ALIZADEH ALIABADI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Jordan	Mohammad KATBEH BADER	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Sudan	Khidir GIBRIL MUSA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Yemen	Abdullah AL-SAYANI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>North America</b>	Canada	Gregory WOLFF	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	USA	Narcy KLAG	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Southwest Pacific</b>	Australia	David PORRITT	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	New Zealand	John HEDLEY	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Tonga	Sione FOLIAKI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009

**B - Potential Replacements**

<b>FAO region</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Nominated</b>	<b>Current term / Duration</b>	<b>End of current term</b>
<b>Africa</b>	Zambia	Arundel SAKALA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Senegal	Mame Ndene LO	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Asia</b>	Indonesia	Dwi PUTRA SETIAWAN	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Thailand	Udon UNAHAWUTTI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Europe</b>	Denmark	Ebbe NORDBO	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Netherlands	Bram DE HOOP	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Latin America and Caribbean</b>	Guatemala	Jaime SOSA LEMMUS	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Uruguay	Beatriz MELCHO	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Near East</b>	Syria	Mohammad Jamal HAJJAR	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Turkey	Birrol AKBAS	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>North America</b>	Canada	Steve COTÉ	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	USA	Julie ALIAGA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
<b>Southwest Pacific</b>	New Zealand	Gavin EDWARDS	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Papua New Guinea	Roy Timothy MASAMDU	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009

## TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

### Terms of Reference

#### **1. Scope of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement**

The Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement manages the dispute settlement functions of the CPM and provides assistance to the CPM with regard to dispute settlement in the WTO and other organizations.

#### **2. Objective**

The main objective of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement is the oversight, administration and support of the IPPC dispute settlement procedures.

#### **3. Structure of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement**

The Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement consists of 7 members, one member drawn from each of the FAO Regions.

#### **4. Functions of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement**

The Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement has the following functions:

1. Provide guidance to the Secretariat and disputing parties in selecting appropriate dispute resolution methods and may assist in conducting or administering consultation, good offices, mediation, or arbitration.
2. Propose nominations for independent experts using Expert Committee procedures (see the report of the second session of the ICPM, Appendix IX, Section 4 and the report of the third session of the ICPM, Appendix XI, Section H, paragraph 27b) where the disputing parties cannot agree on experts proposed by the Secretariat.
3. Approve reports of Expert Committees including verification of all points in Expert Committee procedures (see the report of the second session of the ICPM, Appendix IX, Section 4 and the report of the third session of the ICPM, Appendix XI, Section F); and
4. Undertake other functions as directed by the CPM, which may include:
  - a) assist the Secretariat with requests from WTO or other organizations;
  - b) report on IPPC dispute settlement activities as well as dispute settlement activities undertaken or completed by other organizations that have implications for the phytosanitary community;
  - c) assist in identifying appropriate experts (e.g. for WTO dispute settlement);
  - d) assist in review and maintenance of expert rosters; and
  - e) identify appropriate training opportunities.

#### **5. IPPC Secretariat**

The Secretariat provides administrative, technical and editorial support as required by the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement. The Secretariat is responsible for reporting and record keeping regarding the dispute settlement activities.

### Rules of procedure

1. Except as indicated below, the rules of procedure of the CPM will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the subsidiary body.
2. Membership. Members of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement serve for terms of two years, with a maximum of six years.

3. Chair. The subsidiary body elects its Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson from among its membership.
4. Qualifications of subsidiary body members. Experts should have:
  - a) experience in phytosanitary systems;
  - b) familiarity with the IPPC and International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures;
  - c) experience with regulations/legislation; and
  - d) preferably some form of dispute settlement or conflict resolution knowledge, qualifications and/or experience.
5. Meetings. The subsidiary body meets at least once per year, preferably at the occasion of the regular session of the CPM. Other meetings shall be set by the Chairperson of the subsidiary body as needed, in particular, for the review and approval of Expert Committee reports and the development of reports for the CPM. The subsidiary body will normally work by mail, facsimile and e-mail, and in the most cost-effective manner within the available resources.
6. Observers. Meetings of the subsidiary body are generally open according to Rule VII of the Rules of Procedure for the CPM, but the subsidiary body may determine that certain meetings or business need to be conducted without observers, in particular where confidential or controversial information is involved.
7. Language. The working language of the subsidiary body will be English.
8. Decision-making. The subsidiary body strives for consensus on all decisions but may vote where necessary using a 2/3 majority to take decisions. Decisions shall include dissenting opinions where requested.
9. Amendments. Amendments to the functions and procedures of the subsidiary body will be promulgated by the CPM as required.
10. Confidentiality. The subsidiary body shall exercise due respect for confidentiality where sensitive information is identified by disputing parties.

## MEMBERSHIP OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY ON DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

<b>FAO region</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Nominated</b>	<b>Current term / Duration</b>	<b>End of current term</b>
<b>Africa</b>	Algeria	Ali MOUMEN	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 2 years	2008
<b>Asia</b>	Korea, Republic of	Young-Chul JEONG	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 2 years	2008
<b>Europe</b>	Netherlands	Mennie GERRITSEN	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 2 years	2008
<b>Latin America and Caribbean</b>	Dominican Republic	Pedro Julio JIMÉNEZ ROJAS	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 2 years	2008
<b>Near East</b>	Jordan	Mohammad KATBEH BADER	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 2 years	2008
<b>North America</b>	USA	John GREIFER	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 2 years	2008
<b>Southwest Pacific</b>	New Zealand	John HEDLEY	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 2 years	2008





*ISPM No. 1*

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR  
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

**ISPM No. 1**

***PHYTOSANITARY PRINCIPLES FOR THE  
PROTECTION OF PLANTS AND THE APPLICATION  
OF PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES IN  
INTERNATIONAL TRADE***

**(2006)**



## CONTENTS

### INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

REFERENCES

DEFINITIONS

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

### BACKGROUND

### PRINCIPLES

#### 1. Basic principles

- 1.1 Sovereignty
- 1.2 Necessity
- 1.3 Managed risk
- 1.4 Minimal impact
- 1.5 Transparency
- 1.6 Harmonization
- 1.7 Non-discrimination
- 1.8 Technical justification
- 1.9 Cooperation
- 1.10 Equivalence of phytosanitary measures
- 1.11 Modification

#### 2. Operational principles

- 2.1 Pest risk analysis
- 2.2 Pest listing
- 2.3 Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence
- 2.4 Official control for regulated pests
- 2.5 Systems approach
- 2.6 Surveillance
- 2.7 Pest reporting
- 2.8 Phytosanitary certification
- 2.9 Phytosanitary integrity and security of consignments
- 2.10 Prompt action
- 2.11 Emergency measures
- 2.12 Provision of a NPPO
- 2.13 Dispute settlement
- 2.14 Avoidance of undue delays
- 2.15 Notification of non-compliance
- 2.16 Information exchange
- 2.17 Technical assistance



## INTRODUCTION

### SCOPE

This standard describes phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants that are embodied in the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and elaborated in its International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures. It covers principles related to the protection of plants, including cultivated and non-cultivated/unmanaged plants, wild flora and aquatic plants, those regarding the application of phytosanitary measures to the international movement of people, commodities and conveyances, as well as those inherent in the objectives of the IPPC. The standard does not alter the IPPC, extend existing obligations, or interpret any other agreement or body of law.

### REFERENCES

*Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures*, 1994. World Trade Organization, Geneva.

*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*, 2006. ISPM No. 5, FAO, Rome.

*International Plant Protection Convention*, 1997. FAO, Rome.

All International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures.

### DEFINITIONS

Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in the present standard can be found in ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

### OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

This standard describes the following basic principles under the IPPC: sovereignty, necessity, managed risk, minimal impact, transparency, harmonization, non-discrimination, technical justification, cooperation, equivalence of phytosanitary measures and modification. This standard also describes the operational principles under the IPPC, which are related to the establishment, implementation and monitoring of phytosanitary measures, and to the administration of official phytosanitary systems. The operational principles are: pest risk analysis, pest listing, recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence, official control for regulated pests, systems approach, surveillance, pest reporting, phytosanitary certification, phytosanitary integrity and security of consignments, prompt action, emergency measures, provision of a National Plant Protection Organization, dispute settlement, avoidance of undue delays, notification of non-compliance, information exchange and technical assistance.

## BACKGROUND

The original version of ISPM No. 1 (*Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*) was endorsed as a reference standard by the 27<sup>th</sup> Session of FAO Conference in 1993. It was developed at the time the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization (SPS Agreement) was being negotiated. It helped to clarify some of the elements of the SPS Agreement which were under discussion at that time. The SPS Agreement was adopted in April 1994, and experience has been gained since then on its practical application in relation to phytosanitary measures.

The new revised text of the IPPC was adopted by FAO Conference in 1997. It includes many changes to the 1979 version of the Convention. The revision of the IPPC in 1997 has meant that ISPM No. 1 required revision.

In addition to the SPS Agreement, other international conventions exist which also directly or indirectly deal with the protection of plants.

This standard aims to aid in the understanding of the IPPC and provides guidance on the fundamental elements in phytosanitary systems. The principles described below reflect key elements of the IPPC. In some cases, additional guidance on these elements is provided. The standard should be interpreted in accordance with the full text of the IPPC. Quotations from the IPPC are indicated in quotation marks and italics.

## PRINCIPLES

These principles are related to the rights and obligations of contracting parties to the IPPC. They should be considered collectively, in accordance with the full text of the IPPC, and not interpreted individually.

### 1. Basic principles

#### 1.1 Sovereignty

Contracting parties have sovereign authority, in accordance with applicable international agreements, to prescribe and adopt phytosanitary measures to protect plant health within their territories and to determine their appropriate level of protection for plant health.

In relation to phytosanitary measures, the IPPC provides that:

*“With the aim of preventing the introduction and/or spread of regulated pests into their territories, contracting parties shall have sovereign authority to regulate, in accordance with applicable international agreements, the entry of plants and plant products and other regulated articles and, to this end, may:*

- a) prescribe and adopt phytosanitary measures concerning the importation of plants, plant products and other regulated articles, including, for example, inspection, prohibition on importation, and treatment;*
- b) refuse entry or detain, or require treatment, destruction or removal from the territory of the contracting party, of plants, plant products and other regulated articles or consignments thereof that do not comply with the phytosanitary measures prescribed or adopted under subparagraph (a);*
- c) prohibit or restrict the movement of regulated pests into their territories;*
- d) prohibit or restrict the movement of biological control agents and other organisms of phytosanitary concern claimed to be beneficial into their territories.”* (Article VII.1)

In exercising this authority, and *“In order to minimize interference with international trade, ...”* (Article VII.2) each contracting party undertakes to act in conformity with the provisions of Article VII.2 of the IPPC.

#### 1.2 Necessity

Contracting parties may apply phytosanitary measures only where such measures are necessary to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests, or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests. In this regard, the IPPC provides that: *“Contracting parties shall not, under their phytosanitary legislation, take any of the measures specified in ... unless such measures are made necessary by phytosanitary considerations ...”* (Article VII.2a). Article VI.1b states that *“Contracting parties may require phytosanitary measures for quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests, provided that such measures are ...limited to what is necessary to protect plant health...”*. Article VI.2 states that *“Contracting parties shall not require phytosanitary measures for non-regulated pests.”*

#### 1.3 Managed risk

Contracting parties should apply phytosanitary measures based on a policy of managed risk, recognizing that risk of the spread and introduction of pests always exists when importing plants, plant products and other regulated

articles. Contracting parties “... shall institute only phytosanitary measures that are ... consistent with the pest risk involved ...” (Article VII.2g).

#### 1.4 Minimal impact

Contracting parties should apply phytosanitary measures with minimal impact. In this regard, the IPPC provides that they “...shall institute only phytosanitary measures that ... represent the least restrictive measures available, and result in the minimum impediment to the international movement of people, commodities and conveyances.” (Article VII.2g).

#### 1.5 Transparency

Contracting parties shall make relevant information available to other contracting parties as set forth in the IPPC. In this regard, the IPPC states that, for example:

- “... contracting parties shall, immediately upon their adoption, publish and transmit phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions to any contracting party or parties that they believe may be directly affected by such measures.” (Article VII.2b)
- “Contracting parties shall, on request, make available to any contracting party the rationale for phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions.” (Article VII.2c)
- “The contracting parties shall ... cooperate in the exchange of information on plant pests ...” (Article VIII.1 & 1a).
- “Contracting parties shall, to the best of their ability, establish and update lists of regulated pest ... and make such lists available ...” (Article VII.2i)
- “Contracting parties shall, to the best of their ability ... develop and maintain adequate information on pests status .... This information shall be made available ...” (Article VII.2j).

#### 1.6 Harmonization

Contracting parties should cooperate in the development of harmonized standards for phytosanitary measures. In this regard, the IPPC provides that “The contracting parties agree to cooperate in the development of international standards ...” (Article X.1). Contracting parties should “... take into account, as appropriate, international standards when undertaking activities related to this Convention.” (Article X.4). “The contracting parties shall encourage any state or member organization of FAO, not a party to this convention ...to apply phytosanitary measures consistent with the provisions of this Convention and any international standards adopted hereunder.” (Article XVIII).

#### 1.7 Non-discrimination

Contracting parties should, in accordance with the IPPC, apply phytosanitary measures without discrimination between contracting parties if contracting parties can demonstrate that they have the same phytosanitary status and apply identical or equivalent phytosanitary measures.

Contracting parties should also apply phytosanitary measures without discrimination between comparable domestic and international phytosanitary situations.

In these regards, the IPPC provides that:

- phytosanitary measures “... should not be applied in such a way as to constitute either a means of arbitrary or unjustified discrimination or a disguised restriction, particularly on international trade.” (Preamble)
- contracting parties may require phytosanitary measures, provided that such measures are “... no more stringent than measures applied to the same pests, if present within the territory of the importing contracting party.” (Article VI.1a).

#### 1.8 Technical justification

Contracting parties shall technically justify phytosanitary measures “...on the basis of conclusions reached by using an appropriate pest risk analysis or, where applicable, another comparable examination and evaluation of available scientific information.” (Article II.1). In this regard, the IPPC provides that “Contracting parties shall not, under their phytosanitary legislation, take any of the measures specified in paragraph 1 of this Article (VII) unless such measures ... are technically justified.” (Article VII.2a). Article VI.1b also refers to technical justification. Phytosanitary measures which conform to ISPMs are deemed to be technically justified.

#### 1.9 Cooperation

Contracting parties should cooperate with one another to achieve the objectives of the IPPC. In particular, they “...shall cooperate with one another to the fullest practicable extent in achieving the aims of [the] Convention ...” (Article VIII). Contracting parties should also actively participate in bodies established under the IPPC.

#### **1.10 Equivalence of phytosanitary measures**

Importing contracting parties should recognize alternative phytosanitary measures proposed by exporting contracting parties as equivalent when those measures are demonstrated to achieve the appropriate level of protection determined by the importing contracting party.

*Relevant ISPM: No. 24.*

#### **1.11 Modification**

Modifications of phytosanitary measures should be determined on the basis of a new or updated pest risk analysis or relevant scientific information. Contracting parties should not arbitrarily modify phytosanitary measures. “Contracting parties shall, as conditions change, and as new facts become available, ensure that phytosanitary measures are promptly modified or removed if found to be unnecessary.” (Article VII.2h).

### **2. Operational principles**

Operational IPPC principles are related to the establishment, implementation and monitoring of phytosanitary measures, and to the administration of official phytosanitary systems.

#### **2.1 Pest risk analysis**

National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) should, when performing pest risk analysis, base it on biological or other scientific and economic evidence, following the relevant ISPMs. In doing this, threats to biodiversity resulting from effects on plants should also be taken into account.

*Relevant Articles in the IPPC: Preamble, Articles II, IV.2f and VII.2g.*

*Relevant ISPMs: No 2, No. 5 (including supplement No. 2), No. 11 and No. 21.*

#### **2.2 Pest listing**

Contracting parties “... shall, to the best of their ability, establish and update lists of regulated pests ...” (Article VII.2i).

*Relevant Articles in the IPPC: VII.2i.*

*Relevant ISPMs: No. 19.*

#### **2.3 Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence**

Contracting parties should ensure that their phytosanitary measures concerning consignments moving into their territories take into account the status of areas, as designated by the NPPOs of the exporting countries. These may be areas where a regulated pest does not occur or occurs with low prevalence or they may be pest free production sites or pest free places of production.

*Relevant articles in the IPPC: II.*

*Relevant ISPMs: No. 4, No. 8, No. 10 and No. 22.*

#### **2.4 Official control for regulated pests**

When a pest which is present in a country is regulated as a quarantine pest or regulated non-quarantine pest, the contracting party should ensure that the pest is being officially controlled.

*Relevant ISPM: ISPM No. 5 (including supplement No. 1).*

#### **2.5 Systems approach**

Integrated measures for pest risk management, applied in a defined manner, may provide an alternative to single measures to meet the appropriate level of phytosanitary protection of an importing contracting party.

*Relevant ISPM: No. 14.*

#### **2.6 Surveillance**

Contracting parties should collect and record data on pest occurrence and absence to support phytosanitary certification and the technical justification of their phytosanitary measures. In this regard, the IPPC also provides that “Contracting parties shall, to the best of their ability, conduct surveillance for pests and develop and



*maintain adequate information on pest status in order to support categorization of pests, and for the development of appropriate phytosanitary measures.” (Article VII.2j).*

*Relevant Articles in the IPPC : IV.2b, IV.2e and VII.2j.*

*Relevant ISPMs: No. 6 and No. 8.*

## **2.7 Pest reporting**

Contracting parties “... shall cooperate ... to the fullest practicable extent in ... the reporting of the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that may be of immediate or potential danger ...” to other contracting parties (Article VIII.1a). In this respect, they should follow the procedures established in ISPM No. 17 and other relevant procedures.

*Relevant Article in the IPPC: VIII.1a.*

*Relevant ISPM: No. 17.*

## **2.8 Phytosanitary certification**

Contracting parties should exercise due diligence in operating an export certification system and ensuring the accuracy of the information and additional declarations contained in phytosanitary certificates. “*Each contracting party shall make arrangements for phytosanitary certification ...*” (Article V).

*Relevant Articles in the IPPC: IV.2a and V.*

*Relevant ISPMs: No. 7 and No. 12.*

## **2.9 Phytosanitary integrity and security of consignments**

In order to maintain the integrity of consignments after certification, contracting parties, through their NPPO, shall “*ensure through appropriate procedures that the phytosanitary security of consignments after certification regarding composition, substitution and reinfestation is maintained prior to export.*” (Article IV.2g).

*Relevant Articles in the IPPC: IV.2g and V.*

*Relevant ISPMs: No. 7 and No. 12.*

## **2.10 Prompt action**

Contracting parties should ensure that inspection or other phytosanitary procedures required at import “... shall take place as promptly as possible with due regard to ... perishability” of the regulated article (Article VII.2e).

*Relevant Article in the IPPC: VII.2e.*

## **2.11 Emergency measures**

Contracting parties may adopt and/or implement emergency actions, including emergency measures, when a new or unexpected phytosanitary risk is identified<sup>1</sup>. Emergency measures should be temporary in their application. The continuance of the measures should be evaluated by pest risk analysis or other comparable examination as soon as possible, to ensure that the continuance of the measure is technically justified.

*Relevant Article in the IPPC: VII.6.*

*Relevant ISPM: No. 13.*

## **2.12 Provision of a NPPO**

“*Each contracting party shall make provision, to the best of its ability, for an official national plant protection organization with the main responsibilities set out in [Article IV.1].*” (Article IV.1).

*Relevant Article in the IPPC: IV.*

## **2.13 Dispute settlement**

Contracting parties should be open to consultation regarding their phytosanitary measures, when requested by other contracting parties. If there is a dispute regarding the interpretation or application of the IPPC or its ISPMs, or if a contracting party considers that an action by another contracting party is in conflict with the obligations of the IPPC or guidance provided in its ISPMs, “... the contracting parties concerned shall consult among themselves as soon as possible with a view to resolving the dispute.” (Article XIII.1). If the dispute cannot be resolved in this way, then the provisions of Article XIII relating to the settlement of disputes or other means of dispute settlement may be applied<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The term emergency actions in Article VII.6 of the IPPC is interpreted to include emergency measures as defined in ISPM No. 5.

<sup>2</sup> A non-binding dispute settlement procedure has been developed by the IPPC for use by the contracting parties.

*Relevant Article in the IPPC: XIII.*

#### **2.14 Avoidance of undue delays**

When a contracting party requests another contracting party to establish, modify or remove phytosanitary measures, when conditions have changed or new facts have become available, this request should be considered without undue delay. Associated procedures, which include, but are not limited to, pest risk analysis, recognition of pest free areas or recognition of equivalence, should also be performed promptly.

*Relevant Article in the IPPC: VII.2h.*

*Relevant ISPM: No. 24 (section 2.7 and annex I, step 7).*

#### **2.15 Notification of non-compliance**

Importing contracting parties “... shall, as soon as possible, inform the exporting contracting party concerned...of significant instances of non-compliance with phytosanitary certification.” (Article VII.2f).

*Relevant Article in the IPPC: VII.2f.*

*Relevant ISPM: No. 13.*

#### **2.16 Information exchange**

Contracting parties shall, as appropriate, provide information specified in the IPPC, as follows:

- Official contact points (Article VIII.2)
- Description of the NPPO and organizational arrangements of plant protection (Article IV.4)
- Phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions (Article VII.2b) (including specified points of entry - Article VII.2d) and their rationale (Article VII.2c)
- List of regulated pests (Article VII.2i)
- Pest reporting, including occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests (Articles IV.2b and VIII.1a)
- Emergency actions (Article VII.6) and non-compliance (Article VII.2f)
- Pest status (Article VII.2j)
- Technical and biological information necessary for pest risk analysis (to the extent practicable) (Article VIII.1c).

#### **2.17 Technical assistance**

Contracting parties “... agree to promote the provision of technical assistance to contracting parties, especially those that are developing contracting parties ... with the objectives of facilitating the implementation of the Convention.” (Article XX).

*Relevant Article in the IPPC: XX.*

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR  
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

**ISPM No. 25**

***CONSIGNMENTS IN TRANSIT***

**(2006)**



**CONTENTS****INTRODUCTION**

SCOPE

REFERENCES

DEFINITIONS

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

**BACKGROUND****REQUIREMENTS**

- 1. Risk Analysis for the Country of Transit**
  - 1.1 Risk identification
  - 1.2 Risk assessment
  - 1.3 Risk management
    - 1.3.1 Transit requiring no further phytosanitary measures
    - 1.3.2 Transit requiring further phytosanitary measures
    - 1.3.3 Other phytosanitary measures
- 2. Establishment of a Transit System**
- 3. Measures for Non-compliance and Emergency Situations**
- 4. Cooperation and Domestic Communication**
- 5. Non-discrimination**
- 6. Review**
- 7. Documentation**



## INTRODUCTION

### SCOPE

This standard describes procedures to identify, assess and manage phytosanitary risks associated with consignments of regulated articles which pass through a country without being imported, in such a manner that any phytosanitary measures applied in the country of transit are technically justified and necessary to prevent the introduction into and/or spread of pests within that country.

### REFERENCES

- Glossary of phytosanitary terms*, 2006. ISPM No. 5, FAO, Rome.  
*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*, 2004. ISPM No. 20, FAO, Rome.  
*Guidelines for inspection*, 2005. ISPM No. 23, FAO, Rome.  
*Guidelines for pest risk analysis*, 1996. ISPM No. 2, FAO, Rome.  
*Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*, 2001. ISPM No. 12, FAO, Rome.  
*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*, 2001. ISPM No. 13, FAO, Rome.  
*International Plant Protection Convention*, 1997. FAO, Rome.  
*Pest reporting*, 2002. ISPM No. 17, FAO, Rome.  
*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*, 2004. ISPM No. 11, FAO, Rome.

### DEFINITIONS

#### Revised definition

consignment in transit                      A consignment which passes through a country without being imported, and that may be subject to phytosanitary measures

### OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

International trade may involve the movement of consignments of regulated articles which pass through a country without being imported, under Customs<sup>1</sup> control. Such movements may present a phytosanitary risk to the country of transit. Contracting parties to the IPPC may apply measures to consignments in transit through their territories (Articles VII.1c and VII.2g of the IPPC, 1997), provided that the measures are technically justified and necessary to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests (Article VII.4 of the IPPC, 1997).

This standard provides guidelines by which the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) of the country of transit may decide which movements require intervention of the NPPO and are subject to the application of phytosanitary measures, and if so, the type of phytosanitary measures to be applied. In such cases the responsibilities and elements of the transit system are described, together with the need for cooperation and communication, non-discrimination, review and documentation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Customs techniques which cover all aspects of Customs legislation, including annex E1 concerning customs transit and annex E2 concerning transshipment, are harmonized by the “International Convention on the simplification and harmonization of Customs procedures”, also known as the Kyoto Convention, 1973.

## BACKGROUND

Consignments in transit and their conveyances are included within the scope of the IPPC in Article VII and in Article I.

Article VII.1c states:

*“With the aim of preventing the introduction and/or spread of regulated pests into their territories, contracting parties shall have sovereign authority to regulate . . . and, to this end, may . . . prohibit or restrict the movement of regulated pests into their territories”.*

Article VII.4 states:

*“Contracting parties may apply measures specified in this Article to consignments in transit through their territories only where such measures are technically justified and necessary to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests”.*

Article I.4 states:

*“Where appropriate, the provisions of this Convention may be deemed by contracting parties to extend, in addition to plants and plant products, to storage places, packaging, conveyances, containers, soil and any other organism, object or material capable of harbouring or spreading plant pests, particularly where international transportation is involved”.*

Transit involves the movement of consignments of regulated articles which pass through a country (further referred to as country of transit) without being imported. Consignments in transit constitute a potential pathway for the introduction and/or spread of pests to the country of transit.

Consignments in transit may pass through the country of transit remaining enclosed and sealed if necessary, without being split up or combined with other consignments, and without having their packaging changed. Under such conditions, the movement of consignments will, in many cases, not present a phytosanitary risk and will not require phytosanitary measures, especially if the consignments are transported in sealed containers<sup>2</sup>. However, even under such conditions, contingency plans may be required to address unexpected situations, such as an accident during transit.

Consignments and their conveyances passing through a country may, however, also be transported or handled in such a manner that they do present a phytosanitary risk to that country. This may, for example, be the case when consignments are transported open rather than enclosed, or when they do not pass directly through the country but are held for a period of storage, or are split up, combined or repackaged, or if the means of transport changes (e.g. from ship to railway). In such cases, phytosanitary measures may be applied in the country of transit to prevent the introduction of pests into, and/or their spread within, that country.

