



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of
the
United
Nations

Organisation
des
Nations
Unies
pour
l'alimentation
et
l'agriculture

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Second Session

Rome, 26 – 30 March 2007

Report on Promotion of the IPPC and Cooperation with Relevant International Organizations

Agenda Item 14.2 of the Provisional Agenda

I. Background

1. Strategic Direction No. 6 (Promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant international organizations) of the current Business Plan requires the CPM to, among other things, strengthen cooperation with other, relevant, international organizations with the view of establishing relations, identifying areas of common interest and, where appropriate, developing coordinated activities and joint programmes with other relevant organizations.
2. The following is a brief summary of the IPPC Secretariat activities in 2006 in this area.

II. CAB International

3. The IPPC Secretariat participated in discussions between CAB International (Africa), Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate and the University of Nairobi towards the establishment of a Regional Centre of Excellence in Kenya. There is ongoing discussion regarding this subject.

III. Codex Alimentarius

4. Informal liaison continued between the Secretariats of the Codex Alimentarius Commission and IPPC.

For reasons of economy, this document is produced in a limited number of copies. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring it to the meetings and to refrain from asking for additional copies, unless strictly indispensable.
Most FAO meeting documents are available on Internet at www.fao.org

IV. Convention on Biological Diversity

A. THIRD MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES SERVING AS THE MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE CARTAGENA PROTOCOL ON BIOSAFETY

5. The ICPM Bureau and IPPC Secretariat were represented at the Third Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety (COP-MOP 3), 13-17 March 2006, in Curitiba, Brazil. Decisions on the following topics were made in regards to issues relevant to the CPM:

- Promoting synergy and mutual supportiveness among the various organizations and instruments concerned with risk analysis in relation to living modified organisms, including the IPPC, the Office International des Epizooties (OIE), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the Codex Alimentarius Commission.
- Cooperation between the IPPC, OIE, Codex Alimentarius, WHO, WTO and the Convention on Biological Diversity in particular in developing the web-based portal on food safety and animal and plant health.

6. At a side event, a Vice-Chairperson of the ICPM (Mr Lopian) and a representative of the IPPC Secretariat gave a presentation on cooperation with IPPC, Codex and FAO to determine and manage biosafety risks.

B. EIGHTH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

7. The ICPM Bureau and the IPPC Secretariat were also represented at the Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP-8), 20-31 March 2006, held in Curitiba, Brazil.

8. Decisions on the following topics were made in regards to issues relevant to the CPM:

- Addressing various pathways for invasions of invasive alien species through encouraging the:
 - Coordination of the Secretariats of relevant international bodies in regards to the movement of invasive alien species through civil air transport, including the IPPC, CBD and the International Civil Aviation Organization.
 - Development of guidance or codes of practice regarding the trade and use of biocontrol agents to address the potential risks of biocontrol agents as invasive alien species, taking into account the work of relevant international bodies and agreements such as the IPPC.
 - Development of procedures and/or controls to ensure that cross-border impacts of potentially invasive alien species are considered as part of national and regional decision-making processes, taking into account already existing procedures and controls for invasive alien species that are pests of plants under the IPPC.
- Noted the lack of international standards covering invasive alien species, in particular animals, that are not pests of plants under the IPPC. The CBD will consult with relevant international bodies and instruments in this regard.

9. At a side event, a Vice-Chairperson of the ICPM (Mr. Lopian) and a representative of the IPPC Secretariat gave a presentation on IPPC-CBD cooperation in joint areas of concern and how to use the IPPC's framework to manage invasive alien species, including strategies for combating invasive alien species.

10. The presentations given at both side events are posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP, www.ippc.int).

C. CBD PROGRAMME ON INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES

11. The Technical Panel for the Glossary reviewed and provided input to the CBD Secretariat on the terminology database used for invasive alien species which is posted on their web site at <http://www.biodiv.org/programmes/cross-cutting/alien/terms.shtml>.

12. Contracting parties are reminded of the decision from ICPM-7 (2005) which recommended that contracting parties and NPPOs collect, where appropriate, information on the alien invasions of pests of plants (including plants that are invasive alien species), and forward this to the CBD national focal points, to assist in monitoring progress towards the 2010 biodiversity targets outlined in the COP-7 Decision VII/30.

13. The CBD Secretariat invited contracting parties and the IPPC Secretariat to submit any information on their efforts to address invasive alien species to the CBD Secretariat, no later than 19 November 2007. For more information see Notification 2006-116 from the CBD Secretariat, available at <http://www.biodiv.org/doc/notifications/2006/ntf-2006-116-ias-en.pdf>.

D. JOINT MEETING OF THE IPPC AND CBD SECRETARIATS

14. Cooperation between the IPPC and CBD Secretariats is governed by a Memorandum of Cooperation agreed to by the two Secretariats and is mandated by relevant decisions of the governing bodies, in particular decisions VI/23, VII/13 and VIII/27 of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD, and decisions of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures taken at its sixth and seventh meetings on the issue of cooperation with CBD.

15. A joint meeting of the IPPC and CBD Secretariats was held by teleconference in August 2006. The 2005 joint work plan was reviewed and a revised work plan was developed which is reported on below.

16. Discussions took place on areas for enhanced cooperation including joint work between the governing bodies and areas of mutual interest arising from recent meetings and events. It was agreed that cooperation at all levels was welcome.

17. The revised joint work plan contains the following elements:

- Promoting collaboration at the national level among NPPOs and agencies responsible for biodiversity-related issues
- Addressing gaps in the international regulatory framework for invasive alien species
- Development of standards of mutual interest under the IPPC (e.g. revision of ISPM No. 2: *Guidelines for pest risk analysis*), and development of guidance and standards under the CBD and the Biosafety Protocol
- Terminology
- Capacity-building and technical assistance
- Mechanisms for sharing information through the International Phytosanitary Portal, the clearing house mechanism of the CBD, and the Biosafety Clearing-House
- Other specific matters arising from decisions of the CPM or COP.