It should be noted that the term ‘transit’ is not only used for phytosanitary purposes but is also the accepted name for the standard procedure for moving goods under Customs control. Customs control may include document verification, tracking (e.g. electronic), sealing, control of carrier and entry/exit control. Customs control by itself is not intended to guarantee phytosanitary integrity and security of consignments and thus will not necessarily offer protection against the introduction and/or spread of pests.

Transshipment is a particular aspect of transport of consignments between countries. It refers to the transfer of consignments from one conveyance (means of transport) to another (e.g. ship to ship at a seaport) during the transportation process. Usually transshipment takes place under Customs control within an area specified by Customs. Transshipment may occur in a transit country and is thus covered by this standard.

## REQUIREMENTS

### 1. Risk Analysis for the Country of Transit

Risk analysis related to consignments in transit would be facilitated by the sharing of relevant pest risk analysis (PRA) information already obtained and/or developed by one or both of the NPPOs of the importing and exporting contracting parties.

---

<sup>2</sup> A standard, fully enclosed and secure transport container as commonly used in ocean going trade.



### 1.1 Risk identification

In order to identify potential phytosanitary risks related to consignments in transit, the NPPO of the country of transit (from this point onwards, “the NPPO”) should collect and review relevant information.

Elements of such information may include:

- procedures applied by Customs and other relevant services
- classes of commodities or regulated articles in transit and their country of origin
- means and methods of transport for consignments in transit
- regulated pests associated with the consignments in transit
- host distribution in the country of transit
- knowledge of transit route in the country of transit
- possibilities that pests may escape from consignments
- existing phytosanitary measures for consignments of commodities in transit
- types of packaging
- conditions of transport (refrigeration, modified atmosphere, etc.).

The NPPO may decide that consignments in transit that pose no potential phytosanitary risk, for instance when no pests regulated by the country of transit are associated with the consignments in transit, may move or continue to move without phytosanitary procedures.

The NPPO may also decide that consignments in transit that pose negligible phytosanitary risks, for example conveyances or packaging which are fully enclosed, sealed and secure, or when pests are regulated by the country of transit and are unlikely to escape from the consignment in transit, may move or continue to move without phytosanitary procedures..

If potential phytosanitary risks are identified, risk assessment for particular pests or commodities in transit is needed in order to identify the necessity and technical justification of any phytosanitary measure.

Only those phytosanitary risks which concern regulated pests of the country of transit or those pests that are under emergency action in that country should be considered.

### 1.2 Risk assessment

An assessment of the phytosanitary risks associated with the transit pathway should normally focus only on evaluating the probability of pests being introduced or spread from consignments in transit. The associated potential economic consequences should have been evaluated previously in the case of an existing regulated pest and therefore should not need to be repeated.

Guidance for the assessment of the probability of introduction and spread of a pest is provided in ISPM No. 11 (2004, *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*), in particular section 2.2. For consignments in transit, the following information may also be relevant:

- pathways for introduction and/or spread of regulated pests from the consignments in transit
- dispersal mechanism and mobility of the relevant pests
- means of transport (e.g. truck, rail, airplane, ship, etc.)
- phytosanitary security of the conveyance (e.g. closed, sealed, etc.)
- existence and type of packaging
- changes of configuration (e.g. combined, split, repacked)
- duration of transit or storage, and storage conditions
- route taken by the consignment prior to and within the country of transit
- frequency, volume and season of transit.

In cases where the NPPO, through risk assessment, has identified phytosanitary risks, pest risk management options can be considered.

### 1.3 Risk management

Based on risk assessment, consignments in transit may be classified by the NPPO into two broad risk management categories:

- transit requiring no further phytosanitary measures, or
- transit requiring further phytosanitary measures.

Further details on risk management are provided in ISPM No. 11 (2004, *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*).

### 1.3.1 Transit requiring no further phytosanitary measures

The NPPO, through the assessment of phytosanitary risk, may determine that Customs control alone is adequate. If this is the case, the NPPO should not apply any phytosanitary measures in addition to Customs control.

### 1.3.2 Transit requiring further phytosanitary measures

The risk assessment for consignments in transit may conclude that specific phytosanitary measures are necessary. These may include the following:

- verification of consignment identity or integrity (further details provided in ISPM No. 23: *Guidelines for inspection*)
- phytosanitary movement document (e.g. transit permit)
- phytosanitary certificates (with transit requirements)
- designated entry and exit points
- verification of exit of the consignment
- mode of transport and designated transit routes
- regulation of the changes of configuration (e.g. combined, split, repacked)
- use of NPPO-prescribed equipment or facilities
- Customs facilities recognized by the NPPO
- phytosanitary treatments (e.g. pre-shipment treatments, treatments when consignment integrity is doubtful)
- consignment tracking while in transit
- physical conditions (e.g. refrigeration, pest-proof packaging and/or conveyance preventing spillage)
- use of NPPO-specific seals for conveyances or consignment
- specific carrier's emergency management plans
- transit time or season limits
- documentation in addition to that required by Customs
- inspection of consignment by NPPO
- packaging
- disposal of waste.

Such phytosanitary measures should only be applied for regulated pests of the country of transit or those pests that are under emergency action in that country.

### 1.3.3 Other phytosanitary measures

When appropriate phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit are not available or are impossible to apply, the NPPO may require that such consignments are subject to the same requirements as imports, which may include prohibition.

If consignments in transit are stored or repackaged in such a way that they present a phytosanitary risk, the NPPO may decide that the consignments should meet import requirements or subject them to other appropriate phytosanitary measures.

## 2. Establishment of a Transit System

The contracting party may develop a transit system for phytosanitary control of consignments in transit with the NPPO, Customs and other relevant authorities of their country as collaborators. The objective of such a transit system is to prevent the introduction into and/or spread within the country of transit of regulated pests associated with consignments in transit and their conveyances. Transit systems require a basis of a regulatory framework of phytosanitary legislation, regulations and procedures. The transit system is operated by the NPPO, Customs and other relevant authorities in cooperation as appropriate, and should ensure that prescribed phytosanitary measures are applied.

The NPPO has responsibility for the phytosanitary aspects of the transit system and establishes and implements phytosanitary measures necessary to manage phytosanitary risks, taking into account the transit procedures of Customs.

### **3. Measures for Non-compliance and Emergency Situations**

The transit system may include measures, established by the NPPO, for non-compliance and emergency situations (for example, accidents in the country of transit which could lead to the unexpected escape of a regulated pest from a consignment moving in transit). ISPM No. 13 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*) contains specific guidelines for the country of transit for issuing notices of non-compliance to the exporting country and, where appropriate, to the country of destination.

### **4. Cooperation and Domestic Communication**

Cooperation between NPPOs and Customs and other authorities (for example, port authorities) is essential to establish and/or maintain an effective transit system and identify consignments of regulated articles in transit. Therefore specific agreement with Customs may be needed for the NPPO to be informed of, and have access to, consignments under Customs control.

The NPPO may also establish cooperation and maintain communication with all stakeholders involved in transit as appropriate.

### **5. Non-discrimination**

Consignments in transit should not be subject to more restrictive phytosanitary measures than those applied to consignments of the same phytosanitary status imported into that country of transit.

### **6. Review**

The NPPO should, as necessary, review and adjust the transit system, the types of consignments in transit and the associated phytosanitary risks, in cooperation with relevant authorities and stakeholders as appropriate.

### **7. Documentation**

Any transit system should be adequately described and documented.

Phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions for consignments in transit should be made available, upon request, to any contracting party or parties that may be directly affected by such measures.



**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR  
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

**ISPM No. 26**

***ESTABLISHMENT OF PEST FREE AREAS FOR  
FRUIT FLIES (TEPHRITIDAE)***

**(2006)**



**CONTENTS****INTRODUCTION**

SCOPE

REFERENCES

DEFINITIONS

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

**BACKGROUND****REQUIREMENTS****1. General Requirements**

- 1.1 Public awareness
- 1.2 Documentation and record keeping
- 1.3 Supervision activities

**2. Specific Requirements**

- 2.1 Characterization of the FF-PFA
- 2.2 Establishment of the FF-PFA
  - 2.2.1 Buffer zone
  - 2.2.2 Surveillance activities prior to establishment
    - 2.2.2.1 Trapping procedures
    - 2.2.2.2 Fruit sampling procedures
  - 2.2.3 Controls on the movement of regulated articles
  - 2.2.4 Additional technical information for establishment of a FF-PFA
  - 2.2.5 Domestic declaration of pest freedom
- 2.3 Maintenance of the FF-PFA
  - 2.3.1 Surveillance for maintenance of the FF-PFA
  - 2.3.2 Controls on the movement of regulated articles
  - 2.3.3 Corrective actions (including response to an outbreak)
- 2.4 Suspension, reinstatement or loss of a FF-PFA status
  - 2.4.1 Suspension
  - 2.4.2 Reinstatement
  - 2.4.3 Loss of FF-PFA status

**ANNEX 1**

Guidelines on corrective action plans

**APPENDIX 1**

Guidelines on trapping procedures

**APPENDIX 2**

Guidelines for fruit sampling





## INTRODUCTION

### SCOPE

This standard provides guidelines for the establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance, and for the maintenance of their pest free status.

### REFERENCES

- Determination of pest status in an area*, 1998. ISPM No. 8, FAO, Rome.  
*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*, 2006. ISPM No. 5, FAO, Rome.  
*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*, 1998. ISPM No. 9, FAO, Rome.  
*Guidelines for surveillance*, 1997. ISPM No. 6, FAO, Rome.  
*International Plant Protection Convention*, 1997. FAO, Rome.  
*Pest reporting*, 2002. ISPM No. 17, FAO, Rome.  
*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*, 1996. ISPM No. 4, FAO, Rome.  
*Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*, 1999. ISPM No. 10, FAO, Rome.

### DEFINITIONS

Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in the present standard can be found in ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

### OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

The general requirements for establishing a fruit fly-pest free area (FF-PFA) include:

- the preparation of a public awareness programme
- the management elements of the system (documentation and review systems, record keeping), and
- supervision activities.

The major elements of the FF-PFA are:

- the characterization of the FF-PFA
- the establishment and maintenance of the FF-PFA.

These elements include the surveillance activities of trapping and fruit sampling, and official control on the movement of regulated articles. Guidance on surveillance and fruit sampling activities is provided in Appendices 1 and 2.

Additional elements include: corrective action planning, suspension, loss of pest free status and reinstatement (if possible) of the FF-PFA. Corrective action planning is described in Annex 1.

## BACKGROUND

Fruit flies are a very important group of pests for many countries due to their potential to cause damage in fruits and to their potential to restrict access to international markets for plant products that can host fruit flies. The high probability of introduction of fruit flies associated with a wide range of hosts results in restrictions imposed by many importing countries to accept fruits from areas in which these pests are established. For these reasons, there is a need for an ISPM that provides specific guidance for the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies.

A pest free area is “an area in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained” (ISPM No. 5: *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*). Areas initially free from fruit flies may remain naturally free from fruit flies due to the presence of barriers or climate conditions, and/or maintained free through movement restrictions and related measures (though fruit flies have the potential to establish there) or may be made free by an eradication programme (ISPM No. 9: *Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*). ISPM No. 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) describes different types of pest free areas and provides general guidance on the establishment of pest free areas. However, a need for additional guidance on establishment and maintenance of pest free areas specifically for fruit flies (fruit fly-pest free areas, FF-PFA) was recognized. This standard describes additional requirements for establishment and maintenance of FF-PFAs. The target pests for which this standard was developed include insects of the order Diptera, family Tephritidae, of the genera *Anastrepha*, *Bactrocera*, *Ceratitis*, *Dacus*, *Rhagoletis* and *Toxotrypana*.

The establishment and maintenance of a FF-PFA implies that no other phytosanitary measures specific for the target species are required for host commodities within the PFA.

## REQUIREMENTS

### 1. General Requirements

The concepts and provisions of ISPM No. 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*) apply to the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for all pests including fruit flies and therefore ISPM No. 4 should be referred to in conjunction with this standard.

Phytosanitary measures and specific procedures as further described in this standard may be required for the establishment and maintenance of FF-PFA. The decision to establish a formal FF-PFA may be made based on the technical factors provided in this standard. They include components such as: pest biology, size of the area, pest population levels and dispersal pathway, ecological conditions, geographical isolation and availability of methods for pest eradication.

FF-PFAs may be established in accordance with this ISPM under a variety of different situations. Some of them require the application of the full range of elements provided by this standard, others require only the application of some of these elements.

In areas where the fruit flies concerned are not capable of establishment because of climatic, geographical or other reasons, absence should be recognized according to the first paragraph of section 3.1.2 of ISPM No. 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*). If, however, the fruit flies are detected and can cause economic damage during a season (Article VII.3 of the IPPC), corrective actions should be applied in order to allow the maintenance of a FF-PFA.

In areas where the fruit flies are capable of establishment and known to be absent, general surveillance in accordance with section 3.1.2 of ISPM No. 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*), is normally sufficient for the purpose of delimiting and establishing a pest free area. Where appropriate, import requirements and/or domestic movement restrictions against the introduction of the relevant fruit fly species into the area may be required to maintain the area free from the pest.

#### 1.1 Public awareness

A public awareness programme is most important in areas where the risk of introduction is higher. An important factor in the establishment and maintenance of FF-PFAs is the support and participation of the public (especially the local community) close to the FF-PFA and individuals that travel to or through the area, including parties with direct and indirect interests. The public and stakeholders should be informed through different forms of media (written, radio, TV) of the importance of establishing and maintaining the pest free status of the area, and of avoiding the introduction or re-introduction of potentially infested host material. This may contribute to and

improve compliance with the phytosanitary measures for the FF-PFA. The public awareness and phytosanitary education programme should be ongoing and may include information on:

- permanent or random checkpoints
- posting signs at entry points and transit corridors
- disposal bins for host material
- leaflets or brochures with information on the pest and the pest free area
- publications (e.g. print, electronic media)
- systems to regulate fruit movement
- non-commercial hosts
- security of the traps
- penalties for non-compliance, where applicable.

### **1.2 Documentation and record keeping**

The phytosanitary measures used for the establishment and maintenance of FF-PFA should be adequately documented as part of phytosanitary procedures. They should be reviewed and updated regularly, including corrective actions, if required (see also ISPM No. 4: *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*).

The records of surveys, detections, occurrences or outbreaks and results of other operational procedures should be retained for at least 24 months. Such records should be made available to the NPPO of the importing country on request.

### **1.3 Supervision activities**

The FF-PFA programme, including regulatory control, surveillance procedures (for example trapping, fruit sampling) and corrective action planning should comply with officially approved procedures.

Such procedures should include official delegation of responsibility assigned to key personnel, for example:

- a person with defined authority and responsibility to ensure that the systems/procedures are implemented and maintained appropriately;
- entomologist(s) with responsibility for the authoritative identification of fruit flies to species level.

The effectiveness of the programme should be monitored periodically by the NPPO of the exporting country, through review of documentation and procedures.

## **2. Specific Requirements**

### **2.1 Characterization of the FF-PFA**

The determining characteristics of the FF-PFA include:

- the target fruit fly species and its distribution within or adjacent to the area
- commercial and non-commercial host species
- delimitation of the area (detailed maps or GPS coordinates showing the boundaries, natural barriers, entry points and host area locations, and, where necessary, buffer zones)
- climate, for example rainfall, relative humidity, temperature, prevailing wind speed and direction.

Further guidance on establishing and describing a PFA is provided in ISPM No. 4 (*Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*).

### **2.2 Establishment of the FF-PFA**

The following should be developed and implemented:

- surveillance activities for establishment of the FF-PFA
- delimitation of the FF-PFA
- phytosanitary measures related to movement of host material or regulated articles
- pest suppression and eradication techniques as appropriate.

The establishment of buffer zones may also be necessary (as described in Section 2.2.1) and it may be useful to collect additional technical information during the establishment of the FF-PFA.

### 2.2.1 Buffer zone

In areas where geographic isolation is not considered adequate to prevent introduction to or reinfestation of a PFA or where there are no other means of preventing fruit fly movement to the PFA, a buffer zone should be established. Factors that should be considered in the establishment and effectiveness of a buffer zone include:

- pest suppression techniques which may be used to reduce the fruit fly population, including:
  - use of selective insecticide-bait
  - spraying
  - sterile insect technique
  - male annihilation technique
  - biological control
  - mechanical control, etc.
- host availability, cropping systems, natural vegetation
- climatic conditions
- the geography of the area
- capacity for natural spread through identified pathways
- the ability to implement a system to monitor the effectiveness of buffer zone establishment (e.g. trapping network).

### 2.2.2 Surveillance activities prior to establishment

A regular survey programme should be established and implemented. Trapping is the preferred option to determine fruit fly absence or presence in an area for lure/bait responsive species. However, fruit sampling activities may sometimes be required to complement the trapping programme in cases where trapping is less effective, for example when species are less responsive to specific lures.

Prior to the establishment of a FF-PFA, surveillance should be undertaken for a period determined by the climatic characteristics of the area, and as technically appropriate for at least 12 consecutive months in the FF-PFA in all relevant areas of commercial and non-commercial host plants to demonstrate that the pest is not present in the area. There should be no populations detected during the surveillance activities prior to establishment. A single adult detection, depending on its status (in accordance with ISPM No. 8: *Determination of pest status in an area*), may not disqualify an area from subsequent designation as a FF-PFA. For qualifying the area as a pest free area, there should be no detection of an immature specimen, two or more fertile adults, or an inseminated female of the target species during the survey period. There are different trapping and fruit sampling regimes for different fruit fly species. Surveys should be conducted using the guidelines in Appendices 1 and 2. These guidelines may be revised as trap, lure and fruit sampling efficiencies improve.

#### 2.2.2.1 Trapping procedures

This section contains general information on trapping procedures for target fruit fly species. Trapping conditions may vary depending on, for example, the target fruit fly and environmental conditions. More information is provided in Appendix 1. When planning for trapping, the following should be considered:

##### Trap type and lures

Several types of traps and lures have been developed over decades to survey fruit fly populations. Fly catches differ depending on the types of lure used. The type of trap chosen for a survey depends on the target fruit fly species and the nature of the attractant. The most widely used traps include Jackson, McPhail, Steiner, open bottom dry trap (OBDT), yellow panel traps, which may use specific attractants (para-pheromone or pheromone lures that are male specific), or food or host odours (liquid protein or dry synthetic). Liquid protein is used to catch a wide range of different fruit fly species and capture both females and males, with a slightly higher percentage of females captured. However identification of the fruit flies can be difficult due to decomposition within the liquid bait. In traps such as McPhail, ethylene glycol may be added to delay decomposition. Dry synthetic protein baits are female biased, capture less non-target organisms and, when used in dry traps, may prevent premature decomposition of captured specimens.

##### Trap density

Trap density (number of traps per unit area) is a critical factor for effective fruit fly surveys and it should be designed based on target fruit fly species, trap efficiency, cultivation practices, and other biotic and abiotic factors. Density may change depending on the programme phase, with different densities required during the establishment of FF-PFA and the maintenance phase. Trap density also depends on the risk associated with potential pathways for entry into the designated PFA.

**Trap deployment (determination of the specific location of the traps)**

In a FF-PFA programme, an extensive trapping network should be deployed over the entire area. The trapping network layout will depend on the characteristics of the area, host distribution and the biology of the fruit fly of concern. One of the most important features of trap placement is the selection of a proper location and trap site within the host plant. The application of global positioning systems (GPS) and geographic information systems (GIS) are useful tools for management of a trapping network.

Trap location should take into consideration the presence of the preferred hosts (primary, secondary and occasional hosts) of the target species. Because the pest is associated with maturing fruit, the location including rotation of traps should follow the sequence of fruit maturity in host plants. Consideration should be given to commercial management practices in the area where host trees are selected. For example, the regular application of insecticides (and/or other chemicals) to selected host trees may have a false-negative effect on the trapping programme.

**Trap servicing**

The frequency of trap servicing (maintaining and refreshing the traps) during the period of trapping should depend on the:

- longevity of baits (attractant persistency)
- retention capacity
- rate of catch
- season of fruit fly activity
- placement of the traps
- biology of the species
- environmental conditions.

**Trap inspection (checking the traps for fruit flies)**

The frequency of regular inspection during the period of trapping should depend on:

- expected fruit fly activity (biology of the species)
- response of the target fruit fly in relation to host status at different times of the year
- relative number of target and non-target fruit flies expected to be caught in a trap
- type of trap used
- physical condition of the flies in the trap (and whether they can be identified).

In certain traps, specimens may degrade quickly making identification difficult or impossible unless the traps are checked frequently.

**Identification capability**

NPPOs should have in place, or have ready access to, adequate infrastructure and trained personnel to identify detected specimens of the target species in an expeditious manner, preferably within 48 hours. Continuous access to expertise may be necessary during the establishment phase or when implementing corrective actions.

**2.2.2.2 Fruit sampling procedures**

Fruit sampling may be used as a surveillance method in combination with trapping where trapping is less effective. It should be noted that fruit sampling is particularly effective in small-scale delimiting surveys in an outbreak area. However, it is labour-intensive, time consuming and expensive due to the destruction of fruit. It is important that fruit samples should be held in suitable condition to maintain the viability of all immature stages of fruit fly in infested fruit for identification purpose.

**Host preference**

Fruit sampling should take into consideration the presence of primary, secondary and occasional hosts of the target species. Fruit sampling should also take into account the maturity of fruit, apparent signs of infestation in fruit, and commercial practices (e.g. application of insecticides) in the area.

**Focusing on high risk areas**

Fruit sampling should be targeted on areas likely to have presence of infested fruits such as:

- urban areas
- abandoned orchards
- rejected fruit at packing facilities

- fruit markets
- sites with a high concentration of primary hosts
- entrance points into the FF-PFA, where appropriate.

The sequence of hosts that are likely to be infested by the target fruit fly species in the area should be used as fruit sampling areas.

### **Sample size and selection**

Factors to be considered include:

- the required level of confidence
- the availability of primary host material in the field
- fruits with symptoms on trees, fallen or rejected fruit (for example at packing facilities), where appropriate.

### **Procedures for processing sampled fruit for inspection**

Fruit samples collected in the field should be brought to a facility for holding, fruit dissection, pest recovery and identification. Fruit should be labeled, transported and held in a secure manner to avoid mixing fruits from different samples.

### **Identification capability**

NPPOs should have in place, or have ready access to, adequate infrastructure and trained personnel to identify fruit fly immature stages and emerged adults of the target species in an expeditious manner.

#### **2.2.3 Controls on the movement of regulated articles**

Movement controls of regulated articles should be implemented to prevent the entry of target pests into the FF-PFA. These controls depend on the assessed risks (after identification of likely pathways and regulated articles) and may include:

- listing of the target fruit fly species on a quarantine pest list
- regulation of the pathways and articles that require control to maintain the FF-PFA
- domestic restrictions to control the movement of regulated articles into the FF-PFA
- inspection of regulated articles, examination of relevant documentation as appropriate and, where necessary for cases of non-compliance, the application of appropriate phytosanitary measures (e.g. treatment, refusal or destruction).

#### **2.2.4 Additional technical information for establishment of a FF-PFA**

Additional information may be useful during the establishment phase of FF-PFAs. This includes:

- historical records of detection, biology and population dynamics of the target pest(s), and survey activities for the designated target pest(s) in the FF-PFA
- the results of phytosanitary measures taken as part of actions following detections of fruit flies in the FF-PFA
- records of the commercial production of host crops in the area, an estimate of non-commercial production and the presence of wild host material
- lists of the other fruit fly species of economic importance that may be present in the FF-PFA.

#### **2.2.5 Domestic declaration of pest freedom**

The NPPO should verify the fruit fly free status of the area (in accordance with ISPM No. 8: *Determination of pest status in an area*) specifically by confirming compliance with the procedures set up in accordance with this standard (surveillance and controls). The NPPO should declare and notify the establishment of the FF-PFA, as appropriate.

In order to be able to verify the fruit fly free status in the area and for purposes of internal management, the continuing FF-PFA status should be checked after the PFA has been established and any phytosanitary measures for the maintenance of the FF-PFA have been put in place.

### **2.3 Maintenance of the FF-PFA**

In order to maintain the FF-PFA status, the NPPO should continue to monitor the operation of the surveillance and control activities, continuously verifying the pest free status.

### 2.3.1 Surveillance for maintenance of the FF-PFA

After verifying and declaring the FF-PFA, the official surveillance programme should be continued at a level assessed as being necessary for maintenance of the FF-PFA. Regular technical reports of the survey activities should be generated (for example monthly). Requirements for this are essentially the same as for establishment of the FF-PFA (see Section 2.2) but with differences in density and trap locations dependent upon the assessed level of risk of introduction of the target species.

### 2.3.2 Controls on the movement of regulated articles

These are the same as for establishment of the FF-PFA (provided in Section 2.2.3).

### 2.3.3 Corrective actions (including response to an outbreak)

The NPPO should have prepared plans for corrective actions that may be implemented if the target pest(s) is detected in the FF-PFA or in host material from that area (detailed guidelines are provided in Annex 1), or if faulty procedures are found. This plan should include components or systems to cover:

- outbreak declaration according to criteria in ISPM No. 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*) and notification
- delimiting surveillance (trapping and fruit sampling) to determine the infested area under corrective actions
- implementation of control measures
- further surveillance
- criteria for the reinstatement of freedom of the area affected by the outbreak
- responses to interceptions.

A corrective action plan should be initiated as soon as possible and in any case within 72 hours of the detection (of an adult or immature stage of the target pest).

## 2.4 Suspension, reinstatement or loss of a FF-PFA status

### 2.4.1 Suspension

The status of the FF-PFA or the affected part within the FF-PFA should be suspended when an outbreak of the target fruit fly occurs or based on one of the following triggers: detection of an immature specimen of the target fruit fly, two or more fertile adults as demonstrated by scientific evidence, or an inseminated female within a defined period and distance. Suspension may also be applied if procedures are found to be faulty (for example inadequate trapping, host movement controls or treatments).

If the criteria for an outbreak are met, this should result in the implementation of the corrective action plan as specified in this standard and immediate notification to interested importing countries' NPPOs (see ISPM No. 17: *Pest reporting*). The whole or part of the FF-PFA may be suspended or revoked. In most cases a suspension radius will delimit the affected part of the FF-PFA. The radius will depend on the biology and ecology of the target fruit fly. The same radius will generally apply for all FF-PFAs for a given target species unless scientific evidence supports any proposed deviation. Where a suspension is put in place, the criteria for lifting the suspension should be made clear. Interested importing countries' NPPOs should be informed of any change in FF-PFA status.

### 2.4.2 Reinstatement

Reinstatement should be based on requirements for establishment with the following conditions:

- no further detection of the target pest species for a period determined by the biology of the species and the prevailing environmental conditions<sup>1</sup>, as confirmed by surveillance or;
- in the case of a fault in the procedures, only when the fault has been corrected.

### 2.4.3 Loss of FF-PFA status

If the control measures are not effective and the pest becomes established in the whole area (the area recognized as pest free), the status of the FF-PFA should be lost. In order to achieve again the FF-PFA, the procedures of establishment and maintenance outlined in this standard should be followed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The period starts from the last detection. For some species, no further detection should occur for at least three life cycles, however the required period should be based on scientific information including that provided by the surveillance systems in place.

## GUIDELINES ON CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS

The detection of a single fruit fly (adult or immature) of the target species in the FF-PFA should trigger enforcement of a corrective action plan.

In case of an outbreak, the objective of the corrective action plan is to ensure eradication of the pest to enable reinstatement of pest status in the affected area into the FF-PFA.

The corrective action plan should be prepared taking into account the biology of the target fruit fly species, the geography of the FF-PFA area, climatic conditions and host distribution within the area.

The elements required for implementation of a corrective action plan include:

- legal framework under which the corrective action plan can be applied
- criteria for the declaration of an outbreak
- time scales for the initial response
- technical criteria for delimiting trapping, fruit sampling, application of the eradication actions and establishment of regulatory measures
- availability of sufficient operational resources
- identification capability
- effective communication within the NPPO and with the NPPO (s) of the importing country(s), including provision of contact details of all parties involved.

### Actions to apply the corrective action plan

#### 1. Determination of the phytosanitary status of the detection (actionable or non actionable)

1.1. If the detection is a transient non actionable occurrence (ISPM No. 8: *Determination of pests status in an area*), no further action is required.

1.2. If the detection of a target pest may be actionable, a delimiting survey, which includes additional traps, and usually fruit sampling as well as an increased trap inspection rate, should be implemented immediately after the detection to assess whether the detection represents an outbreak, which will determine necessary responsive actions. If a population is present, this action is also used to determine the size of the affected area.

#### 2. Suspension of FF-PFA status

If after detection it is determined that an outbreak has occurred or any of the triggers specified in Section 2.4.1 is reached, the FF-PFA status in the affected area should be suspended. The affected area may be limited to parts of the FF-PFA or may be the whole FF-PFA.

#### 3. Implementation of control measures in the affected area

As per ISPM No. 9 (*Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*), specific corrective or eradication actions should be implemented immediately in the affected area(s) and adequately communicated to the community. Eradication actions may include:

- selective insecticide-bait treatments
- sterile fly release
- total harvest of fruit in the trees
- male annihilation technique
- destruction of infested fruit
- soil treatment (chemical or physical)
- insecticide application.

Phytosanitary measures should be immediately enforced for control of movement of regulated articles that can host fruit flies. These measures may include cancellation of shipments of fruit commodities from the affected area and as appropriate, fruit disinfestation and the operation of road blocks to prevent the movement of infested fruit from the affected area to the rest of the pest free area. Other measures could be adopted if agreed by the importing country, for example treatment, increased surveys, supplementary trapping.

#### 4. Criteria for reinstatement of a FF-PFA after an outbreak and actions to be taken

The criteria for determining that eradication has been successful are specified in section 2.4.2 and should be included in the corrective action plan for the target fruit fly. The time period will depend on the biology of the



species and the prevailing environmental conditions. Once the criteria have been fulfilled the following actions should be taken:

- notification of NPPOs of importing countries
- reinstatement of normal surveillance levels
- reinstatement of the FF-PFA.

5. Notification of relevant agencies

Relevant NPPOs and other agencies should be kept informed of any change in FF-PFA status as appropriate, and IPPC pest reporting obligations observed (ISPM No. 17: Pest reporting).

**APPENDIX 1**

This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard. The publication below is widely available, easily accessible and generally recognized as authoritative.

**GUIDELINES ON TRAPPING PROCEDURES**

Information about trapping is available in the following publication of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA): *Trapping Guidelines for area-wide fruit fly programmes*, IAEA/FAO-TG/FFP, 2003. IAEA, Vienna.

## APPENDIX 2

This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the standard.

**GUIDELINES FOR FRUIT SAMPLING**

Information about sampling is available in the references listed below. The list is not exhaustive.

- Enkerlin, W.R.; Lopez, L.; Celedonio, H. (1996) Increased accuracy in discrimination between captured wild unmarked and released dyed-marked adults in fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) sterile release programs. *Journal of Economic Entomology* **89**(4), 946-949.
- Enkerlin W.; Reyes, J. (1984) *Evaluacion de un sistema de muestreo de frutos para la deteccion de Ceratitis capitata (Wiedemann)*. 11 Congreso Nacional de Manejo Integrado de Plagas. Asociacion Guatemalteca de Manejo Integrado de Plagas (AGMIP). Ciudad Guatemala, Guatemala, Centro America.
- Programa Moscamed (1990) Manual de Operaciones de Campo. Talleres Graficos de la Nacion. Gobierno de Mexico. SAGAR//DGSV.
- Programa regional Moscamed (2003) Manual del sistema de detección por muestreo de la mosca del mediterráneo. 26 pp.
- Shukla, R.P.; Prasad, U.G. (1985) Population fluctuations of the Oriental fruit fly, *Dacus dorsalis* (Hendel) in relation to hosts and abiotic factors. *Tropical Pest Management* **31**(4)273-275.
- Tan, K.H.; Serit, M. (1994) Adult population dynamics of *Bactrocera dorsalis* (Diptera: Tephritidae) in relation to host phenology and weather in two villages of Penang Island, Malaysia. *Environmental Entomology* **23**(2), 267-275.
- Wong, T.Y.; Nishimoto, J.I.; Mochizuki, N. (1983) Infestation patterns of Mediterranean fruit fly and the Oriental fruit fly (Diptera: Tephritidae) in the Kula area of Mavi, Hawaii. *Environmental Entomology* **12**(4): 1031-1039. IV Chemical control.



**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR  
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

**ISPM No. 27**

***DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOLS FOR REGULATED  
PESTS***

**(2006)**



**CONTENTS****INTRODUCTION**

SCOPE

REFERENCES

DEFINITIONS

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

**BACKGROUND****PURPOSE AND USE OF DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOLS****REQUIREMENTS****1. General requirements for diagnostic protocols****2. Specific requirements for a diagnostic protocol**

2.1 Pest information

2.2 Taxonomic information

2.3 Detection

2.4 Identification

2.5 Records

2.6 Contact points for further information

2.7 Acknowledgements

2.8 References

**3. Publication of diagnostic protocols****APPENDIX 1**

Main elements of procedures for diagnostic protocols







## BACKGROUND

Proper pest detection and pest identification are crucial for the appropriate application of phytosanitary measures (see for example ISPM No. 4: *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*; ISPM No. 6: *Guidelines for surveillance*; ISPM No. 7: *Export certification system*; ISPM No. 9: *Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*; and ISPM No 20: *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*). In particular, contracting parties need proper diagnostic procedures for determination of pest status and pest reporting (ISPM No. 8: *Determination of pest status in an area*; ISPM No. 17: *Pest reporting*), and the diagnosis of pests in imported consignments (ISPM No. 13: *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*).

National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) have produced diagnostic protocols for regulated pests in order to adequately fulfil responsibilities according to Article IV of the IPPC (1997), in particular regarding surveillance, import inspections and export certification. In response to the need for regional harmonization, several Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) have developed a significant number of regional diagnostic standards. This underlines the need for international harmonization, and those national and regional standards may form the basis for international protocols. Subsequently, the ICPM, at its Sixth session in 2004, recognized that there was a need for international diagnostic protocols within the framework of the IPPC and approved the formation of a Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) for that purpose.

## PURPOSE AND USE OF DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOLS

The purpose of harmonized diagnostic protocols is to support efficient phytosanitary measures in a wide range of circumstances and to enhance the mutual recognition of diagnostic results by NPPOs, which may also facilitate trade. Furthermore these protocols should aid the development of expertise and technical cooperation, and they may also be relevant to the accreditation and/or approval of laboratories.

In addition to the methods included in the diagnostic protocols presented in the annexes to this standard, NPPOs may use other methods for diagnosing the same pests (for example based on bilateral agreements). The protocols and their components annexed to this ISPM are considered to have the status of an ISPM or part thereof (see section 3 of this ISPM and article X of the IPPC). Therefore, contracting parties should take into account, as appropriate, these diagnostic protocols when using or requiring the use of diagnostic methods in particular where other contracting parties may be affected.

Diagnostic protocols describe procedures and methods for the detection and identification of regulated pests that are relevant to international trade.

Diagnostic protocols may be used in different circumstances that may require methods with different characteristics. Examples of such circumstances grouped according to an increased need for high sensitivity, specificity and reliability are:

- routine diagnosis of a pest widely established in a country
- general surveillance for pest status
- testing of material for compliance with certification schemes
- surveillance for latent infection by pests
- surveillance as part of an official control or eradication programme
- pest diagnostic associated with phytosanitary certification
- routine diagnosis for pests found in imported consignments
- detection of a pest in an area where it is not known to occur
- cases where a pest is identified by a laboratory for the first time
- detection of a pest in a consignment originating in a country where the pest is declared to be absent.

For example, in the case of routine diagnosis, the speed and cost of a test method may be more relevant than sensitivity or specificity. However, the identification of a pest by a laboratory or in an area for the first time may require methods with a high level of specificity and reproducibility. The significance of the outcome of a diagnosis is often dependent on proper sampling procedures. Such procedures are addressed by other ISPMs (under preparation).

Diagnostic protocols provide the minimum requirements for reliable diagnosis of regulated pests. This may be achieved by a single method or a combination of methods. Diagnostic protocols also provide additional methods to cover the full range of circumstances for which a diagnostic protocol may be used. The level of sensitivity,

specificity and reproducibility of each method is indicated where possible. NPPOs may use these criteria to determine the method or combination of methods that are appropriate for the relevant circumstances.

Diagnostic protocols are intended to be used by laboratories performing pest diagnosis. Such laboratories may be established under or may be authorized by the NPPO to perform these activities in such manner that the results of the pest diagnosis may be considered as part of a phytosanitary measure of the NPPO.

The main elements of the procedure for the development of diagnostic protocols are presented in Appendix 1.

## REQUIREMENTS

### 1. General Requirements for Diagnostic Protocols<sup>1</sup>

Each protocol contains the methods and guidance necessary for the regulated pest(s) to be detected and positively identified by an expert (i.e. an entomologist, mycologist, virologist, bacteriologist, nematologist, weed-scientist, molecular biologist) or competent staff that are specifically trained.

The methods included in diagnostic protocols are selected on the basis of their sensitivity, specificity and reproducibility. In addition, the availability of equipment, the expertise required for these methods and their practicability (for example ease of use, speed and cost) are taken into account when selecting methods for inclusion in the diagnostic protocol. Usually these methods and their associated information should also be published. It may be necessary that some methods are validated before inclusion in the protocols. Such validation may include, for example, the use of a set of known samples, including controls, prepared to verify sensitivity, specificity and reproducibility.

Each diagnostic protocol usually describes more than one method to take into account the capabilities of laboratories and the situations for which the methods are applied. Such situations include diagnosis of different developmental stages of organisms, which require different methodologies, the need for an alternative diagnostic technique because of uncertainties of the initial diagnosis, as well as varying requirements for the level of sensitivity, specificity and reliability. For some purposes a single method may be sufficient, for other purposes a combination of methods may be necessary. Each protocol contains introductory information, information on the taxonomic position of the pest, methods for detection and identification of the pest, records to be kept, and references to appropriate scientific publications. In many cases a wide range of supplementary information is available which may support diagnosis, for example geographical distribution of the pest and host lists, but diagnostic protocols focus on the critical methods and procedures for pest diagnosis.

The aspects of quality assurance and in particular the reference materials that are required by diagnostic protocols (such as inclusion of positive and negative controls or collection of specimens) are specifically indicated in the corresponding section of the protocol.

### 2. Specific Requirements for a Diagnostic Protocol

Diagnostic protocols are arranged according to the following sections:

- Pest information
- Taxonomic information
- Detection
- Identification
- Records
- Contact points for further information
- Acknowledgements
- References.

---

<sup>1</sup> The following general provisions apply to all diagnostic protocols:

- Laboratory tests may involve the use of chemicals or equipment which present a certain hazard. In all cases, national safety procedures should be strictly followed;
- Use of names of chemicals or equipment in these diagnostic protocols implies no approval of them to the exclusion of others that may also be suitable;
- Laboratory procedures presented in the protocols may be adjusted to the standards of individual laboratories, provided that they are adequately validated.

## 2.1 Pest information

Brief information is provided on the pest, including, where appropriate, its life cycle, morphology, variation (morphological and/or biological), relationship with other organisms, host range (in general), effects on hosts, present and past geographical distribution (in general), mode of transmission and dissemination (vectors and pathways). When available, reference to a pest data sheet should also be provided.

## 2.2 Taxonomic information

This section provides information on the taxonomy of the pest involved and includes:

- name (current scientific name, author and year (for fungi, teleomorph name if known))
  - synonyms (including former names)
  - accepted common names, anamorph name of fungi (including synonyms)
  - acronym of viruses and viroids
- taxonomic position (including information on subspecies classifications where relevant).

## 2.3 Detection

This section of the diagnostic protocol provides information and guidance on:

- the plants, plant products or other articles capable of harbouring the pest
- the signs and/or symptoms associated with the pest (characteristic features, differences or similarities with signs and/or symptoms from other causes), including illustrations, where appropriate
- the part(s) of the plant, plant products or other articles on/in which the pest may be found
- the developmental stages of the pest that may be detected, together with their likely abundance and distribution on/in the plants/plant products or other articles
- the likely occurrence of the pest associated with developmental stages of the host(s), climatic conditions and seasonality
- methods for detecting the pest in the commodity (e.g. visual, hand lens)
- methods for extracting, recovering and collecting the pest from the plants, plant products or other articles, or for demonstrating the presence of the pest in the plants, plant products or other articles
- methods for indicating the presence of the pest in asymptomatic plant material or other materials (e.g. soil or water), such as ELISA<sup>2</sup> tests or culturing on selective media
- viability of the pest.

For all the methods included in this section, information is provided on their sensitivity, specificity and reproducibility, where relevant. Where appropriate, guidance is provided on positive and negative controls and reference material to be included in tests. Guidance is also provided on resolving possible confusion with similar signs and/or symptoms due to other causes.

## 2.4 Identification

This section provides information and guidance on methods that either used alone or in combination lead to the identification of the pest. When several methods are mentioned, their advantages/disadvantages are given as well as the extent to which the methods or combinations of methods are equivalent. A flow diagram may be presented if several methods are needed to identify the pest or many alternative methods are included.

Main types of methodologies used in diagnostic protocols include those based on morphological and morphometric characteristics, biological properties such as virulence or host range of a pest, and those based on biochemical and molecular properties. Morphological characteristics may be investigated directly or after culturing or isolation of the pest. Culturing and/ or isolation may also be required for biochemical and/or molecular assays. Details are provided when culturing or isolation procedures are necessary components of methods.

For morphological and morphometric identifications, details are provided, as appropriate, on:

- methods to prepare, mount and examine the pest (such as for light microscopy, electron microscopy and measurement techniques)
- identification keys (to family, genus, species)
- descriptions of the morphology of the pest or of its colonies, including illustrations of morphological diagnostic characteristics, and an indication of any difficulties in seeing particular structures
- comparison with similar or related species

---

<sup>2</sup> Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay

- relevant reference specimens or cultures.

For biochemical or molecular identifications, each method (e.g. serological methods, electrophoresis, PCR<sup>3</sup>, DNA barcoding, RFLP<sup>4</sup>, DNA sequencing) is described separately in sufficient detail (including equipment, reagents and consumables) to perform the test. Where appropriate, reference may be made to methodology described in other diagnostic protocols annexed to this standard.

In cases where more than one method can be used reliably, other appropriate methods may be presented as alternative or supplementary methods, e.g. where morphological methods can be used reliably and appropriate molecular methods are also available.

Where appropriate, methods for isolation of pests from asymptomatic plants or plant products (such as tests for latent infection) are given, as well as methods for extraction, recovery and collection of pests from plant or other material. In these cases, methods may also be provided for direct identification of pests using biochemical or molecular tests on asymptomatic material.

For all the methods included in this section, information is provided on their sensitivity, specificity and reproducibility, where relevant. Where appropriate, guidance is provided on positive and negative controls and reference material to be included in tests. Guidance is also provided on removing possible confusion with similar and related species or taxa.

Diagnostic protocols provide guidance on the criteria for the determination of a positive or negative result for each method or information necessary to determine if an alternative method be applied.

Those cases where the use of appropriate controls for a specific technique, including where relevant reference material, is essential are clearly indicated in the protocol. When appropriate controls are not available, other tests, preferably based on different identification principles, may increase the certainty of the identification. Alternatively, a sample, specimen or, where appropriate, an image should be sent to another laboratory with experience in diagnosis of the suspected pest and possessing the required control or reference materials. Specimen(s) or material for reference purposes should be properly preserved.

Methods for quick, preliminary indications of identity (which will later need to be confirmed) may also be included in diagnostic protocols.

## 2.5 Records

This section provides information on the records that should be kept:

- scientific name of pest identified
- code or reference number of the sample (for traceability)
- nature of the infested material including scientific name of host where applicable
- origin (including the geographic location if known) of the infested material, and location of interception or detection
- description of signs or symptoms (including photographs where relevant), or their absence
- methods, including controls, used in the diagnosis and the results obtained with each method
- for morphological or morphometric methods, measurements, drawings or photographs of the diagnostic features (where relevant) and, if applicable, an indication of the developmental stage(s)
- for biochemical and molecular methods, documentation of test results such as photographs of diagnostic gels or ELISA printouts of results on which the diagnosis was based
- where appropriate, the magnitude of any infestation (how many individual pests found, how much damaged tissue)
- the name of the laboratory and, where appropriate, the name of the person(s) responsible for and/or who performed the diagnosis
- dates of collection of the sample, and of detection and identification of the pest.
- where appropriate, state of the pest, alive or dead, or viability of its development stages.

Evidence such as culture(s) of the pest, nucleic acid of the pest, preserved/mounted specimens or test materials (e.g. photograph of gels, ELISA plate printout results) should be retained, in particular in cases of non-compliance (ISPM No. 13: *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*) and where

---

<sup>3</sup> Polymerase Chain Reaction

<sup>4</sup> Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism

pests are found for the first time (ISPM No. 17: *Pest reporting*). Additional items may be required under other ISPMs such as ISPM No. 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*).

The period for which records should be kept depends on the purpose for which a diagnosis is made. In cases where other contracting parties may be adversely affected by the results of the diagnosis, records and evidence of the results of the diagnosis should be retained for at least one year.

#### **2.6 Contact points for further information**

Contact details of organizations or individuals with particular expertise on the pest(s) are provided; they may be consulted regarding details on the diagnostic protocol.

#### **2.7 Acknowledgements**

The name and address of the experts who wrote the first draft of the diagnostic protocol are given, together with those of any others who made major contributions.

#### **2.8 References**

References to accessible scientific publications and/or published laboratory manuals are given that may provide further guidance on the methods and procedures contained in the diagnostic protocol.

### **3. Publication of Diagnostic Protocols**

Diagnostic protocols are published as annexes to this ISPM and thus are individual publications under the IPPC framework with a specific publication and/or revision date. If appropriate, they may also form part of other ISPMs. The process of their adoption includes stringent review by internationally acknowledged scientists/experts for the relevant discipline.

An index to the annexes is provided as Appendix 2 [Appendix 2 will be added to the standard when protocols have been approved].

## APPENDIX 1

**MAIN ELEMENTS OF PROCEDURES FOR DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOLS****1. Development of Diagnostic Protocols**

The TPDP will commission an expert to lead the development of a diagnostic protocol by adapting, as appropriate, protocols that have already been approved by RPPOs, or other international or national organizations, or by developing a new diagnostic protocol. The diagnostic protocol will be developed further by a small group of experts selected by the TPDP and will then be submitted, in cooperation with the IPPC Secretariat, to the TPDP which, when satisfied with the content, will submit it to the Standards Committee.

**2. Review of Existing Diagnostic Protocols**

TPDP members will review the diagnostic protocols in their discipline on an annual basis or as determined by the TPDP. A request for a revision to a diagnostic protocol may also be submitted by NPPOs, RPPOs or CPM subsidiary bodies through the IPPC Secretariat ([ippc@fao.org](mailto:ippc@fao.org)), which will in turn forward it to the TPDP.

The TPDP will evaluate the request, identify those diagnostic protocols that require revision and oversee their revision. New methods should be at least equivalent to existing methods or provide a significant advantage for their worldwide application such as costs, sensitivity or specificity. Appropriate evidence should be provided to support any claims.

**3. Requests for New Diagnostic Protocols**

Requests for new diagnostic protocols, in addition to those identified in the work programme of the TPDP, should be sent by NPPOs, RPPOs or CPM subsidiary bodies through the IPPC Secretariat using a form for topics and priorities for standards, by 31 July of each year.





**REVISION TO THE METHYL BROMIDE FUMIGATION SCHEDULE OF  
ANNEX I OF ISPM No. 15 (GUIDELINES FOR REGULATING WOOD  
PACKAGING MATERIAL IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE)<sup>1</sup>**

Temperature	Dosage (g/m <sup>3</sup> )	Minimum concentration (g/m <sup>3</sup> ) at:			
		2hrs.	4hrs.	12hrs.	24hrs.
21°C or above	48	36	31	28	24
16°C or above	56	42	36	32	28
10°C or above	64	48	42	36	32

The minimum temperature should not be less than 10°C and the minimum exposure time should be 24 hours. Monitoring of concentrations should be carried out at a minimum at 2, 4 and 24 hrs.

---

<sup>1</sup> When a revised schedule is adopted for treatment of wood packaging, material treated under the previous treatment schedule does not need to be retreated, remarked or recertified.



**IPPC STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME**  
As of April 2006

Rows are numbered for reference purposes only.

**Technical panels**

	Priority	Topic	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status
1	High	Technical Panel No. 1: Technical panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests	TPDP	ICPM-6 (2004)	Work on-going
2		Technical Panel No. 2: Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies	TPFF	ICPM-6 (2004)	Work on-going
3		Technical Panel No. 3: Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments	TPPT	ICPM-6 (2004)	Work on-going
4		Technical Panel No. 4: Technical panel on forest quarantine	TPFQ	ICPM-6 (2004)	Work on-going
5		Technical Panel No. 5: Technical panel for the Glossary	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	Work to begin in 2006

**IPPC STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME (continued)**

**Topics with a draft ISPM**

Bracketed text indicates if the draft ISPM was developed by a technical panel (TP), an expert working group (EWG) or a consultant, and the number of meetings held.

	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Drafting body</b>	<b>Added to work programme</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Projected adoption</b>
6	High	Alternatives strategies to methyl bromide (1 TPPT)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	1st draft of text done by TPPT to be given to EWG	2008
7		Classification of commodities by level of processing, intended use and phytosanitary risk (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Text in draft form	2007
8		Debarking of wood (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Text in draft form	2007
9		Export certification for potato minitubers and micropropagative material (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Text in draft form	2007
10		Recognition of the establishment of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Text in draft form	2007
11		Sampling of consignments (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Text in draft form	2007
12	Normal	Areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (1 consultant, 1 TPF)	TPFF	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2007
13		Glossary of phytosanitary terms (update of ISPM No. 5)	TPG	ICPM-3 (2001)	Updated annually	Annual
14		Pest risk analysis (revision of ISPM No. 2) (3 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Text in draft form	2007
15		Post-entry quarantine facilities (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Text in draft form	2007
16		Requirements for the submission of phytosanitary treatments (including topic of Research protocols for phytosanitary measures, ICPM-6, 2004) (1 TPPT)	TPPT	ICPM-6 (2004)	Country and ICPM-SC comments being reviewed by steward	2008
17		Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (1 consultant)	Consultant	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form, awaiting review by TPF	2008

**IPPC STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME (continued)**

**Topics without a draft ISPM**

	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Drafting body</b>	<b>Added to work programme</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Projected adoption</b>
18	Fast-track	Country of origin (minor modifications to ISPMs No. 7, 11 and 20 regarding use of the term)	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification in draft form	2007
19		Review of adopted ISPMs (minor modifications to ISPMs resulting from the review)	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification in draft form	2008
20	High	Appropriate level of protection (supplement to ISPM No. 5: <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> )	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification in draft form	2009
21		Area-wide suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies (Tephritidae)	TPFF	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification in draft form	2008
22		Development of Annex 1, Specific approved treatments, of ISPM No. 18 ( <i>Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure</i> )	TPPT	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification to be drafted	2011
23		Establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites for fruit flies (Tephritidae)	TPFF	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification in draft form	2008
24		Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade (revision of ISPM No. 15)	TPFQ	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification in draft form	2008
25		Inspection manual	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification being developed	2010
26		Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM No. 5: <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> )	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification in draft form	2009
27		Plants for planting (including movement, post-entry quarantine and certification programmes)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification in draft form	2009
28		Pre-inspection / pre-clearance	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification in draft form	2009
29		Revision of ISPMs No. 7 and 12 in relation to transit and re-export	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification being developed	2008
30		Trapping procedures for fruit flies (Tephritidae)	TPFF	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification in draft form	2008
31	Normal	Guidelines for the movement of used machinery and equipment	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	Specification to be drafted	2011
32		Import of plant breeding material	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Specification in draft form	2011
33		Regulating stored products in international trade	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification in draft form	2011
34		Soil and growing media	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification in draft form	2011

**IPPC STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME (continued)**

**Diagnostic protocols**

	Priority	Topic	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
	n/a	<b>Bacteria:</b>				
35		- <i>Erwinia amylovora</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2009
36		- <i>Liberibacter</i> spp / <i>Liberobacter</i> spp	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2010
37		- <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Authors identified	2009
38		- <i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2008
39		- <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2010
		<b>Fungi and fungus-like organisms:</b>				
40		- <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Call for authors made	2011
41		- <i>Gymnosporangium</i> spp	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Call for authors made	2011
42		- <i>Phytophthora ramorum</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Call for authors made	2010
43		- <i>Tilletia indica</i> / <i>T. controversa</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Call for authors made	2010
		<b>Insects and mites:</b>				
44		- <i>Anastrepha</i> spp	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Authors identified	2010
45		- <i>Anoplophora</i> spp	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Authors identified	2011
46		- <i>Thrips palmi</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2010
47		- <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2008
		<b>Nematodes:</b>				
48		- <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2009
49		- <i>Ditylenchus destructor</i> / <i>D. dipsaci</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2009
50		- <i>Xiphinema americanum</i>	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2010
		<b>Viruses and phytoplasmas:</b>				
51		- Citrus tristeza virus	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Authors identified	2011
52		- Phytoplasmas (general)	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Call for authors made	2011
53		- Plum pox virus	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2010
54		- Tospoviruses (TSWV, INSV, WSMV)	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Text in draft form	2008

**IPPC STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME (continued)**

**Topics that are pending**

	Priority	Topic	Drafting body	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
55	High	Efficacy of measures (2 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-3 (2001)	Text in draft form. ICPM-SC reviewed draft text and decided that work be delayed until draft ISPM on sampling and supplement to Glossary on appropriate level of protection are complete	not applicable
56		Pest risk analysis for plants as pests	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	ICPM-SC decided that work be delayed until completion of revision of ISPM No. 2	not applicable
57		Surveillance for citrus canker ( <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> )	EWG	ICPM-4 (2002)	Text in draft form. ICPM-SC decided that work be delayed until completion of standard on systems approach for citrus canker	not applicable
58	Normal	Systems approach for management of citrus canker ( <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> ) (2 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-5 (2003)	ICPM-SC decided that work be delayed until consensus reached on a technical issue	not applicable





## CRITERIA FOR THE FORMATION, CONTENT AND SUBSEQUENT CHANGE OF SUPPLEMENTS, ANNEXES AND APPENDICES IN ISPMs

There are several ways to add or change information in an ISPM and its component documents (supplements, annexes and appendices).

ISPMs may be:

- amended
- revised or
- have supplements, annexes and/or appendices added to them.

Supplements, annexes and appendices may be:

- amended or
- revised or
- eliminated.

In general, a revision affects the entire document whereas an amendment affects a specific part or parts of the document.

### 1. Criteria for the formation, content and subsequent change of supplements

- A supplement is an official part of a standard (prescriptive) and this should be stated in the header.
- Supplements are the mechanism that the CPM uses in certain situations to add conceptual information that is supplemental to a standard and that provides additional text without changing existing text. This is different from amendments or revisions to a standard.
- Supplements to an ISPM are numbered sequentially with Arabic numerals.
- Supplements are the first component document to follow the body of the standard.
- Glossary (ISPM No. 5) supplements are used to clarify and explain complex phytosanitary terms and definitions which cannot be understood from a normal concise definition.
- Text from supplements may be integrated into the standard according to the decision of the CPM. In this case, the integrated text should be clearly indicated by a symbol or other means, and the standard should carry the date of adoption of the supplement by the CPM.
- Glossary supplements are attached to the end of the section containing terms and definitions, and are numbered sequentially with Arabic numbers in the order of adoption of the supplement by the CPM.
- The date of adoption by the CPM should be indicated in the amended or revised supplement.

### 2. Criteria for the formation, content and subsequent change of annexes

- An annex is an official part of a standard (prescriptive) and this should be stated in the header. An annex adds technical information to the standard. It is referred to in the main text of the standard.
- Annexes to an ISPM are numbered sequentially with Arabic numerals.
- Annexes follow the body of the standard and follow supplements, if present.
- Information in annexes does not affect the principles incorporated in the primary standard. They do not normally include conceptual information of relevance to the standard.
- Annexes may provide technical guidelines for phytosanitary treatments or procedures, including treatments, treatment schedules and diagnostic protocols. They may include tables and figures.
- Annexes may contain information that may need to be amended or revised to ensure that the specific information provided is consistent with and reflects current scientific knowledge and other relevant information. The circumstances under which amendments and revisions become necessary may include:
  - the approval of new guidelines, treatments or procedures
  - a change in existing methods

- as a result of experiences with implementation of a particular standard.
  - New annexes or amendments and revisions to existing annexes may be proposed following the *Procedures for identifying topics and priorities for standards* (Report of ICPM-4, 2002, Appendix XIV).
  - Amendment or revision of annexes may be made without modifying the standard.
  - The date of adoption by the CPM should be indicated in the amended or revised annex.
- 3. Criteria for the formation, content and subsequent change of appendices**
- Appendices are not official parts of standards (for information only, not prescriptive) and this should be stated in the header.
  - Appendices to an ISPM are numbered sequentially with Arabic numerals.
  - Appendices should be the last component document in a standard.
  - Appendices provide references or further information relevant to the standard.
  - The date of adoption by the CPM should be indicated in the amended or revised appendix.

**COMPOSITION OF THE CORE GROUP OF THE INFORMAL WORKING GROUP ON  
STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

<b>FAO Region</b>	<b>Country</b>	<b>Name</b>
Africa	Ghana	Edmond Kojo Jack-Vesper SUGLO
Asia	Philippines	Larry R. LACSON
Europe	Sweden	Göran KROEKER
Latin America and Caribbean	Trinidad and Tobago	Lilory McCOMIE
Near East	Lebanon	Charles ZARZOUR
North America	USA	Richard DUNKLE
Southwest Pacific	Samoa	Kirifi POUONO
CPM Bureau	Kenya	Chagama KEDERA
CPM Bureau	Canada	Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE
CPM Bureau	Finland	Ralf LOPIAN



## EXAMPLES OF VOLUNTARY ASSESSED CONTRIBUTIONS

**A- Example of an apportionment of the costs to IPPC contracting parties to meet an estimated budget deficit of \$2 million for 2006 using the United Nations scale of assessment for 2003**

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
1	*Afghanistan	0.00900	180
2	Albania	0.00300	60
3	Algeria	0.07000	1400
4	*Andorra	0.00400	80
5	*Angola	0.00200	40
6	*Antigua and Barbuda	0.00200	40
7	Argentina	1.14900	22980
8	*Armenia	0.00200	40
9	Australia	1.62700	32540
10	Austria	0.94700	18940
11	Azerbaijan	0.00400	40
12	Bahamas	0.01200	40
13	Bahrain	0.01800	160
14	Bangladesh	0.01000	200
15	Barbados	0.00900	160
16	Belarus	0.01900	380
17	Belgium	1.12900	22580
18	Belize	0.00100	20
19	*Benin	0.00200	40
20	Bhutan	0.00100	20
21	Bolivia	0.00800	160
22	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.00400	80
23	*Botswana	0.01000	200
24	Brazil	2.39000	47800
25	*Brunei Darussalam	0.03300	660
26	Bulgaria	0.01300	260
27	Burkina Faso	0.00200	40
28	*Burundi	0.00100	20
29	Cambodia	0.00200	40
30	*Cameroon	0.00900	1800
31	Canada	2.55800	51160
32	Cape Verde	0.00100	20
33	Central African Republic	0.00100	20
34	Chad	0.00100	20
35	Chile	0.21200	4240
36	China	1.53200	30640
37	Colombia	0.20100	4020
38	*Comoros	0.00100	20
39	Congo	0.00100	20
40	Costa Rica	0.02000	400
41	Côte d'Ivoire	0.00900	180
42	Croatia	0.03900	780

\* Not a contracting party to the IPPC (as of 6 December 2005).

<sup>1</sup> IPPC contracting parties that are not UN members (and therefore do not appear in this table) are Cook Islands, European Union, Niue, Serbia and Montenegro, and Switzerland.

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
43	Cuba	0.03000	600
44	Cyprus	0.03800	760
45	Czech Republic	0.20300	4060
46	Democratic People's Republic of Korea	0.00900	180
47	*Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.00400	80
48	Denmark	0.74900	14980
49	*Djibouti	0.00100	20
50	*Dominica	0.00100	20
51	Dominican Republic	0.02300	460
52	Ecuador	0.02500	500
53	Egypt	0.08100	1620
54	El Salvador	0.01800	360
55	Equatorial Guinea	0.00100	20
56	Eritrea	0.00100	20
57	Estonia	0.01000	100
58	Ethiopia	0.00400	80
59	Fiji	0.00400	80
60	Finland	0.52200	10440
61	France	6.46600	129320
62	*Gabon	0.01400	280
63	*Gambia	0.00100	20
64	*Georgia	0.00500	100
65	Germany	9.76900	195390
66	Ghana	0.00500	100
67	Greece	0.53900	10780
68	Grenada	0.00100	20
69	Guatemala	0.02700	560
70	Guinea	0.00300	60
71	*Guinea-Bissau	0.00100	20
72	Guyana	0.00100	20
73	Haiti	0.00200	40
74	Honduras	0.00500	100
75	Hungary	0.12000	2400
76	Iceland	0.03300	660
77	India	0.34100	6820
78	Indonesia	0.20000	4000
79	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	0.27200	5440
80	Iraq	0.13600	2720
81	Ireland	0.29400	5880
82	Israel	0.41500	8300
83	Italy	5.06475	101295
84	Jamaica	0.00400	80
85	Japan	19.51575	390315
86	Jordan	0.00800	160
87	*Kazakhstan	0.02800	560
88	Kenya	0.00800	160
89	*Kiribati	0.00100	20
90	*Kuwait	0.14700	2940
91	Kyrgyzstan	0.00100	20
92	Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.00100	20

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
93	Latvia	0.01000	200
94	Lebanon	0.01200	240
95	*Lesotho	0.00100	20
96	Liberia	0.00100	20
97	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	0.06700	1340
98	*Liechtenstein	0.00600	120
99	Lithuania	0.01700	340
100	Luxembourg	0.08000	1600
101	*Madagascar	0.00300	60
102	Malawi	0.00200	400
103	Malaysia	0.23500	4700
104	*Maldives	0.00100	20
105	Mali	0.00200	40
106	Malta	0.01500	300
107	*Marshall Islands	0.00100	20
108	Mauritania	0.00100	20
109	Mauritius	0.01100	220
110	Mexico	1.08600	21720
111	*Micronesia (Federated States of)	0.00100	20
112	*Monaco	0.00400	80
113	*Mongolia	0.00100	20
114	Morocco	0.04400	880
115	*Mozambique	0.00100	20
116	*Myanmar	0.01000	20
117	*Namibia	0.00700	140
118	*Nauru	0.00100	20
119	*Nepal	0.00400	80
120	Netherlands	1.73800	34760
121	New Zealand	0.24100	4820
122	Nicaragua	0.00100	20
123	Niger	0.00100	20
124	Nigeria	0.06800	1360
125	Norway	0.64600	12920
126	Oman	0.06100	1220
127	Pakistan	0.06100	1220
128	*Palau (Republic of)	0.00100	20
129	Panama	0.01800	360
130	Papua New Guinea	0.00600	120
131	Paraguay	0.01600	320
132	Peru	0.11800	2860
133	Philippines	0.10000	2000
134	Poland	0.37800	7560
135	Portugal	0.46200	9244
136	*Qatar	0.03400	680
137	Republic of Korea	1.85100	37020
138	Republic of Moldova	0.00200	40
139	Romania	0.05800	1160
140	Russian Federation	1.20000	24000
141	*Rwanda	0.00100	20
142	Saint Kitts and Nevis	0.00100	20

	State <sup>1</sup>	2003 Scale (%)	Assessment (US\$)
143	Saint Lucia	0.00200	40
144	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	0.00100	20
145	Samoa	0.00100	20
146	*San Marino	0.00200	40
147	*Sao Tome and Principe	0.00100	20
148	Saudi Arabia	0.55400	11080
149	Senegal	0.00500	100
150	Seychelles	0.00200	40
151	Sierra Leone	0.00100	20
152	*Singapore	0.39300	7860
153	*Slovakia	0.04300	860
154	Slovenia	0.08100	1620
155	Solomon Islands	0.00100	20
156	*Somalia	0.00100	20
157	South Africa	0.40800	8160
158	Spain	2.51875	50375
159	Sri Lanka	0.01600	320
160	Sudan	0.00600	120
161	Suriname	0.00200	40
162	Swaziland	0.00200	40
163	Sweden	1.02675	20535
164	Syrian Arab Republic	0.08000	1600
165	Tajikistan	0.00100	20
166	Thailand	0.29400	5880
167	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	0.00600	120
168	Togo	0.00100	20
169	Tonga	0.00100	20
170	Trinidad and Tobago	0.01600	320
171	Tunisia	0.03000	600
172	Turkey	0.44000	8800
173	*Turkmenistan	0.00300	60
174	*Tuvalu	0.00100	20
175	*Uganda	0.00500	100
176	*Ukraine	0.05300	1060
177	United Arab Emirates	0.20200	4040
178	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	5.53600	110720
179	United Republic of Tanzania	0.00400	80
180	United States of America	22.00000	440000
181	Uruguay	0.08000	1600
182	*Uzbekistan	0.01100	220
183	*Vanuatu	0.00100	20
184	Venezuela	0.20800	4160
185	Viet Nam	0.01600	320
186	*Yemen	0.00600	120
187	*Yugoslavia	0.02000	400
188	Zambia	0.00200	40
189	*Zimbabwe	0.00800	160
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00000</b>	<b>approximately \$2,000,000</b>



**B- RESOLUTION No. V**  
**Financial Contributions from OIE Member Countries for 2005**

In accordance with Article 11 of the Internal Statutes and Article 14 of the Organic Rules, and

Considering the need to meet the budgetary expenses of the OIE for 2005,

THE COMMITTEE

RESOLVES

that overall contributions from Member Countries of the Office International des Epizooties be established for the 2005 Financial Year as follows (in EUR):

Countries in the 1st category	109 725
Countries in the 2nd category	87 780
Countries in the 3rd category	65 835
Countries in the 4th category	43 890
Countries in the 5th category	21 945
Countries in the 6th category	13 167

(Adopted by the International Committee of the OIE on 28 May 2004)

72 GS/FR -PARIS, May 2004



## STRATEGIC PLAN

### POSITION STATEMENT<sup>1</sup>

The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) is an international treaty ratified in 1952, first amended in 1979, and then again in 1997. The purpose of the Convention is to secure common and effective action to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products.

The IPPC as amended in 1997 provides for the establishment of a Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM). The amendments came into force on 2 of October 2005. As an interim measure, FAO Conference, in 1997, established the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM). With the entry into force of the amended IPPC, the ICPM was superceded by the CPM. Membership in the CPM is open to contracting parties to the IPPC. The functions of the CPM are listed in Article XI.2 of the IPPC.

The CPM has a unique formal role in the area of plant protection as the global forum for the discussion of areas of common action under the IPPC. These include in particular the establishment of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) that provide norms for safe and fair international trade that are recognized by the WTO. Although the CPM is a relatively new body, the IPPC has a wide membership and nearly fifty years history of implementation resulting in the development of significant expertise, experience and goodwill among Members. The CPM provides a means for liaison with other organizations and opportunities for interaction including possibilities for sharing resources.

Basic funding for the CPM is through FAO, which is the depository for the IPPC and provides the Secretariat with its infrastructure – including legal support. Lack of adequate resources is a limiting factor to the implementation of the work programme of the CPM and additional resources need to be sought, particularly to establish a greater number of standards on a regular basis. The consequences of these limited resources are significant when considering the requirements of the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization (WTO-SPS Agreement) for the availability of ISPMs to promote harmonization.

Further limiting factors to the implementation of the work programme include differences in development status and technological capacity of members, differing levels of participation and expectations of countries. Despite the increased importance of the IPPC due to linkage with the WTO-SPS Agreement, the IPPC is not widely known or understood. Further contributing to this is the newness of the CPM procedures.

The CPM has adopted its own rules and procedures. It has established a Standards Committee. Since the establishment of the ICPM a number of ISPMs were adopted, bringing to twenty four the total number of ISPMs adopted to date (the first ISPMs were adopted by FAO Conference prior to the formation of the ICPM). Procedures to assist with dispute settlement have been developed so the CPM may offer a complementary, technical role to other international dispute settlement systems. A subsidiary body on dispute settlement has been formed to administer the dispute settlement activities of the CPM. The CPM is continuously investigating possibilities to improve its technical assistance activities in order to raise the phytosanitary capacity of developing countries. The CPM does not have any clear role yet in the sharing of regulatory and scientific information, and has weak links with the research community. However, first steps to clarify the role of the CPM in relation to stronger links with research and educational institutions have been undertaken.

The CPM has prepared priority lists for the development of standards and has prepared a strategic plan to make clear its strategic directions and goals. These activities are updated biennially and annually, respectively. Annual timetables of meetings are endorsed by members of the CPM.

---

<sup>1</sup> The position statement reflects basic changes since its first adoption in 2000, and takes into account the entry into force of the New Revised Text of the IPPC.

There are nine Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) that have coordinating functions in their respective regions. One of their roles is to help achieve the objectives of the IPPC. Their relationship with the IPPC Secretariat and the CPM, and the opportunities for increased interaction, have been clarified. Possibilities to increase contributions of these organizations to the work programme of the CPM remain to be explored despite their disparity in numbers of members, authority, constitutions and capabilities.

The primary use of phytosanitary measures in most countries has been in the protection of agriculture, horticulture and forestry from the ingress of exotic pests and/or their spread within countries. It has, however, been recognized that IPPC principles are equally valid for the protection of wild flora and biodiversity. Explicit systems to deal with environmental issues have been developed in order to address the increasing importance of environmental issues, such as invasive alien species. The issue of invasive alien species is also addressed by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and a strong cooperation between the IPPC and the CBD is of importance to create synergic effects in the protection of plants, ecosystems and biodiversity. The role of the IPPC in relation to the protection of marine plants remains to be clarified.

The increasing volume and speed of the movement of goods and people is placing pressure on phytosanitary systems and creating greater demand for standards, while at the same time many governments are finding it difficult to meet the increasing demands for resources to implement the standards. In addition there is an increasing demand to restrict the spread of organisms that threaten biological diversity. A functioning international approach with a wide body of international and regional standards provide countries with affordable and effective means to counter threats to agriculture and biodiversity while at the same time benefiting from partaking in international trade.

The provisions of the WTO-SPS Agreement and the IPPC have put pressures on countries to establish justified import regulation in a transparent manner. The means of dealing with these pressures has not been examined by the CPM on either the political front or with effected private sector groups or environmental organizations. The process of undertaking the construction of import regulations is a matter of increasing detail, complexity and contention. In this situation, an increasing divergence between developed and developing countries will be difficult to avoid if steps are not taken urgently. Likewise, the CPM needs to ensure that all Members are fully able to implement the Convention.

International trading systems and initiatives to protect agriculture, horticulture, forestry, biodiversity and the environment in general involve the activities of a number of international governmental organizations. Cooperation between these organizations, such as the WTO-SPS, IPPC, OIE, Codex Alimentarius, CBD and IAEA, is essential to avoid overlaps or conflicting approaches and to maximize the efficient use of resources and create synergy. The ICPM/CPM has been active in promoting such cooperation. Additional efforts, however, need to be envisaged to intensify this cooperation.

## **MISSION STATEMENT**

To secure common action in protecting the world's cultivated and natural plant resources from the spread and introduction of plant pests, while minimizing interference with the international movement of goods and people. This is accomplished by providing a global forum for promoting the full implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention through the:

1. development, adoption and monitoring of the implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures;
2. exchange of information;
3. provision of dispute settlement mechanisms;
4. development of phytosanitary capacity of Members by promoting the provision of technical assistance;
5. maintenance of an effective and efficient administrative framework;
6. promotion of IPPC and cooperation with other relevant international organizations.

## STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS AND GOALS

**Strategic Direction No. 1: The development and adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and the monitoring of their implementation**

Setting international phytosanitary standards is a basic and unique role identified in the IPPC, particularly given the status accorded IPPC standards as a result of the WTO-SPS Agreement. Internationally accepted phytosanitary standards form the basis for the harmonization of phytosanitary measures that protect natural and cultivated plant resources while ensuring that measures are technically justified and cause the minimum disruption to trade. An increased number of international standards is necessary to facilitate international trade as envisaged by the WTO-SPS Agreement.

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
<b>1.1 Maintain an effective standard development, adoption and revision system using the CPM and SC</b>			
1.1.1 Increase efficiency of standard development and adoption	Ongoing	Medium	CPM, SC, Secretariat
1.1.2 Develop concept and reference standards	Ongoing	High	CPM, SC, EWGs
1.1.3 Develop specific standards where relevant concept standards are in place	Ongoing	High	CPM, SC, TPs, EWGs
1.1.4 Involve RPPO cooperation in standard setting (ISPMs)	Ongoing	Medium	CPM, Secretariat
1.1.5 Revise standards as required	Ongoing	Medium	CPM, SC, EWGs
<b>1.2 Ensure that ISPMs take into account protection of the environment</b>			
1.2.1 Monitor the process to ensure standards take into account the protection of the environment	Ongoing	High	CPM, SC, Secretariat
<b>1.3 Ensure transparency in the standard-setting process</b>			
1.3.1 Monitor information sharing systems concerning standard-setting activities and procedures	Ongoing	Medium	CPM, Secretariat
<b>1.4 Facilitate the implementation of standards</b>			
1.4.1 Establish explanatory documents corresponding to ISPMs if needed	Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat, SC
1.4.2 Establish programmes to support the implementation of standards	Ongoing	High	CPM, SC, RPPOs, SPTA
1.4.3 Encourage RPPOs to assist their members in the implementation of ISPMs, and report on implementation	Ongoing	Medium	CPM, Secretariat
1.4.4 Establish and promote the use of electronic certification	2006	High	WG, CPM

**Strategic Direction No. 2: Information exchange**

This strategic direction covers members and the IPPC Secretariat's obligations to provide information as specified in the IPPC. It also includes information exchange that may be specified by the CPM or in ISPMs, including information such as pest lists, pest reports, and phytosanitary measures. Information exchange activities ensure that members communicate officially on phytosanitary regulations and other issues of phytosanitary significance, and determine the means by which the IPPC Secretariat makes them available to other members.

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
<b>2.1 Establish procedures for information exchange</b>			
2.1.1 Promote exchange of information, especially through the use of electronic communication/internet	Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat, IPP SG
2.1.2 Develop the IPP for provision of official information by countries	Ongoing	Low	Secretariat
2.1.3 Request and enable NPPOs to fulfil their reporting obligations under the IPPC	Ongoing	High	CPM, Secretariat
2.1.4 Monitor the NPPO data on the IPP	Ongoing	High	IPP SG, Secretariat
2.1.5 Secretariat to fulfil reporting obligations and communicate administrative matters efficiently	Ongoing	Medium	IPP, Secretariat
2.1.6 Develop capacity building tools area of the IPP	Ongoing	High	Secretariat, IPP SG, programming team

**Strategic Direction No. 3: The provision of dispute settlement mechanisms**

This relates to the non-binding dispute settlement provisions contained in Article XIII of the IPPC (1997). The CPM is charged with the task of developing rules and procedures for dispute settlement under the IPPC. The Convention explicitly recognizes the role of the IPPC in complementing the formal binding dispute settlement process that exists under the WTO.

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
<b>3.1 Increase awareness of dispute settlement mechanism</b>			
3.1.1 Develop information material concerning the IPPC dispute settlement procedure	Ongoing	Medium	Subsidiary body
<b>3.2 Provide supporting information on IPPC and other dispute settlement systems</b>			
3.2.1 Establish an inventory of other dispute settlement systems	2006	Low	Subsidiary body
3.2.2 Provide rulings/precedents from dispute settlements systems with phytosanitary relevance (e.g. WTO)	Ongoing	Low	Subsidiary body

<b>Strategic Direction No. 4: The development of the phytosanitary capacity of Members to implement the IPPC by promoting the provision of technical assistance</b>			
Article XX in the IPPC (1997) requires members to promote the provision of technical assistance especially to developing contracting parties, either bilaterally or through appropriate international organizations with the purpose of facilitating implementation of the IPPC. Adequate capacity and infrastructure for all Members are critical to accomplish the IPPC's goals.			
<b>Goals</b>	<b>Timing</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Means</b>
<b>4.1 Maintain methods and tools for individual countries to evaluate their phytosanitary capacity, requirements for technical assistance and progress in capacity development</b>			
4.1.1 Maintain and update Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)	Ongoing	High	SPTA, Secretariat
4.1.2 Produce interactive learning tools to increase awareness and knowledge of IPPC and ISPMs as an integrate component of the PCE	2008	High	Secretariat
4.1.3 Provide training for regional "resource groups" to assist with the application of the PCE tool in each region	2008	High	Secretariat
4.1.4 Enhance the PCE tool to enable storing and retrieving of information so progress can be tracked over time	2008	High	Secretariat
4.1.5 Develop a template for comments on the PCE and send to countries	2008	High	Secretariat
4.1.6 Develop a component in the PCE tool that can categorise weaknesses and activities, and automatically generate appropriate outputs identifying the nature and scope of capacity development required	2008	High	Secretariat
4.1.7 Update the PCE tool and release on CD-ROM and enable ability to download from the IPP	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
4.1.8 Promote the use of the PCE tool	Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat, Bureau
4.1.9 Identify and develop additional technical assistance tools	Ongoing	High	SPTA, Secretariat
<b>4.2 Promote technical cooperation to support the working programme of the CPM</b>			
4.2.1 Organize regional workshops on draft ISPMs	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
4.2.2 Organize workshops to improve the understanding and implementation of existing standards	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
4.2.3 Increase assistance for the establishment, revision and updating of national legislation	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
4.2.4 Provide legal advice on phytosanitary legal and associated institutional issues to the CPM	In process	High	Secretariat
4.2.5 Establish a process to identify and rank priorities for the CPM's activities in technical assistance	2006	High	Secretariat, CPM, IWG-TA
<b>4.3 Assist members to obtain technical assistance from donors</b>			
4.3.1 Provide information to help Members obtain technical assistance from donors	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
<b>4.4 Promote the improvement and development of RPPOs</b>			
4.4.1 Assist RPPOs in the establishment of information systems	Ongoing	Medium	Members, Secretariat, RPPOs
<b>4.5 Increase the participation by developing countries in IPPC activities</b>			
4.5.1 Work to ensure that funds are contributed to the Special Trust Fund to support developing country involvement	Ongoing	High	Secretariat, CPM, Bureau

<b>Strategic direction No. 5: The maintenance of an effective and efficient administrative framework</b>			
To function effectively, the CPM must establish organizational structures and procedures, identify funding mechanisms, and address various support and administrative functions, including internal review and evaluation mechanisms. This strategic direction is to make provision for the CPM to address its administrative issues and strategies, making continual improvement to ensure its business practices are effective and efficient.			
Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
<b>5.1 Provision of an adequate budget for the IPPC</b>			
5.1.1 Establish mechanisms for increasing resources available to the IPPC	Ongoing	High	CPM, Bureau, Secretariat
5.1.2 Provide a transparent budget according to the strategic directions	Ongoing	High	Secretariat, Bureau
<b>5.2 Implement planning, reporting and review mechanisms</b>			
5.2.1 Review business plan annually	Ongoing	High	Bureau, Secretariat
5.2.2 Review strategic plan and update work programme annually	Ongoing	High	SPTA, CPM
5.2.3 Report on activities of the Secretariat, including reporting by Secretariat on the implementation of the strategic plan	Ongoing	High	Secretariat

<b>Strategic Direction No. 6: Promotion of IPPC and cooperation with relevant international organizations</b>			
This strategic direction recognizes the need to communicate IPPC issues, obligations, processes and interests to all concerned, including other bodies with similar or overlapping interests, and to encourage RPPOs to promote regionally the implementation of the IPPC.			
Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
<b>6.1 Promote the IPPC</b>			
6.1.1 Encourage non-contracting parties to adopt the IPPC	Ongoing	Medium	Members, Secretariat, Bureau, FAO regional and national officers
6.1.2 Communicate IPPC issues, obligations, processes and interests to all concerned, including other bodies with similar or overlapping interests	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
6.1.3 Encourage RPPOs to promote regionally the implementation of the IPPC	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
<b>6.2 Strengthen cooperation with other international organizations</b>			
6.2.1 Establish relations, identify areas of common interest and, where appropriate, develop coordinated activities and joint programmes with other relevant organizations	Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat, Bureau
6.2.2 Strengthen cooperation and coordination with relevant organizations on technical assistance	Ongoing	Medium	CPM, Secretariat, Bureau
<b>6.3 Strengthen the scientific basis of the work of the IPPC</b>			
6.3.1 Develop a policy for linkages with research and education institutions (preliminary)	2006	Medium	EWG, Secretariat
6.3.2 Promote the need for sufficient research and development to sustain the work of the IPPC	Ongoing	Medium	EWG, Secretariat



**List of acronyms and abbreviations**

CBD	=	Convention on Biological Diversity
CP	=	Contracting party [to the IPPC]
CPM	=	Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
EWG	=	Expert Working Group
FAO	=	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IAEA	=	International Atomic Energy Agency
IPP	=	International Phytosanitary Portal
IPP SG	=	International Phytosanitary Portal Support Group
IPPC	=	International Plant Protection Convention
ISPM	=	International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures
IWG-TA	=	Informal Working Group on Technical Assistance
NPPO	=	National Plant Protection Organization
OIE	=	World Organisation for Animal Health
PCE	=	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation
RPPO	=	Regional Plant Protection Organization
SC	=	Standards Committee
SPS	=	Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures of the World Trade Organization
SPTA	=	Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance
TA	=	Technical Assistance
TC	=	Technical Consultation
TCP	=	Technical Cooperation Programme
TP	=	Technical Panel
WG	=	Working Group
WTO	=	World Trade Organization



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE WORKING GROUP ON THE FEASIBILITY OF INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF PEST FREE AREAS**

The working group is to carry out a **feasibility study** on the international recognition of pest free areas, taking into account legal, technical and economic factors and assess the feasibility and sustainability of such a system.

The study will consider the following elements. The results of the study should be presented in the form of a report. The report should contain clear conclusions and make recommendations.

### **Legal issues:**

- What international recognition of a PFA means.
- Whether liability insurance should be necessary
- Which international organization(s) or individuals could take part in the international recognition process or could provide international recognition of a PFA. If other than the IPPC how would they relate to the IPPC or which role they would play (e.g. IPPC recognized experts, IPPC recognized organizations, other organizations).
- Whether the international recognition body carries any legal responsibility in relation to its international recognition process, what its obligations are in relation to reporting recognition or denial of recognition of a PFA.
- Whether a disclaimer of responsibility can be part of the international recognition process.
- What the obligations of contracting parties to the IPPC will be in regard to an internationally recognized PFA.
- Whether international recognition of PFAs will increase the likelihood of acceptance by contracting parties of the concept of PFAs.
- Whether international recognition of a PFA will reduce undue delays in the recognition of that PFA by trading partners.
- Which organizations or entities can request the international recognition of a PFA, e.g. the NPPO of the exporting contracting party in which the PFA is located (to facilitate exports), the NPPO of the importing contracting party (to recognize a PFA in an exporting country), industry representatives (to facilitate exports and/or imports), the NPPO of the importing contracting party in which the PFA is located (to recognize the PFA in its territory, to justify import requirements), a RPPO on behalf of one or more of its NPPOs.

### **Technical issues:**

- Whether the international recognition of a PFA should result in a statement from the international body that the area is free of the specific pest, or whether it should result in an assurance that the criteria for the establishment and maintenance of a PFA have been applied.
- Whether international recognition of a PFA can only take place if there is a specific ISPM for the establishment and maintenance of a PFA for that specific pest or group of pests.
- Whether, once a PFA has received international recognition, such recognition needs to be renewed on a regular basis, or whether the recognition is valid until the PFA status changes.
- Whether the process of international recognition of PFAs, if such a process is developed, could be applied to areas of low pest prevalence, pest free production sites and pest free places of production.
- Whether a process for the international recognition of PFAs could be put in place for many pests, or only for a limited number of globally relevant pests. If it is determined that such a process could only apply to a limited number of globally relevant pests, what criteria should be used to identify these pests.
- The elements of the international recognition process, including, but not limited to, the assurance and verification procedures and the requirements (including evidence required) to be fulfilled by the country where the PFA is located.

- Whether pest specific ISPMs should recognize that different ecological conditions and associated risk levels may exist in different areas, and therefore the requirements for the establishment and maintenance of the specific PFA may differ. As a result of this, whether the international recognition body should apply judgement in the recognition process.
- Whether there should be specific requirements covering the reinstatement of an area that had lost its are freedom status

**Economic issues:**

- The benefits and disadvantages of international recognition of a PFA, including, but not limited to:
  - importing countries
  - exporting countries
  - developing and least developed countries (either importing or exporting)
  - market access issues (imports and exports)
  - implementation of the IPPC
  - technical assistance.
- The financial costs of an international recognition system c.f. the current approach of bilateral recognition
- The source(s) and methods of funding for an international recognition system.

**Other issues:**

- Whether a pilot project, to test the international recognition process for a PFA, would be beneficial. If so, what would the parameters be for such a pilot project, e.g. for a pest for which a pest specific ISPM is available, for a pest for which there are bilaterally recognized PFAs, or for a pest-commodity combination that has international trade significance and for which there is already considerable experience available, etc.

The following areas of expertise should be available in the working group which will carry out the feasibility study:

- general phytosanitary administrative expertise
- knowledge of ISPMs, especially those on PFAs, ALPPs, etc.
- knowledge of operation and maintenance of PFAs in their country
- knowledge of accreditation and audit systems
- legal expertise in phytosanitary issues
- OIE experience in international recognition of PFAs.

Data on existing PFAs (e.g. recognized areas, size of area recognized, recognized by whom, commodity involved, pest involved) should be considered

The expert working group should have 7 members, preferably one from each region, plus 3 Bureau members.

## THE ROLE OF IPPC CONTACT POINTS

The IPPC contact points are used for all information exchanged under the IPPC between contracting parties, between the Secretariat and contracting parties and, in some cases, between contracting parties and Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs).

The IPPC contact point should:

- have the necessary authority to communicate on phytosanitary issues on behalf of the contracting party, i.e. as the contracting party's single IPPC enquiry point;
- ensure the information exchange obligations under the IPPC are implemented in a timely manner;
- provide coordination for all official phytosanitary communication between contracting parties related to the effective functioning of the IPPC;
- redirect phytosanitary information received from other contracting parties and from the IPPC Secretariat to appropriate official(s);
- redirect requests for phytosanitary information from contracting parties and the IPPC Secretariat to the appropriate official(s);
- keep track of the status of appropriate responses to information requests that have been made to the contact point; and

*The role of the IPPC contact point is central to the effective functioning of the IPPC, and it is important that the IPPC contact point has adequate resources and sufficient authority to ensure that requests for information are dealt with appropriately and in a timely manner.*

Article VIII.2 requires contracting parties to designate a contact point, and therefore it is the contracting party which is responsible for making, and informing the Secretariat of, the nomination. There can be only one contact point per contracting party. The contracting party, by making the nomination, agrees that the nominee has the necessary authority to fulfil the functions of the contact point as determined within the framework of the IPPC. Individual persons cannot appoint themselves as contact points.



## Work Plan for the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) for 2006

GOALS		TIMING	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY	OUTPUT(S)	DEADLINE	ACTIVITIES / Comments	FUNDING
<b>2.1 Establish procedures for information exchange</b>								
<b>2.1.1 Promote exchange of information, especially through the use of electronic communication/internet</b>		Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat, IPP SG, RPPOs	Discuss at all PCE meetings facilitation, ongoing TCPs and IPP Training workshop events	ongoing	Still needs practical implementation in PCE meetings	Limited
		Dec 2006	High	Secretariat	Regional and sub-regional workshops	ongoing; monthly	Subject at all scheduled IPP training workshops (point 2.1.3.2)	Probably enough to hold 1 workshop
	<b>2.1.1.1 National project development</b>	Ongoing	High	Secretariat	FAO-Technical Cooperation Projects (TCP) developed and implemented	ongoing	Depending on governmental requests to FAO for Technical Assistance	FAO TC
		Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat	Add to phytosanitary TCPs	ongoing	e.g. TCP/Yemen, but needs to be addressed in ALL new projects	FAO TC
		Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat, RPPOs	Report at RPPO meetings, including TC	annual		1 meeting only
		Annual	High	Secretariat, IPP SG, RPPOs	Report to CPM	annual	- Progress report & Work programme - Revised ICPM-3 Appendix XV with interpretations on information exchange for re-adoption at CPM - Submit discussion paper in Annex 1 of ICPM 2005/25 (after consideration by Secretariat and Bureau) to first meeting of the CPM for its consideration	Yes
<b>2.1.2 Develop the IPP for provision of official information by countries</b>	<b>2.1.2.1 develop and document procedures for information exchange</b>	March 2006	high	Secretariat; NPPO contacts (during training); IPP SG	Agreed version 1.0 of procedures for information exchange to meet country obligations under IPPC	March 2006	Secretariat to draft, test with countries and confirm version 1.0 of procedures with IPP SG and Bureau, and report to CPM-1	Yes, limited human resources

GOALS		TIMING	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY	OUTPUT(S)	DEADLINE	ACTIVITIES / Comments	FUNDING
		July 2006	medium	Secretariat	Modified procedures based on experience in the use of version 1.0	mid 2006	Secretariat to modify and present to CPM-1 based on experience during 2005/6 workshop programme	Yes, limited human resources
		April 2006	medium	Secretariat	Clearly documented working practices for information exchange activities of the Secretariat	March 2006	Includes posting publications, documents, calendar items, news items, general information (web page), individual and official contact information, links to web sites and management of work groups, email lists and restricted work areas under the IPPC section of the IPP	Yes, limited human resources
		Ongoing	high		One IPP Webmaster in place and trained on any IPP data quality issues; - able to respond to any related inquiries, - able to provide online assistance to NPPOs	Jan 2006	IPP SG considered that it is essential to designate a Webmaster for the IPP to take overall editorial responsibility for management of users, presentation and data quality (according to common editorial guidelines; point 2.1.3.3)	None
		Ongoing	medium	Secretariat	4 trained secretariat staff including 2 clerks in the use of mailing lists, restricted work areas, merged data files, and address labels	Ongoing	Data entered on IPP to manage contact information on various groups	Yes, limited human resources
		Annual	High	Secretariat	IPP SG meeting to review 2005 and discuss work plan for 2006.	March 2006	May be difficult to hold this meeting due to expected budget reductions in 2006.	None
	<b>2.1.2.2 Develop systems to support procedures for information exchange</b>	Ongoing	High	Secretariat	Functional IPP	Ongoing	Continuously getting feedback from NPPOs, RPPOs & Secretariat.	Yes, only for maintenance
		April 2006	Medium	Secretariat; IPP SG meeting	Outline development plan for IPP for 2006	Jan 2006	IPP SG to review and advise on requirements for any IPP modifications	Yes, limited human resources



GOALS		TIMING	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY	OUTPUT(S)	DEADLINE	ACTIVITIES / Comments	FUNDING
		Jan-March 2006	High	Secretariat; programming team	System modifications based on user feedback in regional IPP training workshops (point 2.1.3.2) and IPP SG	Ongoing; 2006	IPP SG to review results of regional IPP training workshops and test of procedures and draw up requirements for any IPP modifications. Based on testing of up-dated version of IPP at workshops (estimate 5 person months input)	Probably <u>only</u> for maintenance of existing functionality; no new developments
		Feb, June, Oct + Dec 2006	High	Secretariat; programming team	Implement quarterly developed and prioritised IPP 'milestones'	Ongoing		Extremely limited & limited human resources
		Jan-March 2006	Medium	Secretariat; programming team; translator	Navigation in Arabic and Chinese	March 2006	Work to proceed as resources become available; assume 1 person months programming plus \$15,000 translation costs	None
		Ongoing	High	Secretariat; programming team	Develop a Secretariat work flow management component to the IPP	April 2006	To reduce duplication of effort, allow generation of simple reports e.g. on standard setting, and improve consistency & accuracy of data	Limited
		2006	High	Secretariat	WG to determine phytosanitary meta-data standards to facilitate the electronic exchange of official phytosanitary data	Dec 2006	This was placed on the ICPM SD 2 work programme in 2005 and has not been completed due to limited resources. It is a major obstacle to facilitate the electronic exchange of phytosanitary information with the IPP	Yes
<b>2.1.3 Request and enable NPPOs to fulfil their reporting obligations under the IPPC</b>	<b>2.1.3.1 Complete Nomination process for responsible NPPO staff in information exchange using the IPP</b>		High	Secretariat; NPPOs & RPPOs	All IPPC member countries have nominated responsible persons to update official NPPO information in the IPP	Ongoing	Nomination of Responsible Person/s to update country information in the IPP in order to meet their National Phytosanitary Information Exchange Obligations under the IPPC (prerequisite for participation in sub/regional IPP training workshops)	

GOALS		TIMING	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY	OUTPUT(S)	DEADLINE	ACTIVITIES / Comments	FUNDING
	<b>2.1.3.2 Train NPPOs in use of IPP to meet reporting obligations</b>	<u>Asia</u> : Dec 2006 <u>Near East</u> (NEPPO?): mid 2006 <u>Europe</u> (Russian speaking): March 2006 <u>NAPPO</u> members: ad hoc (2006) <u>Yemen</u> (TCP): Jan 2006 <u>Sri Lanka</u> : August 2006 <u>African IAPSC</u> member countries: June-Dec 2006 <u>Latin American</u> countries: 2006	High	Secretariat; NPPOs & RPPOs; TCP/RAF/3013(A); Fast Track TCPs (if possible)	120 trained national users able to enter country data to IPP to meet reporting obligations	2006	Sub/Regional Workshops for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asia (remaining 10 countries)</li> <li>Near East (NEPPO?)</li> <li>Europe (Russian speaking)</li> <li>NAPPO members</li> </ul> National Workshops for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yemen (TCP)</li> <li>Sri Lanka (Fast Track TCP)</li> <li>African IAPSC member countries (TCP)</li> <li>Remaining Latin American countries</li> </ul> Refer to 2.1.1	1 workshop only
	<b>2.1.3.3 Produce and disseminate relevant training materials</b>	Ongoing (2006)	High	Secretariat; RPPOs; FAO Rep.	Editorial guidelines, other IPP help manuals related to data entry in the IPP and an update of the IPP CD-ROM made available to all workshop participants in all FAO languages	prior to each IPP-training workshop	Relevant documents and general workshop handouts in the corresponding workshop language will be prepared and distributed to all participants prior to the training event CD-ROM updates are produced for each workshop event	Limited - no money for Arabic or Chinese
	<b>2.1.3.4 Train RPPO staff and FAO regional plant protection officers in use of IPP</b>		Medium	Secretariat; RPPO information officers; FAO Rep.	Trained RPPO staff able to enter relevant information in the IPP, and able to assist and train national staff of NPPOs	ad hoc	Continue efforts initiated during IPPC Workshop for Regional Plant Protection Officers in Bangkok, Thailand, November 14-18, 2005	None

GOALS		TIMING	PRIORITY	RESPONSIBILITY	OUTPUT(S)	DEADLINE	ACTIVITIES / Comments	FUNDING
	<b>2.1.3.5 Contact NPPOs regarding IPPC reporting obligations</b>	Ongoing	High	ICPM; Secretariat	Letter to NPPOs on meeting IPPC reporting obligations (including contact point) using the IPP	2006 (regularly)	Continued assistance will be provided to NPPO-IPP-editors in fulfilling reporting obligations using the IPP	limited
		Ongoing	High	NPPOs	Data entered and maintained in IPP in support of reporting obligations	ongoing	Continued assistance provided to NPPO-IPP-editors in fulfilling reporting obligations using the IPP - IPP Webmaster	None - will have to be covered by existing staff
<b>2.1.4 Monitor the NPPO data on the IPP</b>	<b>2.1.4.1 Monitor IPP</b>	Ongoing (2006)	High	IPP SG, Secretariat; programming team	Report to CPM	Dec 2006	Develop measures of system availability; system use to track log-in activity, quality of data in compliance with IPPC (NPPO contact details, and other obligations), and prepare report for CPM 1; plus web statistics for non logged-in use; user survey on usability, etc. Needs an IPP Webmaster to do part of this!	None
<b>2.1.5 Secretariat to fulfil reporting obligations and communicate administrative matters efficiently</b>		Ongoing	Medium	IPP, Secretariat	Report as per provisions in the IPPC	Ongoing	Undertaken as defined by the CPM and through the extensive use of the IPP.	Meet basics only
<b>2.1.6 Develop capacity building tools area of the IPP</b>		Ongoing	High	Secretariat; IPP SG; programming team	An area on the IPP where resources can be found that support capacity building under the IPPC	Ongoing - prototype by Dec 2006	IPP SG will provide advice and guidance on what should be done. This work will only be undertaken once the existing IPP system is complete and functioning reliably. However, the work plan needs to be in place before we reach that stage.	None



**LIST OF DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS**

Chairperson : Chagema KEDERA (Kenya)

Vice-Chairpersons : Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE (Canada)  
Ralf LOPIAN (Finland)

## MEMBERS - MEMBRES - MIEMBROS

**ALBANIA - ALBANIE**

## Representative

Ms Shpresa CALI  
 Specialist of Plant Protection  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer  
 Protection  
 General Directorate of Food Quality and  
 Consumer Protection  
 Directorate of Animal Health and Plant  
 Protection  
 Bulev. D. Kombit, nr.2  
 Tirana  
 Phone: +355 225539  
 Fax: +355 225539  
 E-mail: shpresacali@yahoo.com

**ALGERIA - ALGÉRIE - ARGELIA**

## Représentant

Mme Fatiha BENDDINE  
 Sous-Directrice á la Direction de la Protection  
 des Végétaux  
 Ministère de l'agriculture et du développement  
 rural  
 12 Boulevard Colonel Amirouche  
 Alger  
 Phone: +213 21429349  
 E-mail: fbenddine@hotmail.com

## Suppléant(s)

Abderrahman HAMIDAOU  
 Représentant permanent adjoint auprès de la  
 FAO  
 Ambassade de la République algérienne  
 démocratique et populaire  
 Via Barnaba Oriani 26  
 Rome, Italy

**ARGENTINA - ARGENTINE**

## Representante

Sra Diana María GUILLÉN  
 Directora Nacional de Protección Vegetal  
 Secretaria de Agricultura, Ganaderia, Pesca y  
 Alimentos  
 Pasero Colón 367, Piso 7  
 Ciudad Autonoma de Buenos Aires  
 Phone: +54 11 43316041 Ext.1706/08  
 Fax: +54 11 43316041 Ext.1709  
 E-mail: dnpv@sinavimo.gov.ar

## Suplente(s)

Diego QUIROGA  
 Director de Cuarentena Vegetal  
 Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad  
 Agroalimentaria  
 Paseo Colón 367, 7 Piso, C. Fte.  
 1063 Buenos Aires  
 Phone: +54 11 43316041/49 Ext. 1727/728  
 Fax: +54 11 3425137  
 E-mail: dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar

Sra Maria del Carmen SQUEFF  
 Consejero, Representante Permanente Alterno  
 ante la FAO  
 Embajada de la República Argentina  
 Piazza dell'Esquilino 2  
 Roma, Italy  
 E-mail: faoprarg1@interfree.it

**AUSTRALIA - AUSTRALIE**

## Representative

Ms Lois RANSOM  
 Chief Plant Protection Officer  
 Product Integrity, Animal and Plant Health  
 Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and  
 Forestry  
 GPO Box 858  
 Canberra, ACT 2601  
 Phone: +61 2 62716534  
 Fax: +61 2 62725835  
 E-mail: lois.ransom@daff.gov.au

## Alternate(s)

Ms Judy BARFIELD  
 Councillor Agricultural Affairs  
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of Australia  
 Via Antonio Bosio, 5  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 0685272376  
 Fax: +39 0685272346  
 E-mail: judy.barfield@dfat.gov.au

Ms Cheryl McRAE  
 Adviser, SPS Disputes, Policy and Operations  
 International Division  
 Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and  
 Forestry  
 GPO Box 858  
 Canberra, ACT 2601  
 Phone: +61 2 62723338  
 Fax: +61 2 62724118  
 E-mail: cheryl.mcrae@daff.gov.au

David PORRITT  
 Manager, Multilateral, Invasive Plants and  
 Germplasm  
 Plant Biosecurity, Biosecurity Australia  
 Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and  
 Forestry  
 GPO Box 858  
 Canberra, ACT 2601  
 Phone: +61 2 6272 4633  
 Fax: +61 2 6272 3307  
 E-mail: david.porridd@daff.gov.au

Ms Julia RYMER  
 Executive Officer  
 Product Integrity, Animal and Plant Health  
 Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and  
 Forestry  
 GPO Box 858  
 Canberra, ACT 2601  
 Phone: +61 2 62724837  
 Fax: +61 2 62725835  
 E-mail: julia.rymer@daff.gov.au

**AUSTRIA - AUTRICHE**

## Representative

Ms Natalie FEISTRITZER  
 Counsellor, Agricultural Affairs  
 Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Via Pergolesi 3  
 00198 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 06 8440141  
 Fax: +39 06 8543286  
 E-mail: natalie.feistritzter@bmaa.gv.at

## Alternate(s)

Ewald DANGL  
 Officer, Federal Ministry of Agriculture,  
 Forestry, Environment and Water Management  
 Stubenring 1  
 A-1012 Vienna  
 Phone: +43 1 711005842  
 Fax: +43 1 711006503  
 E-mail: ewald.dangl@bmlfuw.gv.at

Michael KURZWEIL  
 Officer, Federal Ministry of Agriculture,  
 Forestry, Environment and Water Management  
 Stubenring 1  
 A-1012 Vienna  
 Phone: +43 1 711002819  
 Fax: +43 1 5138722  
 E-mail:  
 michael.kurzweil@lebensministerium.at

Norbert WINKLER  
 Officer, Federal Ministry of Agriculture,  
 Forestry, Environment and Water Management  
 Stubenring 1  
 A-1012 Vienna  
 Phone: +43 1 711002955  
 Fax: +43 1 711002959  
 E-mail: norbert.winkler@bmlfuw.gv.at

Antonio ATAZ  
 General Secretariat  
 Council of the European Union  
 Rue de la Loi 175  
 B 1048 Brussels  
 Phone: +322 2354964

Ms Zuzana KUPCOVA  
 General Secretariat  
 Council of the European Union  
 Rue de la Loi 175  
 B 1048 Brussels  
 Phone: +322 2857101

Ms Gilberte REYNDERS  
 General Secretariat  
 Council of the European Union  
 Rue de la Loi 175  
 B 1048 Brussels  
 Phone: +322 2858082

**BAHRAIN - BAHREÏN - BAHREIN**

## Representative

Mohamed El-Sayed Mahmoud FODA  
 Advisor, Plant Protection  
 Ministry of Municipality Affairs and  
 Agriculture  
 P.O. Box 251  
 Manama  
 Phone: +973 17696730; 39065909  
 Fax: +973 17695734  
 E-mail: mmfoda1@hotmail.com

## Alternate(s)

Abdul Aziz Mohamed ABDULKAREEM  
Plant Protection Specialist  
Ministry of Municipality Affairs and  
Agriculture  
P.O. Box 251  
Manama  
Phone: +973 17696747  
Fax: +973 17696731  
E-mail: ama\_mohamed@hotmail.com

**BANGLADESH**

## Representative

Ahmed RAHIM UDDIN  
Director, Plant Protection Wing  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Department of Agricultural Extension  
Khamarbari, Farmgate  
Dhaka-1215  
Phone: +880 2 9131295  
Fax: +880 2 9131596

## Alternate(s)

Ms Nasrin AKHTER  
Economic Councillor  
Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
Embassy of the People's Republic of  
Bangladesh  
Via Antonio Bertoloni, 14  
Rome, Italy

**BELARUS - BÉLARUS - BELARÚS**

## Representative

Romouald NOVITSKI  
Director, State Inspection for Seed Breeding,  
Quarantine and Crop Protection  
Ministry of Agriculture and Food  
15, Kirova Str.  
Minsk

## Alternate(s)

Aliaksandr PISKUN  
Senior Inspector  
Head State Inspection for Seed Breeding,  
Quarantine and Crop Protection  
Ministry of Agriculture and Food  
15, Kirova Str.  
Minsk

Dmitry YARMOLYUK

**BELGIUM - BELGIQUE - BÉLGICA**

## Représentant

Lieven VAN HERZELE  
Attaché  
Ministère de la Santé publique, Sécurité  
alimentaire et environnement  
DG 4: Animaux, Végétaux et Alimentation  
Service de la Politique sanitaire des Animaux et  
des Plantes  
Division de la Protection des Plantes  
Bruxelles  
Phone: +32 2 524 7323  
Fax: +32 524 7349  
E-mail: lieven.vanherzele@health.fgov.be

**BELIZE - BELICE**

## Representative

Francisco GUTIERREZ  
Technical Director, Plant Health  
Belize Agricultural Health Authority  
Plant Health Department  
P.O.Box 169, Agricultural Showgrounds  
Belmopan  
Phone: +501 822 0818  
Fax: +501 822 0271  
E-mail: frankpest@yahoo.com

**BHUTAN - BHOUTAN - BHUTÁN**

## Representative

Karma DORJI  
Executive Director  
Bhutan Agriculture and Food Regulatory  
Authority (BAFRA)  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Thimphu  
Phone: +975 2 327030  
Fax: +975 2 327032  
E-mail: karma\_d@moa.gov.bt;  
toepkarma@druknet.bt

**BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA - BOSNIE-HERZÉGOVINE - BOSNIA Y HERZEGOVINA**

## Representative

Milad ZEKOVIC  
Director of Department of Health Protection of  
Plants  
Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic  
Relations  
Uprava Bilt 32 B  
Musala 9  
Sarajevo  
Phone: + 387 33 212387  
E-mail: uprava.bihzzb@bihnet.ba



**BRAZIL - BRÉSIL - BRASIL**

## Representative

Flávio MIRAGAIA PERRI  
Ambassador  
Permanent Representation of the Federative  
Republic of Brazil to FAO  
Via di Santa Maria dell'Anima 32  
Rome, Italy

## Alternate(s)

Ms Denize DE FÁTIMA BORGATTO  
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food  
Supply (MAPA)  
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Block D, Sala 339  
Brasília, DF 70043 900  
Phone: +55 61 218 2834; 218 2308  
Fax: +55 61 225 4738  
E-mail: denize@agricultura.gov.br

Alexandre MOREIRA PALMA  
Adviser, Plant Health Department  
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food  
Supply (MAPA)  
Esplanada dos Ministérios  
Bloco D, Anexo B, Sala 307  
70043-900 Brasília/DF  
Phone: +55 61 33223205; 32182675  
Fax: +55 61 33223205; 32182675  
E-mail: dsv@agricultura.gov.br;  
apalma@agricultura.gov.br

Mário Gustavo MOTTIN  
Second Secretary, Alternate Permanent  
Representative to FAO  
Permanent Representation of the Federative  
Republic of Brazil to FAO  
Via di Santa Maria dell'Anima 32  
Rome, Italy

Girabis Evangelista RAMOS  
Director  
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food  
Supply  
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Block D  
Brasília  
Phone: +55 61 32182834  
Fax: +55 61 32254738  
E-mail: girabis@agricultura.gov.br

Odilson Luiz RIBEIRO E SILVA  
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food  
Supply  
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Sala 352  
Brasília - DF 70043 900  
Phone: +55 61 32182834; 32182731  
Fax: +55 61 32254738  
E-mail: odilson@agricultura.gov.br

Sra Ligia Maria SCHERER  
Minister  
Deputy Permanent Representative to FAO  
Permanent Representation of the Federative  
Republic of Brazil to FAO  
Via di Santa Maria dell'Anima 32  
Rome, Italy

Jose SILVINO AS SILVA  
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food  
Supply  
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Block D  
Brasília - DF

**BULGARIA - BULGARIE**

## Representative

Peter NIKOLOV  
Director, National Plant Protection Service  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
17, Hristo Botev Blvd  
1040 Sofia  
Phone: +359 2 9534116  
Fax: +359 2 9520987  
E-mail: gen\_direktor@nsrz-bg.com

## Alternate(s)

Ms Marina FILCHEVA  
Intern  
Permanent Representation of Bulgaria to FAO  
Via Pietro Paolo Rubens 21  
Rome, Italy

Krassimir KOSTOV  
Counsellor, Permanent Representative to FAO  
Permanent Representation of Bulgaria to FAO  
Via Pietro Paolo Rubens 21  
Rome, Italy

Ms Roumiana KRUSTEVA  
Senior Expert  
Integration Policy and International  
Cooperation Department  
National Plant Protection Service  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
17, Hristo Botev Blvd  
1040 Sofia  
Phone: +359 2 9173725  
E-mail: rk\_integration@nsrz-bg.com

**BURKINA FASO**

## Représentant

Sana KOROGHO  
 Chef de Service de la Législation et du Contrôle  
 Phytosanitaire et des Pesticides  
 Direction de la Protection des Végétaux et du  
 Conditionnement (DPVC)  
 01 B.P. 5362  
 Ouagadougou 01  
 Phone: +226 50361915  
 Fax: +226 50361865  
 E-mail: sageko2000@yahoo.fr;  
 dpv@cenatrin.bf

## Suppléant(s)

Boubakar CISSE  
 Représentant permanent adjoint auprès de la  
 FAO  
 Ambassade du Burkina Faso  
 Via XX Settembre, 86  
 Rome, Italy

**BURUNDI**

## Représentant

Emile NTAHONDI  
 Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Élevage  
 Département de la Protection des Végétaux  
 Ministère de l'agriculture et de l'élevage  
 B.P. 114  
 Gitega  
 Phone: +257 402036; 910931  
 Fax: +257 402104; 222873  
 E-mail: entahondi@hotmail.com

**CAMBODIA - CAMBODGE - CAMBOYA**

## Representative

Hean VANHAN  
 Deputy Director  
 Department of Agronomy and Agricultural  
 Land Improvement  
 Phnom Penh

**CAMEROON - CAMEROUN - CAMERÚN**

## Représentant

Moungui MÉDI  
 Représentant permanent auprès de la FAO  
 Ambassade de la République du Cameroun  
 Via Siracusa 4-6  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 06 4403644  
 E-mail: info@cameroonembassy.it

## Suppléant(s)

Marcel PROSPER BAKAK  
 Phone: +237 9961337  
 E-mail: mandjek4@yahoo.fr

**CANADA - CANADÁ**

## Representative

Gary KOIVISTO  
 Executive Director, Plant Products Directorate  
 Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
 59 Camelot Drive  
 Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9  
 Phone: +1 613 2252342 Ext.4751  
 Fax: +1 613 2286615  
 E-mail: koivisitog@inspection.gc.ca

## Alternate(s)

Eric ALLEN  
 Adviser and Research Scientist  
 Canadian Forest Service  
 Pacific Forestry Centre  
 506 West Burnside Road  
 Victoria, BC V8Z 1M5  
 Phone: +1 250 3630674  
 Fax: +1 250 3630775  
 E-mail: eallen@pfc.cfs.nrcan.gc.ca

## Marie-Claude FOREST

National Manager, Import/Export Section, Plant  
 Health Division  
 Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
 59 Camelot Drive  
 Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9  
 Phone: +1 613 2252342 Ext. 4359  
 Fax: +1 613 2286602  
 E-mail: mcforest@inspection.gc.ca

## Ms Kathryn MCKINLEY

Alternative Permanent Representative of  
 Canada to FAO  
 Canadian Embassy  
 (Office of the Deputy and Alternate Permanent  
 Representatives)  
 Via Zara, 30  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 06 445982552  
 Fax: +39 06 445982930  
 E-mail: kathryn.mckinley@international.gc.ca

Gregory WOLFF  
International Standards Adviser, Plant Health  
Division  
Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
59 Camelot Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9  
Phone: +1 613 2252342 Ext.4354  
Fax: +1 613 2286602  
E-mail: wolffg@inspection.gc.ca

CPM Vice-Chairperson  
Ms Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE  
Adviser  
Canadian Food Inspection Agency  
59 Camelot Drive  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9  
Phone: +1 613 2252342 Ext.4344  
Fax: +1 613 2286602  
E-mail: rbast@inspection.gc.ca

#### CAPE VERDE - CAP-VERT - CABO VERDE

Représentant  
Ilidio FURTADO  
Directeur des services de l'agriculture  
Ministère de l'environnement, agriculture et  
pêches  
Large Guedes de Menezes  
C.P. 115 Praia  
Phone: +238 2647227  
Fax: +238 2647543  
E-mail: reic@cvtelecom.cv

#### CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC - RÉPUBLIQUE CENTRAFRICAINE - REPÚBLICA CENTROAFRICANA

Représentant  
Simon GOBANDA  
Chef de service phytosanitaire  
Ministère de la modernisation et du  
développement de l'agriculture  
B.P. 786  
Bangui  
Phone: +236 613455  
Fax: +236 675595  
E-mail: sigobanda@yahoo.fr

#### CHAD - TCHAD

Représentant  
Laoumaye NEKAOU DAH  
Direction de la Protection des Végétaux et du  
Conditionnement  
Ministère de l'agriculture  
B.P. 441  
N'Djaména  
Phone: +235 524509  
Fax: +235 343197  
E-mail: pvchad@intnet.td

#### CHILE - CHILI

Representante  
Francisco BAHAMONDE  
Director Nacional, Servicio Agrícola y  
Ganadero  
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores  
Catedral 1158, piso 3  
Santiago

Suplente(s)  
Sergio INSUNZA  
Attaché, Representante Alterno ante la FAO  
Embajada de la República de Chile  
Via Po, 23  
Rome, Italy

Orlando MORALES  
Jefe, Division Protección Agrícola, Servicio  
Agrícola y Ganadero  
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores  
Catedral 1158, piso 3  
Santiago

#### CHINA - CHINE

Representative  
Wang SHOUCONG  
Deputy Director General  
Department of Crop Production  
Ministry of Agriculture  
No. 11, Nongzhanguan Nanli  
Beijing  
Phone: +86 10 64192864  
Fax: +86 10 64192859  
E-mail: wangsc@agri.gov.cn

Alternate(s)  
Ms Cecilia CHEUNG SO MUI  
Vice-Chairwoman, Administration Committee  
Civic and Municipal Affairs Bureau  
Avenida Almeida Ribeiro No. 163  
Macau  
Phone: +853 3993833  
Fax: +853 341890  
E-mail: ceciliac@iacm.gov.mo

Wang FUXIANG  
Director  
Senior Agronomist  
Division of Plant Quarantine  
National Agro - Technical Extension and  
Service Centre  
Ministry of Agriculture  
No. 20, Mai Zi Dian Street  
Beijing  
Phone: +86 10 64194524; 64194757  
Fax: +86 10 64194726  
E-mail: wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn

Guo HANDI  
 First Secretary, Alternate Permanent  
 Representative to FAO  
 Permanent Representation of the  
 People's Republic of China to FAO  
 Via degli Urali, 12  
 Rome, Italy

Meng JIANHONG  
 Second Secretary  
 Department of Treaty and Law  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
 No. 2 Chao Yang Men Nan Da Jie  
 Beijing  
 Phone: +86 10 65963251  
 Fax: +86 10 65963257  
 E-mail: meng\_jianhong@mfa.gov.cn

LEONG KUN FONG  
 Chef, Division of the Protected Areas  
 Civic and Municipal Affairs Bureau  
 Phone: +853 870120; 6896095  
 Fax: +853 870271  
 E-mail: fongl@iacm.gov.mo

Wai-shing LOK  
 Agricultural Officer  
 Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation  
 Department  
 5/F, Cheung Sha Wan Government Offices  
 303 Cheung Sha Wan Road  
 Kowloon, Hong Kong  
 Phone: +852 2150 7012  
 Fax: +852 2736 9904  
 E-mail: edward\_ws\_lok@afcd.gov.hk

Cui PENG WEI  
 Director  
 Department of Personnel and Labour  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 No. 11, Nongzhanguan Nanli  
 Beijing  
 Phone: +86 10 64192515  
 Fax: +86 10 64193303  
 E-mail: cuipengwei@agri.gov.cn

Ms Wang XIAO-HUA  
 Director of Division  
 Forest Pests Control Division  
 Department of Afforestation  
 State Forestry Administration  
 18# Hepingli East Street  
 Beijing  
 Phone: +86 10 84238512  
 Fax: +86 10 84238067  
 E-mail: wangxiaohua@forestry.gov.cn

Hu YANAN  
 Counsellor, Alternate Permanent Representative  
 to FAO  
 Permanent Representation of the People's  
 Republic of China to FAO  
 Via degli Urali, 12  
 Rome, Italy

Wang YIYU  
 Division of Plant Quarantine (Import & Export)  
 Department of Supervision on Animal and Plant  
 Quarantine  
 General Administration of Quality Supervision,  
 Inspection and Quarantine  
 No. 9 Madiandonglu, Haidian District  
 Beijing  
 E-mail: wangyiyu@aqsig.gov.cn

Pang YULIANG  
 Third Secretary, Alternate Permanent Secretary  
 to FAO  
 Permanent Representation of the People's  
 Republic of China to FAO  
 Via degli Urali, 12  
 Rome, Italy

#### COLOMBIA - COLOMBIE

Representante  
 Juan Carlos SÁNCHEZ  
 Representante Permanente Alterno  
 Embajada de la República de Colombia  
 Via Giuseppe Pisanelli 4, Int. 10  
 Roma, Italy

Suplente(s)  
 Luis TAMARA  
 Vice Ministro de Agricultura  
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural  
 Avenida Jiménez N. 7-65  
 Bogotá

#### CONGO

Représentant  
 Blaise GASSILA  
 Directeur de la Production Agricole et de la  
 Protection des Végétaux  
 Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'élevage et de la  
 pêche  
 B.P. 2453  
 Brazzaville  
 Phone: +242 6692542  
 Fax: +242 814513  
 E-mail: blaisegassila@yahoo.fr

## Suppléant(s)

Auguste ITOUA  
 Conseiller à l'Agriculture  
 Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'élevage et de la  
 pêche  
 B.P. 2453  
 Brazzaville  
 Phone: +242 6621433  
 E-mail: augusteitoua@yahoo.fr

**COOK ISLANDS - ÎLES COOK - ISLAS  
 COOK**

## Representative

Ngatoko Ta NGATOKO  
 Quarantine Adviser  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 P.O. Box 96  
 Rarotonga  
 Phone: +682 28711  
 Fax: +682 21881  
 E-mail: nngatoko@agriculture.gov.ck

**COSTA RICA**

## Representante

Erick ARCE COTO  
 Subdirector Ejecutivo, Servicio Fitosanitario del  
 Estado  
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
 San José  
 Phone: +506 2606190  
 Fax: +506 2608301  
 E-mail: earce@protecnet.go.cr

Sra Victoria GUARDIA DE HERNÁNDEZ  
 Embajador, Jefe Delegación  
 Representante Permanente ante la FAO  
 Representación Permanente de la República de  
 Costa Rica ante la FAO  
 Viale Liegi, 2, int. 8  
 Roma, Italy

## Suplente(s)

Sra Xenia CARRO ABAD  
 Jefe Programa Nacional de Mosca de la Fruta  
 Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado  
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
 San José  
 Phone: +506 2202732  
 Fax: +506 2202732  
 E-mail: xcarro@protecnet.go.cr

Sra Yolanda GAGO DE SINIGAGLIA  
 Ministro Consejero, Representante Permanente  
 ante la FAO  
 Representación Permanente de la República de  
 Costa Rica ante la FAO  
 Viale Liegi, 2, int. 8  
 Roma, Italy

Sra Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO  
 Jefe, Departamento de Exportación  
 Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado  
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
 San José  
 Phone: +506 2606721  
 Fax: +506 2606721  
 E-mail: mgonzalez@protecnet.go.cr

## Sra Úrsula PERSIANI

Asistente  
 Representación Permanente de la República de  
 Costa Rica ante la FAO  
 Viale Liegi, 2, int. 8  
 Roma, Italy

**CROATIA - CROATIE - CROACIA**

## Representative

Ms Marina SARCEVIC  
 Senior Phytosanitary Inspector  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water  
 Management of Croatia  
 Ulica grada Vukovara 78  
 10 000 Zagreb  
 Phone: +385 1 6109457  
 Fax: +385 1 6106619  
 E-mail: marina.sarcevic@mps.hr

**CUBA**

## Representante

Sra Ileana HERRERA CARRICARTE  
 Especialista en Programas de Desarrollo y  
 Relaciones Internacionales  
 Centro Nacional de Sanidad Vegetal  
 Ayuntamiento No. 231, Plaza de la Revolución  
 Habana  
 Phone: +537 881 5089  
 Fax: +537 870 3277  
 E-mail: ileana@sanidadvegetal.cu;  
 ileanadhc@yahoo.es

**CYPRUS - CHYPRE - CHIPRE**

## Representative

Gabriel ODYSSEOS  
 Agricultural Attaché  
 Deputy Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Piazza Farnese, 44  
 Rome, Italy

**CZECH REPUBLIC - RÉPUBLIQUE  
TCHÈQUE - REPÚBLICA CHECA**

Representative

Ms Jitka MASKOVA  
 State Phytosanitary Administration  
 Division on Protection against Harmful  
 Organisms  
 Drnovska 507, Areal Vurv  
 16106 Prague - 6 Ruzyně  
 Phone: +42 0233 022240  
 Fax: +42 0233 022226  
 E-mail: jitka.maskova@srs.cz

**CÔTE D'IVOIRE**

Suppléant(s)

Lido Lambert BALLOY  
 Représentant adjoint auprès de la FAO  
 Ambassade de la République de Côte d'Ivoire  
 Via Guglielmo Saliceto 6/8/10  
 Rome, Italy

**DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF  
KOREA - RÉPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE  
DÉMOCRATIQUE DE CORÉE - REPÚBLICA  
POPULAR DEMOCRÁTICA DE COREA**

Representative

Su Chang YUN  
 Minister of Embassy  
 Embassy of the Democratic People's Republic  
 of Korea  
 Viale dell'Esperanto, 26  
 Rome, Italy

Alternate(s)

Yong Ho RI  
 Second Secretary  
 Embassy of the Democratic People's Republic  
 of Korea  
 Viale dell'Esperanto, 26  
 Rome, Italy

**DENMARK - DANEMARK - DINAMARCA**

Representative

Ebbe NORDBO  
 Head of Section  
 Plant Directorate  
 Skovbrynet 20  
 DK-2800 Lyngby  
 Phone: +45 45263600  
 Fax: +45 45263613  
 E-mail: eno@pdir.dk

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC - RÉPUBLIQUE  
DOMINICAINE - REPÚBLICA  
DOMINICANA**

Representante

Fausto MONEGRO RAMOS  
 Encargado del Portal Fitosanitario de República  
 Dominicana  
 Departamento de Sanidad Vegetal  
 Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura  
 Ave. Duarte, Km. 6-1/2  
 Los Jardines del Norte  
 Santo Domingo  
 Phone: +1 809 5473888 Ext.4103  
 Fax: +1 809 5620057  
 E-mail: fmonegro@hotmail.com

Suplente(s)

Mario ARVELO CAAMAÑO  
 Embajador  
 Representante Permanente ante la FAO  
 Via Baldassarre Peruzzi, 10, int. 2  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 06 9761 3676; 380 2504006  
 Fax: +39 06 9725 6408  
 E-mail: mario@marioarvelo.com

Pedro JIMENÉZ ROJAS  
 Representación Permanente de la República  
 Dominicana ante la FAO  
 Via Baldassarre Peruzzi, 10, int. 2  
 Roma, Italy

**ECUADOR - ÉQUATEUR**

Representante

Emilio IZQUIERDO MIÑO  
 Embajador, Representante Permanente ante la  
 FAO  
 Embajada de la República del Ecuador  
 Via Antonio Bertoloni, 8  
 Roma, Italy

Suplente(s)

Sra Patricia BORJA  
 Segundo Secretario  
 Embajada de la República del Ecuador  
 Via Antonio Bertoloni, 8  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 06 45439007  
 Fax: +39 06 8076271  
 E-mail: pborja@ecuador.it

José VILATUÑA RODRÍGUEZ  
 Coordinador de Investigación Fitosanitaria  
 Servicio Ecuatoriano de Sanidad Agropecuaria  
 (SESA)  
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
 Avenidas Amazonas y Eloy Alfaro, piso 9  
 Quito  
 Phone: +593 22543319  
 E-mail: jvilatuna@mag.gov.ec

**EGYPT - ÉGYPTÉ - EGIPTO**

Representative  
 Safwat EL-HADDAD  
 General Director of Center of Agriculture  
 Quarantine Area  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation  
 5, Nadi El Seid Street, Dokki,  
 Cairo  
 Phone: +202 3372881  
 Fax: +202 3363582  
 E-mail: safwat.el\_haddad@E-mail.com

**EL SALVADOR**

Representante  
 Rafael GONZÁLEZ  
 Asesor del Ministro de Agricultura y Ganadería  
 Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal y  
 Animal  
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería  
 Final 1a Av. Norte y Av. Manuel Gallardo  
 Departamento de La Libertad  
 San Salvador

## Suplente(s)

Sra María Eulalia JIMENÉZ  
 Ministra Consejera, Representante Adjunto ante  
 la FAO  
 Embajada de la República de El Salvador  
 Via Gualtierio Castellini, 13  
 Roma, Italy

**EQUATORIAL GUINEA - GUINÉE  
 ÉQUATORIALE - GUINEA ECUATORIAL**

Representante  
 D. Lázaro ENGONO NGOMO  
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Bosques  
 C/Carretera a Luba  
 Malabo

**ERITREA - ÉRYTHRÉE**

Representative  
 Tekleab MESGHENA  
 Director General, Ministry of Agriculture  
 Regulatory Service Department  
 P.O. Box 8195  
 Asmara  
 Phone: +291 1 120395; 159280  
 Fax: +291 1 127508  
 E-mail: mtekleab@eol.com.er

## Alternate(s)

Yohannes TENSUE  
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of Eritrea  
 Via Boncompagni, 16 - 3rd Floor  
 Rome, Italy

**ETHIOPIA - ÉTHIOPIE - ETIOPÍA**

Representative  
 Markos FIKRE  
 Head, Plant Protection Department  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development  
 P.O. Box 62347  
 Kasainchis  
 Addis Ababa  
 Phone: +251 1 626973; 463681  
 Fax: +251 1 463686  
 E-mail: fikrem2001@yahoo.com

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITY -  
 COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE -  
 COMUNIDAD EUROPEA**

Représentant  
 Marc VEREECKE  
 Chef de secteur, Biotechnologie et santé des  
 végétaux  
 Directorate-General - Health and Consumer  
 Protection  
 Phytosanitary Unit  
 European Commission  
 Rue de la Loi 200  
 B-1049 Bruxelles, Belgium

## Suppléant(s)

Harry ARIJS  
 Administrateur, Biotechnologie et santé des  
 végétaux  
 Directorate-General - Health and Consumer  
 Protection  
 Phytosanitary Unit  
 European Commission  
 Rue de la Loi 200  
 B-1049 Bruxelles, Belgium

**FIJI - FIDJI**

Representative  
 Hiagi Munivai FORAETE  
 Acting Director, Quarantine and Inspection  
 Division  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Sugar and Land  
 Resettlement  
 P.O. Box 18360  
 Suva  
 Phone: +679 330 2067  
 Fax: +679 330 1657  
 E-mail: hforaete@govnet.gov.fj;  
 hmforaete@connect.com.fj

**FINLAND - FINLANDE - FINLANDIA**

Representative / CPM Vice-Chairperson

Ralf LOPIAN  
 Senior Advisor  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
 Department of Food and Health  
 P.O. Box 30  
 00023 Helsinki  
 Phone: +358 9 16052449  
 Fax: +358 9 16052443  
 E-mail: ralf.lopian@mmm.fi

Alternate(s)

Ms Tuula MÄKI-VALKAMA  
 Senior Officer, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
 Department of Food and Health  
 P.O. Box 30  
 00023 Helsinki  
 Phone: +358 9 16052692  
 Fax: +358 9 16052443  
 E-mail: tuula.maki-valkama@mmm.fi

**FRANCE - FRANCIA**

Représentant

Olivier LETODE  
 Chef de Bureau de la santé des végétaux  
 Ministère de l'agriculture et de la pêche  
 78, rue de Varenne  
 Paris  
 Phone: +33 1 49558148  
 Fax: +33 1 49555949

Suppléant(s)

Marc VEDELE  
 Chargé de mission au Bureau de la santé des végétaux  
 Ministère de l'agriculture et de la pêche  
 78, rue de Varenne  
 Paris

**GERMANY - ALLEMAGNE - ALEMANIA**

Representative

Ms Karola SCHORN  
 Federal Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection  
 Plant Health Department  
 D-53123 Bonn  
 Phone: +49 228 5293527  
 Fax: +49 228 5294262  
 E-mail: 517@bmelv.bund.de

Alternate(s)

Ms Kerstin SCHÄFER  
 Adviser  
 Federal Biological Research Center  
 Division on National and International Affairs on Plant Health  
 D-38104 Braunschweig  
 Phone: +49 531 2993373  
 Fax: +49 531 29930072  
 E-mail: ag.bs@bba.de

Jens-Georg UNGER  
 Federal Biological Research Center  
 Division on National and International Affairs on Plant Health  
 D-38104 Braunschweig  
 Phone: +49 531 2993370  
 Fax: +49 531 2993007  
 E-mail: ag.bs@bba.de

**GHANA**

Representative

Kwaku NICOL  
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of the Republic of Ghana  
 Via Ostriana 4  
 Rome, Italy

**GREECE - GRÈCE - GRECIA**

Representative

Nikolaos KOULIS  
 Regulatory Expert  
 Ministry of Rural Development and Food  
 150 Sygrou Avenue  
 176 71 Kallithea  
 Phone: +30 2109287233  
 Fax: +30 2109212090  
 E-mail: syg059@minagric.gr

**GUATEMALA**

Representante

Jaime SOSA  
 Funcionario del área de Protección Fitosanitaria  
 Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación  
 15 avenida 14-72, zona 13  
 Ciudad Autónoma de Guatemala  
 Phone: +502 2422 3400; 5308 1766  
 E-mail: jaimesosa@agexpront.org.gt;  
 jsosa@pipaa.com

Suplente(s)

Sra Ileana RIVERA DE ANGOLFI  
 Representante Permanente Adjunto ante la FAO  
 Embajada de la República de Guatemala  
 Via dei Colli della Farnesina, 128  
 Roma, Italy



**GUINEA - GUINÉE**

## Représentant

Moriba PIVI  
 Chef de Division Protection des Végétaux  
 Direction Nationale de l'Agriculture  
 Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'élevage des eaux  
 et forêts  
 B.P. 576  
 Conakry  
 Phone: +224 29 60411910  
 E-mail: isys@biasy.net

## Suppléant(s)

Abdoulaye TRAORE  
 Conseiller Economique, Représentant  
 permanent adjoint auprès de la FAO  
 Ambassade de la République de Guinée  
 Via Adelaide Ristori, 9b/13  
 Rome, Italy

**HONDURAS**

## Representante

César Augusto NOÉ PINO  
 Director General del Servicio Nacional de  
 Sanidad Agropecuaria  
 Secretaría de Estado en el Despacho de  
 Agricultura y Ganadería  
 Blvd. Miraflores, Ave. la FAO  
 Edificio SENASA, Tercer Piso, Dirección  
 General  
 Tegucigalpa  
 Phone: +504 2310786  
 Fax: +504 2391144  
 E-mail: cnoepino@yahoo.com

## Suplente(s)

Sra Reina MAYRA  
 Representante Permanente Adjunto  
 Embajada de la República de Honduras  
 Via Giambattista Vico 40, int. 8  
 Roma, Italy

**HUNGARY - HONGRIE - HUNGRÍA**

## Representative

Lajos SZABÓ  
 Deputy Head of Department  
 Department for Plant Protection and Soil  
 Conservation  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development  
 Kossuth Lajos tér 11  
 1860 Budapest 55. PF 1  
 Phone: +36 1 3014249  
 Fax: +36 1 3014644  
 E-mail: szabol@posta.fvm.hu

**INDIA - INDE**

## Representative

P.S. CHANDURKAR  
 Plant Protection Adviser to the Government of  
 India  
 Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and  
 Storage  
 Department of Agriculture and Cooperation  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 NH-IV, Faridabad  
 Phone: +91 129 2413985 / 0056  
 Fax: +91 29 2412125  
 E-mail: ppa@nic.in

## Alternate(s)

Shri AMIT JHA  
 Director Plant Protection  
 Department of Agriculture and Cooperation  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 Krishi Bhawan  
 New Delhi  
 Phone: +91 2338 1385  
 Fax: +91 2338 1385  
 E-mail: amit.jha@nic.in

**INDONESIA - INDONÉSIE**

## Representative

Syukur IWANTORO  
 Director General, Agency for Agricultural  
 Quarantine  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 JL Harsono Rm 3, E Building  
 Jakarta 12550 1st  
 Phone: +62 21 7816481  
 Fax: +62 21 7816481  
 E-mail: syukur@deptan.go.id

## Alternate(s)

Siti MAULUDIAH  
 First Secretary, Alternate Permanent  
 Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia  
 Via Campania 55  
 Rome, Italy

Dwi Putra SETIAWAN  
 Head, Plant Quarantine Technical and Method  
 Division  
 Agency for Agricultural Quarantine  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 JL Harsono Rm 3, E Building  
 Jakarta 12550  
 Phone: +62 21 7816482  
 Fax: +62 21 7816482  
 E-mail: setiawan.dwi@cbn.net.id;  
 setiawan@deptan.go.id

Sulistio SUKAMTO  
Head of Analysis Section  
Directorate General for Horticulture  
Ministry of Agriculture  
JL Pasar Minggu  
Jakarta 12550

Suwardi SURYANINGRAT  
Senior Plant Quarantine Inspector  
Agency for Agricultural Quarantine  
Ministry of Agriculture  
JL Pemuda No. 64  
Rawamangun  
Jakarta 13220  
Phone: +62 21 4894877  
Fax: +62 21 4892020  
E-mail: swd\_surya@yahoo.com

**IRAQ**

## Representative

Jabar Hashim AL YASIRI  
Agricultural Chief Engineer in the State Board  
for Plant Protection  
Agriculture Ministry  
Baghdad  
Phone: +964 7903502371  
E-mail: plantprotection75-@hotmail.com

## Alternate(s)

Akram AL JAFF  
Ambassador to FAO  
Permanent Representation of the Republic of  
Iraq to FAO  
Via della Camilluccia, 355  
00135 Rome, Italy

**IRELAND - IRLANDE - IRLANDA**

## Representative

Michael HICKEY  
Senior Inspector  
Department of Agriculture and Food  
Maynooth  
Co. Kildare  
Phone: +353 1 5053354  
Fax: +353 1 5053564  
E-mail: michael.hickey@agriculture.gov.ie

**ITALY - ITALIE - ITALIA**

## Représentant

Bruno FARAGLIA  
Coordinateur technique  
Ministère pour les politiques agricoles et  
forestières  
Via XX Settembre, 20  
Rome  
Phone: +39 06 46656088  
Fax: +39 06 4814628  
E-mail: b.faraglia@politicheagricole.it

## Suppléant(s)

Alessandro GASTON  
Ministère des affaires étrangères  
Piazzale della Farnesina 1  
Rome

**JAMAICA - JAMAÏQUE**

## Representative

Ms Sheila HARVEY  
Acting Chief  
Plant Quarantine, Produce Inspection Unit  
Ministry of Agriculture  
193 Old Hope Road  
Kingston 6  
Phone: +876 9776401; 9770637  
Fax: +876 9776401; 9271904  
E-mail: syharvey@moa.gov.jm

**JAPAN - JAPON - JAPÓN**

## Representative

Yasuhiro HAYAKAWA  
Director, Plant Protection Division  
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau,  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
(MAFF),  
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,  
Tokyo  
Phone: +81 3 35023383  
Fax: +81 3 35023386  
E-mail: yasui\_hayakawa@mm.maff.go.jp

## Alternate(s)

Masashi KANEDA  
Deputy Director, Plant Protection Division  
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
(MAFF)  
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo  
Phone: +81 3 35025978  
Fax: +81 3 35023386  
E-mail: masasi\_kaneda@nm.maff.go.jp

Masahiro SAI  
Section Chief, Plant Protection Division  
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
(MAFF)  
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo  
Phone: +81 3 35023383  
Fax: +81 3 35023386  
E-mail: masahiro\_sai@nm.maff.go.jp

Motoi SAKAMURA  
Principal Officer  
Export and Domestic Plant Quarantine section  
Kobe Plant Protection Station  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
(MAFF)  
1 - 1, Hatoba-cho, Chuou-ku  
Kobe  
Phone: +81 78 3312384  
Fax: +81 78 3911757  
E-mail: sakamuram@pps.go.jp

**JORDAN - JORDANIE - JORDANIA**

Representative  
Mohammad Rabah KATBEH BADER  
Head of Phytosanitary Division  
Ministry of Agriculture  
University Street  
P.O. Box 2099  
Amman  
Phone: +962 6 5686151; 795895691  
Fax: +962 6 5686310  
E-mail: katbehbader@moa.gov.jo

**KENYA**

Representative  
Ms Ann NYIKULI  
Permanent Representative to FAO  
Embassy of the Republic of Kenya  
Via Archimede, 164  
Rome, Italy

**Alternate(s)**

Ms Esther KIMANI  
Officer-in-Charge  
Plant Quarantine Station  
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service  
National Plant Protection Organization  
P.O. Box 49421  
Nairobi  
Phone: +254 722 209505; 734 330017  
E-mail: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Joseph MBURU  
Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
Embassy of the Republic of Kenya  
Via Archimede, 164  
Rome, Italy

**CPM Chairperson**

Chagama J. KEDERA  
Managing Director  
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service  
Ooloolua Ridge, Karen  
P.O. Box 49592 00100 GPO  
Nairobi  
Phone: +254 020 884545 / 882308 / 882933  
Fax: +254 020 882265  
E-mail: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

**LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC -  
RÉPUBLIQUE DÉMOCRATIQUE  
POPULAIRE LAO - REPÚBLICA  
DEMOCRÁTICA POPULAR LAO**

Representative  
Khamphilay CHOUNLAMOUNTRY  
Deputy Director  
Department of Agriculture  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
Lane Xang Avenue  
Vientiane  
Phone: +856 2 412349  
Fax: +856 21 412350  
E-mail: doag@laotel.com

**LATVIA - LETTONIE - LETONIA**

Representative  
Ringolds ARNITIS  
State Plant Protection Service  
Republikas Lauk. 2  
1981 Riga  
Phone: +371 7027098; 7027302  
E-mail: ringolds.arnitis@vaad.gov.lv

**LIBERIA - LIBÉRIA**

Representative  
Augustus B.G. FAHNBULLEH  
Director, Coordinator  
National Quarantine and Environmental  
Services  
Technical Affairs Department  
Ministry of Agriculture  
1000 Monrovia 10  
Phone: +231 6 439982  
E-mail: fahnbullehgate@yahoo.com

## Alternate(s)

Ms Musu J.RUHLE  
 Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative  
 to FAO  
 Embassy of the Republic of Liberia  
 Piazzale delle Medaglie d'Oro, 7  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 06 35453399  
 Fax: +39 06 35344729

**LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA -  
 JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBYENNE -  
 JAMAHIRIJA ÁRABE LIBIA**

## Representative

Abdalla A.M. ZAIED  
 Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Permanent Representation of the Libyan Arab  
 Jamahiriya to FAO  
 Via Nomentana, 365  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 06 8603880  
 Fax: +39 06 86325597  
 E-mail: aazaied@lttnet.net

## Alternate(s)

Bashir Othman AKSLURA  
 Director, Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Permanent Representation of the Libyan Arab  
 Jamahiriya to FAO  
 Via Nomentana, 365  
 Rome, Italy

Serajadden ESSA  
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Permanent Representation of the Libyan Arab  
 Jamahiriya to FAO  
 Via Nomentana, 365  
 Rome, Italy

**LITHUANIA - LITUANIE - LITUANIA**

## Representative

Lidiya NECAYEVA  
 Head of Division of SPSS  
 Vilnius

**MALAYSIA - MALAISIE - MALASIA**

## Representative

H.E. Dato' Lily ZACHARIAH  
 Ambassador, Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of Malaysia  
 Via Nomentana, 297  
 Rome, Italy

## Alternate(s)

Amri ISMAIL  
 Assistant Agricultural Attaché, Alternate  
 Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of Malaysia  
 Via Nomentana, 297  
 Rome, Italy

Johari RAMLI  
 Agricultural Attaché, Alternate Permanent  
 Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of Malaysia  
 Via Nomentana, 297  
 Rome, Italy

Mazlan SAADON  
 Deputy Director, Import and Export Control  
 Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Division  
 Department of Agriculture  
 Jalan Gallagher  
 50632 Kuala Lumpur  
 Phone: +603 26977180  
 Fax: +603 26977164  
 E-mail: mazlan@doa.gov.my

Wan Normah WAN ISMAIL  
 Deputy Director of Enforcement  
 Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Division  
 Department of Agriculture  
 Jalan Gallagher  
 50632 Kuala Lumpur  
 Phone: +603 26977160  
 Fax: +603 26977164  
 E-mail: wanis@doa.gov.my;  
 wann54@yahoo.com

**MALI - MALÍ**

## Représentant

Ibrahim Bocar DAGA  
 Représentant Permanent auprès de la FAO,  
 Ambassadeur  
 Ambassade de la République du Mali  
 Via Antonio Bosio, 2  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 06 44254068  
 Fax: +39 06 44254029  
 E-mail: ambmali@tiscalinet.it

## Suppléant(s)

Abdrahamane SIDIBE  
 Chef de Division Législation et Contrôle  
 Phytosanitaire à la Direction Nationale de  
 l'Agriculture  
 Ministère de l'agriculture  
 B.P. 1098  
 Bamako  
 Phone: +223 222 2877  
 Fax: +223 222 4036

Modibo Mahamane TOURE  
Deuxième Conseiller, Représentant permanent  
suppléant auprès de la FAO  
Ambassade de la République du Mali  
Via Antonio Bosio, 2  
Rome, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 44254068

**MALTA - MALTE**

Representative  
Pierre HILI  
First Secretary, Chargé d'Affaires a.i.  
Permanent Representative to FAO  
Permanent Representation of the Republic of  
Malta to FAO  
Via dei Somaschi, 1  
00186 Rome, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 6879947  
Fax: +39 06 6892687  
E-mail: maltaembassy.unRome, Italy@gov.mt

**MAURITANIA - MAURITANIE**

Représentant  
Moussa Mamadou SOW  
Point de Contact Officiel de la CIPV de la  
Mauritanie  
Ministère du Développement Rural et de  
l'Environnement  
Direction de l'Agriculture  
B.P. 180  
Nouakchott  
Phone: +222 525 7879; 660 4424  
Fax: +222 5257879; 525 4423; 525 3467  
E-mail: m\_dioolo@yahoo.fr

## Suppléant(s)

Mme Mariem MINT MOHAMED AHMEDOU  
Première Conseiller  
Ambassade de la République islamique de  
Mauritanie  
Via Paisiello, 26, Int. 5  
Rome, Italy

**MAURITIUS - MAURICE - MAURICIO**

Representative  
Denis CANGY  
Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
Embassy of the Republic of Mauritius  
c/o Consulate of the Republic of Mauritius  
Via G.B. Morgagni 6/A  
Rome, Italy

**MEXICO - MEXIQUE - MÉXICO**

Representante  
Mario PUENTE RAYA  
Director de Regulación Fitosanitaria  
Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127  
Col. Del Carmen Coyacan  
C.P. 04100  
Phone: +52 55 545147  
Fax: +52 55 580696  
E-mail: mpuente@senasica.sagarpa.gob.mx

## Suplente(s)

Vladimir HERNÁNDEZ LARA  
Representante Alterno de México ante la FAO  
Embajada de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos  
Via Lazzaro Spallanzani, 16  
Roma, Italy

René HERNÁNDEZ RUÍZ  
Jefe del Departamento de Armonización y  
Planes de Trabajo Fitosanitarios  
Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127  
Col. Del Carmen Coyacan  
C.P. 04100  
Phone: +52 56581417  
Fax: +52 56580696  
E-mail: aptf@senasica.sagarpa.gob.mx

Jorge LEYVA VÁZQUEZ  
Director General de Inspección Fitozoosanitaria  
Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería,  
Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación  
Municipio Libre No. 377 - Piso 7, Ala B.  
Santa Cruz, Atoyac  
C.P.03310  
Phone: +52 91831000 Ext. 34063  
Fax: +52 91831000 Ext. 34079  
E-mail: dgif.dir@senasica.sagarpa.gob.mx

**MOROCCO - MAROC - MARRUECOS**

Représentant  
Mekki CHOUIBANI  
Chef  
Division des contrôles techniques et  
phytosanitaires, DPVCTRF  
Av. de la Victoire  
B.P. 1308  
Rabat  
Phone: +212 37 299931  
Fax: +212 37 297544  
E-mail: chouibani@yahoo.fr; chouibani-  
m@menara.ma

**NETHERLANDS - PAYS-BAS - PAÍSES  
BAJOS**

## Representative

Rob VAN LINT  
 Director, Plant Protection Service of the  
 Netherlands  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food  
 Quality  
 P.O. Box 9102  
 7600 HC Wageningen  
 Phone: +31 3177496600  
 Fax: +31 317421701  
 E-mail: r.j.t.van.lint@minlnv.nl

## Alternate(s)

Bram DE HOOP  
 Official IPPC Contact Point of the Netherlands  
 Division of International Phytosanitary Affairs  
 Plant Protection Service of the Netherlands  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food  
 Quality  
 P.O. Box 9102  
 6700 HC Wageningen  
 Phone: +31 317496629  
 Fax: +31 317421701  
 E-mail: m.b.de.hoop@minlnv.nl

Ms Mennie GERRITSEN-WIELARD  
 Senior Staff Officer, Phytosanitary Affairs  
 Department of Agriculture  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food  
 Quality  
 P.O. Box 20401  
 2500 EK The Hague  
 Phone: +31 703785782  
 Fax: +31 703786156  
 E-mail: m.j.gerritsen@minlnv.nl

Ton VAN ARNHEM  
 Division Chief, International Phytosanitary  
 Affairs  
 Department of Agriculture  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food  
 Quality  
 P.O. Box 20401  
 2500 EK Den Haag  
 Phone: +31 70385094  
 Fax: +31 70386156  
 E-mail: a.c.van.arnhem@minlnv.nl

Theo VAN BANNING  
 Counsellor, Deputy Permanent Representative  
 to FAO  
 Via delle Terme Deciane 6  
 I-00153 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 065740306  
 Fax: +39 065744927  
 E-mail: t.r.g.van.banning@minlnv.nl

**NEW ZEALAND - NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE -  
NUEVA ZELANDIA**

## Representative

John HEDLEY  
 Principal Adviser, International Coordination  
 Biosecurity New Zealand  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
 Pastoral House 28, The Terrace  
 P.O. Box 2526  
 Wellington  
 Phone: +64 4 819 0428  
 Fax: +64 4 819 0731  
 E-mail: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz

## Alternate(s)

Ms Carolyn HINI  
 Senior Adviser  
 International Biosecurity New Zealand  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
 Pastoral House 28, The Terrace  
 P.O. Box 2526  
 Wellington  
 Phone: +64 4 819 0427  
 Fax: +64 4 819 0731  
 E-mail: carolyn.hini@maf.govt.nz

Peter THOMSON  
 Director Post Clearance  
 Biosecurity New Zealand  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
 Pastoral House 28, The Terrace  
 P.O. Box 2526  
 Wellington  
 Phone: +64 4 819 0353  
 Fax: +64 4 819 0728  
 E-mail: peter.thomson@maf.govt.nz

Keawe WOODMORE  
 Specialist Negotiator, SPS Issues  
 Trade Negotiations Division  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade  
 195 Lambton Quay  
 Wellington  
 Phone: +64 4 439 8339  
 Fax: +64 4 439 8522  
 E-mail: keawe.woodmore@mfat.govt.nz

**NICARAGUA**

## Representante

Martín AGENOR ROSALES  
 Jefe de Vigilancia Fitosanitaria y Campaña  
 Ministerio Agropecuario y Forestal  
 Km. 8 1/2, Carretera a Masaya  
 Managua  
 Phone: +505 2781320  
 Fax: +505 2781320  
 E-mail: magenor@dgpsa.gob.ni

## Suplente(s)

Sra Amelia SILVA  
 Ministro Consejera  
 Embajada de la República de Nicaragua  
 Via Brescia, 16  
 Roma, Italy

**NIGER - NÍGER**

## Représentant

Dogo ISSOUFOU  
 Chef de Service Législation et Réglementation  
 phytosanitaires  
 Ministère du Développement Agricole  
 Direction de la Protection des Végétaux  
 B.P. 323  
 Niamey  
 Phone: +227 742556  
 Fax: +227 741983  
 E-mail: dpv@intnet.ne

**NIGERIA - NIGÉRIA**

## Representative

P.O. AGBOADE  
 Head  
 Nigeria Plant Quarantine Service  
 Moor Plantation  
 P.M.B. 5672  
 Ibadan  
 Phone: +234 2 314183 / 3842  
 E-mail: peterlbayo@yahoo.com;  
 npqs\_ngr@yahoo.com

## Alternate(s)

Ms S.N. ORAKA  
 Crop Protection Officer  
 Federal Department of Agriculture  
 Area 11 Garki  
 Abuja

**NIUE - NIOUÉ**

## Representative

Ms Crispina Fakanaiki KONELIO  
 Senior Plant Protection Officer  
 Department of Agriculture, Forestry and  
 Fisheries  
 P.O. Box 74  
 Alofi  
 Phone: +683 4032  
 Fax: +683 4079  
 E-mail: quarantine\_niue@yahoo.co.nz

**NORWAY - NORVÈGE - NORUEGA**

## Representative

Ms Katrine Røed MEBERG  
 Adviser  
 Norwegian Ministry of Agriculture and Food  
 Department of Food Policy  
 P.O. Box 8007 Dep.  
 NO-0030 Oslo  
 Phone: +47 22249343  
 Fax: +47 22249559  
 E-mail: katrineb.meberg@lmd.dep.no

## Alternate(s)

Ms Hilde PAULSEN  
 Senior Adviser  
 Norwegian Food Safety Authority  
 P.O. Box 383  
 2381 Brumunddal  
 Phone: +47 23216878  
 Fax: +47 23217001  
 E-mail: hilde.paulsen@mattilsynet.no

**OMAN - OMÁN**

## Representative

Rasmi MAHMOUD  
 Technical Adviser  
 Embassy of the Sultanate of Oman  
 Via della Camilluccia, 625  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 3335042289

**PAKISTAN - PAKISTÁN**

## Representative

H. Pathan IQBAL  
 Director, DPP  
 Plant Protection Department  
 Jinnah Avenue, Malir Halt  
 Karachi  
 Phone: +92 21 9248670  
 Fax: +92 21 9248673  
 E-mail: plant-q@khi.paknet.com.pk

**PANAMA - PANAMÁ**

## Representante

Eudoro JAÉN ESQUIVEL  
 Embajador, Representante Permanente ante la  
 FAO  
 Viale Regina Margherita, 239 - piso 4  
 Roma, Italy

## Suplente(s)

Ariel ESPINO DE LEÓN  
 Director Nacional de Sanidad Vegetal  
 Ministerio de Desarrollo Agropecuario  
 Apartado 5390  
 Panamá

Horacio MALTEZ  
Representante Permanente ante la FAO  
Viale Regina Margherita, 239 - piso 4  
Roma, Italy

**PAPUA NEW GUINEA - PAPOUASIE-  
NOUVELLE-GUINÉE - PAPUA NUEVA  
GUINEA**

Representative  
Roy MASAMDU  
Chief Plant Protection Officer  
National Agriculture Quarantine and Inspection  
Authority (NAQIA)  
Technical and Advisory Services Division  
P. O. Box 741  
Port Moresby, N.C.D.  
Phone: +675 325 9977; 311 2100  
Fax: +675 325 9310; 311 2100  
E-mail: naqs@dg.com.pg;  
rmasamdu@online.net.pg

**PARAGUAY**

Representante  
Ernesto Raúl GALLIANI GRANADA  
Director de Organismo Nacional de Protección  
Fitosanitaria  
Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal  
y de Semillas  
Humaitá 145, entre Independencia Nacional y  
Nuestra Señora de la Asunción, Edificio Planeta  
I  
Asunción  
Phone: +595 21 441 549; 21 445 769  
Fax: +595 21 441 491  
E-mail: dpv\_senave@telesurf.com.py

Suplente(s)

Sra Liz Haydee CORONEL CORREA  
Consejera de Embajada  
Embajada de la República del Paraguay  
Viale Castro Pretorio, 116 - piso 2  
Roma, Italy

**PERU - PÉROU - PERÚ**

Representante  
Roberto SEMINARIO PORTOCARRERO  
Representante Permanente Adjunto ante la  
FAO, Encargado de Negocios  
Embajada de la República del Perú  
Via Francesco Siacci, 2/B, int. 5  
Roma, Italy

Suplente(s)

Sra Dora PARIONA JAVIER  
Especialista de Sanidad Vegetal  
Servicio Nacional de Sanidad Agraria  
Av. La Molina 1915  
Lima 12  
Phone: + 511 3133301  
Fax: +511 3133315

Fernán VALER  
Agregado Agrícola de la Representación  
Permanente del Perú ante los Organismos  
Internacionales

**PHILIPPINES - FILIPINAS**

Representative  
Ms Merle PALACPAC  
Chief  
Plant Quarantine Service  
Bureau of Plant Industr  
692 San Andres Street, Malate  
Manila  
Phone: +632 404 0409; 523 9132  
Fax: +632 524 2812

Alternate(s)

Noel DE LUNA  
Agricultural Attaché, Deputy Permanent  
Representative to FAO  
Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines  
Viale delle Medaglie d'Oro, 112  
Rome, Italy

Ms María Luisa GAVINO  
Assistant Agricultural Attaché, Alternate  
Permanent Representative to FAO  
Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines  
Viale delle Medaglie d'Oro, 112  
Rome, Italy

**POLAND - POLOGNE - POLONIA**

Representative  
Ms Janina BUTRYMOWICZ  
Main Specialist  
Main Inspectorate, State Plant Health and Seed  
Inspection Service  
Zwirki i Wigury Str. 73  
87-100 Torun  
Phone: +48 56 6235698  
Fax: +48 56 6528228  
E-mail: j.butrymowicz@piorin.gov.pl



**PORTUGAL**

## Representative

Antonio PACHECO DA SILVA  
 Director of Phytosanitary Services  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development  
 and Fisheries  
 Tapada da Ajuda, Edifício 1  
 Lisbon  
 Phone: +351 21 3613274  
 Fax: +351 21 3613277  
 E-mail: dsf@dgpe.min-agricultura.pt

## Alternate(s)

Joao Miguel LOMELINO DE FREITAS  
 Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of the Portuguese Republic  
 Viale Liegi, 21  
 Rome, Italy

**REPUBLIC OF KOREA - RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE - REPÚBLICA DE COREA**

## Representative

Jong-Ho BAEK  
 Director, International Quarantine Cooperation  
 Division  
 National Plant Quarantine Service  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
 433-1 Anyang 6-dong, Anyang-si, Gyeonggi-do  
 Phone: +82 31 4451223  
 Fax: +82 31 4456934  
 E-mail: jono100@npqs.go.kr

## Alternate(s)

Jeong-Eun AHN  
 Assistant Director, Bilateral Cooperation  
 Division  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
 Government Complex Gwacheon, Jungang-  
 dong, Gwachcon-si, Gyeonggi-do  
 Phone: +82 2 5001730  
 Fax: +82 2 5046659  
 E-mail: jeahn@maf.go.kr

Jin-Won HWANG  
 Assistant Director, International Quarantine  
 Cooperation Division  
 National Plant Quarantine Service  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
 433-1 Anyang 6-dong, Anyang-si, Gyeonggi-do  
 Phone: +82 31 4461926  
 Fax: +82 31 4456934  
 E-mail: jwhwang@npqs.go.kr

**RUSSIAN FEDERATION - FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE - FEDERACIÓN DE RUSIA**

## Representative

V.V. POPOVICH  
 Division of Phytosanitary Surveillance  
 Federal Service for Veterinary and  
 Phytosanitary Surveillance  
 Orlikov per. 1/11  
 107139 Moscow  
 Phone: +7 495 2076266; 495 9751318  
 E-mail: kuskuta@mail.ru

## Alternate(s)

Ms Natalia A. SHEROKOLAVA  
 Deputy Director  
 Federal State Organization  
 All Russian Plant Quarantine Centre  
 Pogranichnaya str. 32  
 Bykovo-2 Ramensky region  
 Moscow  
 Phone: +7 495 2237241  
 Fax: +7 495 7857613  
 E-mail: natalia\_sh@mail.ru

Alexander A. TITARENKO  
 Permanent Observer to FAO  
 Embassy of the Russian Federation  
 Via Gaeta 5  
 00185 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: +39 06 4941680  
 Fax: +39 06 491031

**SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES - SAINT-VINCENT-ET-LES GRENADINES - SAN VICENTE Y LAS GRANADINAS**

## Representative

Reuben H. ROBERTSON  
 Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries  
 Murrays Road  
 Kingstown  
 Phone: +1 784 4561410  
 Fax: +1 784 4571688  
 E-mail: office.agriculture@mail.gov.vc

**SAMOA**

## Representative

Asuao Kirifi POUONO  
 Head of Quarantine Division and Assistant  
 Chief Executive Officer - Quarantine  
 Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries  
 P.O. Box 1874  
 Apia  
 Phone: +685 20103  
 Fax: +685 20103  
 E-mail: kpouono@lesamoa.net;  
 maffm@lesamoa.net

**SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE - SAO TOMÉ-  
ET-PRINCIPE - SANTO TOMÉ Y PRÍNCIPE**

## Représentant

Alvaro VILA NOVA  
 Directeur Général du CIAT-STP  
 Centre de Recherche Agronomique  
 Technologique  
 B.P. 309  
 Sao Tome  
 Phone: +239 223 342; 904925  
 Fax: +239 223 343  
 E-mail: ciatstp@costome.net;  
 novalvaro@costome.net;  
 vilanovalvaro@yahoo.com.br

**SAUDI ARABIA - ARABIE SAOUDITE -  
ARABIA SAUDITA**

## Representative

Suliman ALSAWI  
 Department of Quarantine Plant  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 Riyadh  
 Phone: +966 140 44929  
 E-mail: ssmssl45@yahoo.com

## Alternate(s)

Fahad M.A ABDEEN  
 General Director  
 Plant Protection Department  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 Riyadh  
 E-mail: falsaqan@yahoo.com

**SENEGAL - SÉNÉGAL**

## Représentant

Mame Ndéné LO  
 Ingénieur Agronome, Directeur de la Protection  
 des Végétaux  
 Ministère de l'agriculture de l'hydraulique rurale  
 et de la sécurité alimentaire  
 Building administratif, 3ème étage  
 Avenue Léopold Sédar Senghor  
 Dakar  
 Phone: +221 8340397  
 Fax: +221 8342854  
 E-mail: dvpl@sentoosn

**SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO - SERBIE-ET-  
MONTÉNEGRO - SERBIA Y MONTENEGRO**

## Representative

Ivan TOMASEV  
 Border Phytosanitary Inspector  
 Plant Protection Directorate  
 Belgrade  
 Phone: +381 63 491 685  
 E-mail: fitosu@eunet.yu

**SEYCHELLES**

## Representative

Ravindran SUBRAMANIAM  
 Director of Plant Protection Services Section  
 Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources  
 P.O. Box 166, Independence house  
 Victoria  
 Phone: +248 611475  
 Fax: +248 324030  
 E-mail: plantpro@seychelles.net;  
 sravi@seychelles.net

**SIERRA LEONE - SIERRA LEONA**

## Representative

Elio PACIFICO  
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Consulate General of the Republic of Sierra  
 Leone in Naples  
 Via Generale Orsini, 42  
 Naples, Italy

## Alternate(s)

Samuel Idrissa KAMARA  
 Technical Adviser, Entomologist  
 Rice Research Station  
 c/o Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food  
 Security  
 1st floor, Youyi Building, Brookfields  
 Freetown

**SLOVAKIA - SLOVAQUIE - ESLOVAQUIA**

## Representative

Jozef KOTLEBA  
 Phytosanitary Counsellor  
 Ministry of Agriculture  
 Dobrovicova 12  
 81237 Bratislava  
 Phone: +421 2 59266357  
 Fax: +421 2 59266358  
 E-mail: jozef.kotleba@land.gov.sk

**SLOVENIA - SLOVÉNIE - ESLOVENIA**

## Representative

Ms Vlasta KNAPIC  
 Undersecretary, Head of Plant Health Division  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Forestry  
 Phytosanitary Administration of the Republic of  
 Slovenia  
 Einspielerjeva 6  
 SI-1000 Ljubljana  
 Phone: +386 1 3094378  
 Fax: +386 1 3094335

**SPAIN - ESPAGNE - ESPAÑA**

## Representante

C. PÉREZ FERNÁNDEZ  
 Subdirección de Sanidad Vegetal, MAPA  
 C/Alfonso XII, 62, 2a Planta  
 28014, Madrid  
 Phone: +34 913476711; 913478263  
 E-mail: cperezfe@mapya.es

## Suplente(s)

Guillermo ARTOLACHIPI  
 Subdirector General de Sanidad Vegetal  
 Dirección General de Agricultura  
 Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y  
 Alimentación  
 Calle Infanta Isabel 1  
 28071 Madrid

Ernesto RIOS  
 Representante Permanente ante la FAO  
 Embajada de España  
 (Oficina de los Representantes Permanentes  
 Adjunto y Alterno)  
 Largo dei Lombardi, 21  
 Roma, Italy

**SRI LANKA**

## Representative

Rodney M. PERERA  
 Ambassador, Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of the Democratic Socialist Republic  
 of Sri Lanka  
 Via Adige, 2  
 Rome, Italy

## Alternate(s)

Ms Kumudu FERNANDO  
 Director, Seed Certification and Plant  
 Protection  
 Ministry of Agriculture Development  
 Seed Certification and Plant Protection Centre  
 P.O. Box 74, Gannoruwa  
 Peradeniya  
 Phone: +94 81 2384226  
 Fax: +94 81 2388077  
 E-mail: scppc@sltnet.lk

## Niluka KADURUGAMUWA

Second Secretary, Alternate Permanent  
 Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of the Democratic Socialist Republic  
 of Sri Lanka  
 Via Adige, 2  
 Rome, Italy

## Chandrasiri KUDAGAMAGE

Director General of Agriculture  
 Ministry of Agriculture Development  
 Department of Agriculture  
 Peradeniya  
 Phone: +94 81 2388157  
 Fax: +94 81 2388333  
 E-mail: kudagamage@sitnet.lk

## Tissa WARNASURIYA

Secretary to the Ministry of Agriculture  
 Development  
 Ministry of Agriculture Development  
 Govijana Mandiraya, Rajamalwatte Road  
 Battaramulla  
 Phone: +94 11 2868920

**SUDAN - SOUDAN - SUDÁN**

## Representative

Khidir GIBRIL MUSA  
 Director General, PPD  
 Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
 P.O. Box 285  
 Al Gamaá Avenue  
 Khartoum  
 Phone: +249 1 83772648; 83780358; 83768193  
 Fax: +241 1 8378202  
 E-mail: maofus@yahoo.com

## Alternate(s)

Mohamed ELTAYEB ELFAKI ELNOR  
 Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of the Republic of the Sudan  
 Via Prati della Farnesina, 57  
 Rome, Italy

**SWEDEN - SUÈDE - SUECIA**

## Representative

Göran KROEKER  
 Chief Phytosanitary Officer  
 Swedish Board of Agriculture  
 Jordbruksverket  
 Vallgatan 8  
 SE-55182 Jönköping  
 Phone: +46 036 155000  
 Fax: +46 036 190546  
 E-mail: goran.kroeker@sjv.se;  
 jordbruksverket@sjv.se

## Alternate(s)

Ms Marianne SJÖBLOM  
Senior Administrative Officer  
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Consumer  
Affairs  
Fredsgatan 8  
10333 Stockholm  
Phone: +46 8 4051000  
Fax: +46 8 206496

**SWITZERLAND - SUISSE - SUIZA**

## Représentant

Hans DREYER  
Responsable  
Section Certification, Protection des végétaux et  
des variétés  
Office fédéral de l'agriculture  
Mattenhofstrasse 5  
CH-3003 Bern  
Phone: +41 31 3222692  
Fax: +41 31 3222634  
E-mail: hans.dreyer@blw.admin.ch

## Suppléant(s)

Hubert POFFET  
Représentant permanent auprès de la FAO  
Viale Aventino 89  
Rome, Italy

**SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC - RÉPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE - REPÚBLICA ÁRABE SIRIA**

## Representative

Jamal HAJJAR  
Director of Plant Protection  
Plant Protection Directorate  
Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian Reform  
Hijaz Square  
Damascus  
Phone: +963 11 2220187  
Fax: +963 11 2247913  
E-mail: hajjar-j@scs-net.org

## Alternate(s)

Ms Hanadi KABOUR  
Second Secretary  
Embassy of the Syrian Arab Republic  
Piazza d'Aracoeli, 1  
Rome, Italy

**THAILAND - THAÏLANDE - TAILANDIA**

## Representative

Ms Oratai SILAPANAPAPORN  
Director  
Office of Commodity and System Standards  
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity  
and Food Standards  
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives  
Rajdamner Nok Avenue  
Bangkok  
Phone: +66 2 2803900  
Fax: +66 2 2803899  
E-mail: oratai@acfs.go.th

## Alternate(s)

Pornprome CHAIRIDCHAI  
First Secretary, Permanent Representative to  
FAO  
Office of Agricultural Affairs  
Royal Thai Embassy  
Via Cassia 929 Villino M  
Rome, Italy

Ms Tritaporn KHOMAPAT  
Permanent Representative to FAO  
Office of Agricultural Affairs  
Royal Thai Embassy  
Via Cassia 929 Villino M  
Rome, Italy

Udorn UNAHAWUTTI  
Director  
Plant Quarantine Research Group  
Department of Agriculture  
50 Phaholyotin Rd. Chatuchak  
Bangkok 10900  
Phone: +66 2 5798516  
Fax: +66 2 5794129  
E-mail: unahawut@yahoo.com

**TOGO**

## Représentant

Akla-Esso M'baw AROKOUM  
Directeur de l'Agriculture  
Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'élevage et de la  
pêche  
B.P. 385  
Quartier Administratif  
Lomé  
Phone: +228 2226105; 9059044  
E-mail: arokoum2003@yahoo.fr

**TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO - TRINITÉ-ET-TOBAGO - TRINIDAD Y TABAGO**

## Representative

Ms Lilory MC COMIE  
Deputy Director Research  
Crops Research Division  
Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Marine Resources  
CES, Centeno, Via Arima  
Port of Spain  
Phone: +1 868 6426008  
Fax: +1 868 6466747  
E-mail: lilory@tstt.net.tt

**TUNISIA - TUNISIE - TÚNEZ**

## Représentant

Abdalaziz CHEBIL  
Ingénieur général, Directeur de la défense des cultures  
Direction générale de la protection et du contrôle de la qualité des produits agricoles  
Ministère de l'agriculture et des ressources hydrauliques  
30, rue Alain Savary  
Tunis  
Phone: +216 71 788979  
Fax: +216 71 784419  
E-mail: chebilabeldelaziz@yahoo.fr

**TURKEY - TURQUIE - TURQUÍA**

## Representative

Yuksel YUCEKAL  
Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO  
Embassy of the Republic of Turkey  
Via Palestro, 28  
Rome, Italy

**UKRAINE - UCRANIA**

## Representative

Ms Svetlana SKLYARENKO  
Head, Division of Eurointegration and Cooperation with International Organizations  
General State Inspection on Plant Quarantine of Ukraine

## Alternate(s)

Oleksandr ANOPCHENKO  
Head, State Inspection on Plant Quarantine  
Kiev

Ms Oksana DRAMARETSKA  
Alternate Permanent Representative of Ukraine to FAO  
Embassy of Ukraine  
Via Guido d'Arezzo, 9  
Rome, Italy

**UNITED ARAB EMIRATES - ÉMIRATS ARABES UNIS - EMIRATOS ÁRABES UNIDOS**

## Representative

Ms Sumaia AL RAHMAN AL RAIS  
Ministry of Environment and Water  
P.O. Box 213  
Abu Dhabi

**UNITED KINGDOM - ROYAUME-UNI - REINO UNIDO**

## Representative / Rapporteur

Stephen ASHBY  
Deputy Head  
Plant Health Division, Plant Health Strategy and Bee Health  
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs  
Room 343, Foss House, King's Pool, 1-2 Peasholme Green  
York YO1 7PX  
Phone: +44 1904455048  
Fax: +44 1904455198  
E-mail: steve.ashby@defra.gsi.gov.uk

## Alternate(s)

Paul BARTLETT  
Principal Plant Health Consultant  
Central Science Laboratory  
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA)  
Sand Hutton  
York YO41 1LZ  
Phone: +44 1904462221  
Fax: +44 1904462250; 1904462250  
E-mail: p.bartlett@csl.gov.uk

## Victor HEARD

Deputy Permanent Representative to FAO  
UK Permanent Representation to the UN Agencies for Food and Agriculture  
Via Montserrat 48/1  
00186 Rome, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 68400915  
Fax: +39 06 68400920  
E-mail: v-heard@dfid.gov.uk

## John David MUMFORD

Professor  
Imperial College London, Silwood Park  
Ascot SL5 7PY

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA -  
RÉPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE -  
REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE TANZANÍA**

Representative

Ms Perpetua HINGI  
Agricultural Attaché  
Embassy of The United Republic of Tanzania  
Viale Cortina d'Ampezzo 185  
Rome, Italy

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA - ÉTATS-  
UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE - ESTADOS UNIDOS DE  
AMÉRICA**

Representative

Richard DUNKLE  
Deputy Administrator, Plant Protection and  
Quarantine  
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service  
United States Department of Agriculture  
Room 302-E, Whitten Building  
1400 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20250  
Phone: +1 202 7205601

Alternate(s)

Julie ALIAGA  
International Standards Program Director  
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service  
United States Department of Agriculture  
4700 River Road, Unit 140  
Riverdale, MD 20737  
Phone: +1 301 7340763  
Fax: +1 301 7347639  
E-mail: julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov

John GREIFER  
Director, Trade Support Team  
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service  
United States Department of Agriculture  
Room 1132, South Building  
1400 Independence Avenue, SW  
Washington, DC 20250  
Phone: +1 202 7202873

Peter GROSSER  
APHIS Attaché  
United States Mission to the European Union  
Brussels

David HEGWOOD  
Minister-Counsellor  
Alternate Permanent Representative  
United States Mission to the United Nations  
Agencies for Food and Agriculture  
Rome, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 46743508  
Fax: +39 06 46743520  
E-mail: usunrome@state.gov

Narcy KLAG  
Deputy Director, Phytosanitary Issues  
Management  
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service  
United States Department of Agriculture  
4700 River Road, Unit 140  
Riverdale, MD 20737  
Phone: +1 301 7348469  
Fax: +1 301 7347639  
E-mail: narcy.g.klag@aphis.usda.gov

**URUGUAY**

Representante

Humberto ALMIRATI  
Director General  
Dirección General de Servicios Agrícolas  
Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca  
Avda. Millán 4703, CP 12900  
Montevideo  
Phone: +598 3092219  
Fax: +598 3092074  
E-mail: halmirati@mgap.gub.uy;  
ataidgsa@mgap.gub.uy

Suplente(s)

José Luis RIVAS  
Representante Alterno del Uruguay ante la FAO  
Embajada de la República Oriental del Uruguay  
Via Vittorio Veneto, 183  
Rome, Italy

**VIET NAM**

Representative

Dam Quoc TRU  
Deputy Director General  
Plant Protection Department  
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development  
149 Ho Dac Di Street  
Hanoi  
Phone: +844 8518198  
Fax: +844 8574719; 5330043  
E-mail: trudq@fpt.vn

**YEMEN - YÉMEN**

Representative

Abdullah H. AL-SAYANI  
Director  
Plant Quarantine Department  
General Directorate of Plant Protection  
Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation  
P.O. Box 26  
Sana'a  
Phone: +967 1 563328  
Fax: +967 1 562749  
E-mail: p-quarantine@yemen.net.ye

**ZAMBIA - ZAMBIE**

## Representative

Watson MWALE  
Acting Director  
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives  
Agriculture Research Institute  
Lusaka  
Phone: +260 1 278130; 97780497  
Fax: +260 1 278130  
E-mail: director@zari.gov.zm

## Alternate(s)

Arundel SAKALA  
Coordinator, Phytosanitary Service  
Zambia Agriculture Research Institute  
Mt. Makulu Research Station, Private Bag 7  
Chilanga  
Phone: +260 1 278141; 278130  
E-mail: pqpsmt@zamtel.zm;  
director@zari.gov.zm

**OBSERVER COUNTRIES (NOT CONTRACTING PARTIES) - PAYS OBSERVATEURS (NON PARTIES CONTRACTANTES) - PAÍSES OBSERVADORES (PARTES NO CONTRATANTES)**

**ANGOLA**

## Représentant

Kiala Kia MATEVA  
Counselleur de l'Ambassade d'Angola en Italie  
Représentant Permanent auprès des Agences  
des Nations Unies à Rome  
Ambassade de la République d'Angola  
Via Filippo Bernardini 21  
Rome, Italy

## Alternate(s)

Zohrab MALEK  
Ambassador  
Permanent Representative to FAO  
Via Camillo Sabatini 102  
Rome, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 520 1924  
E-mail: armambfao@virgilio.it

## Suppléant(s)

Carlos Alberto AMARAL  
Conseiller de l'Ambassade, Représentant  
Permanent Suppléant auprès de la FAO  
Ambassade de la République d'Angola  
Via Filippo Bernardini 21  
Rome, Italy

Mme Laurinda Maria Rosa FERNANDO  
Chef de Département  
Direction Nationale de l'Agriculture et Forêts  
Ministère de l'agriculture et du développement  
rural  
Rue Comandante Gika, C.P. 527  
Luanda  
Phone: +244 222 321429  
Fax: +244 923 694921  
E-mail: laurindafernand@yahoo.com.br

**GABON - GABÓN**

## Représentant

Louis Stanislas CHARICAUTH  
Représentant permanent suppléant auprès de la  
FAO  
Ambassade de la République gabonaise  
Via San Marino, 36-36A  
Rome, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 85358970  
E-mail: lscharicauth@yahoo.fr

**MADAGASCAR**

## Représentant

Mme Tamara MONJA  
Représentant permanent adjoint auprès de la  
FAO  
Ambassade de la République de Madagascar  
Via Riccardo Zandonai, 84/A  
Rome, Italy

**ARMENIA - ARMÉNIE**

## Representative

Mekhak GHAZARYAN  
Head of Plant Quarantine Inspection  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Government Building, Republic Square  
Yerevan

**MYANMAR**

## Representative

HLAING MYINT OO  
Councillor, Alternate Permanent  
Representative to FAO  
Embassy of the Union of Myanmar  
Via della Camilluccia, 551  
Rome, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 36304056

**QATAR**

## Representative

Soltan AL MOREKY  
 Ambassador, Permanent Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of the State of Qatar  
 Via Antonio Bosio, 14  
 Rome, Italy

## Alternate(s)

Mohd ABDULLA

Akeel HATOOR  
 Alternate Representative to FAO  
 Embassy of the State of Qatar  
 Via Antonio Bosio, 14  
 Rome, Italy

**SINGAPORE - SINGAPOUR - SINGAPUR**

## Representative

Keng Ho ONG  
 Deputy Director, Plant Health  
 Agri-Food and Veterinary Authority  
 Phone: +65 63257866  
 Fax: +65 62206068  
 E-mail: ong\_keng\_ho@ava.gov.sg

**UGANDA - OUGANDA**

## Representative

Kornayombi BULEGEYA  
 Commissioner Crop Protection  
 Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and  
 Fisheries  
 P.O. Box 102  
 Entebbe

**REPRESENTATIVES OF UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND OBSERVERS  
 FROM INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS  
 REPRESENTANTS DES NATIONS UNIES ET INSTITUTIONS SPÉCIALISÉE ET OBSERVATEURS  
 D'ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES  
 REPRESENTANTES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS Y ORGANISMOS ESPECIALIZADOS E  
 OBSERVADORES DE ORGANIZACIONES INTERGUBERNAMENTALES**

**ARAB LEAGUE**

Fathi ABU ABED  
 Counsellor  
 Via Nomentana 133  
 Rome, Italy  
 Phone: + 39 06 44249994  
 Fax: +39 06 44119415

**ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (APPPC)**

Yongfan PIAO  
 Executive Secretary to APPPC / Plant Protection Officer  
 FAO Regional Office for Asia and Pacific  
 39 Phra Atiti  
 Bangkok 10200  
 Thailand  
 Phone: +66 2 6974268  
 Fax: +66 2 6974445  
 E-mail: Yongfan.piao@fao.org

**CAB INTERNATIONAL**

Roger DAY  
 Coordinator, Knowledge and Information Systems  
 Africa Regional Centre  
 P.O. Box 633-00621  
 Nairobi, Kenya  
 Phone: +254 20 7224450; 62  
 Fax: +254 20 7122150  
 E-mail: r.day@cabi.org



Ms Megan QUINLAN  
CABI Associate  
Suite 17, 24-28 Saint Leonards Road  
Windsor, Berkshire SL4 3BB  
United Kingdom  
Phone: +44 1753854799  
E-mail: quinlanmm@aol.com

**SECRETARIAT OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION - SECRÉTARIAT DE LA COMMISSION DU CODEX ALIMENTARIUS**

Dr Kazuaki MIYAGISHIMA  
Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 570 54390  
Fax: +39 06 570 54593  
E-mail: kazuaki.miyagishima@fao.org

Ms Gracia BRISCO  
Food Standards Officer  
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00100 Rome, Italy  
Phone: +39 06 570 52700  
Fax: +39 06 570 54593  
E-mail: gracia.brisco@fao.org

**COMITÉ REGIONAL DE SANIDAD VEGETAL DEL CONO SUR (COSAVE)**

Sra Ana Maria PERALTA  
Coordination Secretary  
Comité Regional de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur  
Avenida Presidente Bulnes No. 107, Piso 2, Depto 24.  
Santiago, Chile  
Phone: +562 6710722; 6714459; 6713371  
Fax: +562 6712947  
E-mail: cosave@sag.gob.cl; cosave@cosave.org; anaperalta@sag.gob.cl

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

Nicolaas VAN OPSTAL  
Director General  
1 rue de Nôtre  
75016 Paris, France  
Phone: +33 1 45207794  
Fax: +33 1 42248943  
E-mail: hq@eppo.fr

**FAO REGIONAL OFFICES**

Ms Hannah CLARENDON  
Crop Protection Officer  
FAO Regional Office for Africa  
General Abdul Nasser Road  
P.O. GP 1628  
Accra, Ghana  
Phone: +233 21 675000 Ext. 3137; 7010930 Ext. 3137  
Fax: +233 21 7010943; 668427  
E-mail: hannah.clarendon@fao.org

Taher EL-AZZABI  
Regional Plant Protection Officer  
FAO Regional Office  
Cairo, Egypt

Allan HRUSKA  
Oficial de Protección Vegetal  
Oficina Regional para América Latina y el Caribe  
Dag Hammarskjöld 3241, Vitacura  
Santiago, Chile  
Phone: +56 2 3372237  
Fax: +56 2 3372101  
E-mail: allan.hruska@fao.org

**INTER AFRICAN PHYTOSANITARY COUNCIL (IAPSC) - CONSEIL PHYTOSANITAIRE  
INTERAFRICAIN (CPI)**

Daniel KOUMBA-KOUMBA  
Directeur du CPI/UA  
B.P. 4170  
Yaoundé, Cameroun  
Phone: +237 221 1969  
Fax: +237 221 1967  
E-mail: koumba\_koumba@yahoo.fr

**INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE (IICA) - INSTITUTO  
INTERAMERICANO DE COOPERACIÓN PARA LA AGRICULTURA**

Sra María DE LOURDES FONALLERAS  
Especialista en Protección Vegetal e Inocuidad de Alimentos  
IICA Argentina  
Bernanrdo de Irigoyen 88, 5 piso  
Buenos Aires, Argentina  
Phone: +54 11 43348282; 43451210  
Fax: +54 11 43451208  
E-mail: mlfonalleras@iica.org.ar

**INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA) - AGENCE INTERNATIONALE DE  
L'ÉNERGIE ATOMIQUE - ORGANISMO INTERNACIONAL DE ENERGÍA ATÓMICA**

Walther ENKERLIN  
Technical Officer  
Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture (NAFA)  
Insect Pest Control Section  
Wagramer Strasse 5  
P.O. Box 100  
A-1400 Vienna, Austria  
Phone: +43 1 2600 26077  
E-mail: w.enkerlin@iaea.org

Ms Tatiana RUBIO CABELLO  
Technical Officer  
Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture (NAFA)  
Food and Environmental Protection Section  
Wagramer Strasse 5  
P.O. Box 100  
A-1400 Vienna, Austria  
Phone: +43 1 2600 21639  
E-mail: t.rubio-cabello@iaea.org

**INTERNATIONAL SEED TESTING ASSOCIATION (ISTA) - ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE D'ESSAIS DE SEMENCES**

Michael MUSCHICK  
ISTA Secretary General  
Zuerichstrasse 50  
P.O. Box 308  
8303 Bassersdorf, CH-Switzerland  
Phone: +41 44 8386000  
Fax: +41 44 8386001  
E-mail: ista.office@ista.ch

**NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (NAPPO) - ORGANISATION NORD AMÉRICAINE POUR LA PROTECTION DES PLANTES - ORGANIZACIÓN NORTEAMERICANA DE PROTECCIÓN A LAS PLANTAS**

Ian R. MCDONELL  
Executive Director  
1431 Merivale Road, 3rd Floor, Room 309  
Ottawa, Ontario KIA OY9  
Canada  
Phone: +613 228 2535  
Fax: +613 228 2540  
E-mail: imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca

**PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (PPPO) / SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY**

Sidney SUMA  
Coordinator Biosecurity and Trade Facilitation  
Land Resources Division  
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)  
Private Mail Bag Service  
Suva, Fiji Islands  
Phone: +679 3370733  
Fax: +679 3370021  
E-mail: sidneys@spc.int

**WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR ANIMAL HEALTH (OIE) - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTÉ ANIMALE - ORGANIZACIÓN MUNDIAL DE SANIDAD ANIMAL**

Bernard VALLAT  
Director-General  
12 rue de Prony  
75017 Paris, France  
Phone: +33 1 44151888  
Fax: +33 1 42670987  
E-mail: b.vallat@oie.int

## Alternate(s)

David WILSON  
Deputy-Director General  
12 rue de Prony  
75017 Paris, France  
Phone: +33 1 44151888  
Fax: +33 1 42670987  
E-mail: d.wilson@oie.int

**WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION (WTO) - ORGANISATION MONDIALE DU COMMERCE  
ORGANIZACIÓN MUNDIAL DEL COMERCIO**

Ms Lee Ann JACKSON  
Economic Affairs Officer  
Agriculture and Commodities Division  
Rue de Lausanne 154  
CH-1211 Geneva 21  
Switzerland

**OBSERVERS FROM NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS  
OBSERVATEURS D'ORGANISATIONS NON GOUVERNEMENTALES  
OBSERVADORES DE ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES****ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION AGENCY**

Ms Danielle GRABIEL  
E-mail: daniellegrabiel@eia-international.org

Alexander VON BISMARCK  
E-mail: saschavonbismarck@eia-international.org

**INTERNATIONAL SEED FEDERATION (ISF) - FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE DU  
COMMERCE DES SEMENCES**

John STEVENS  
Trade and Certification Manager  
Phone: +1 515 2704032  
Fax: +1 515 3346568  
E-mail: john.stevens@pioneer.com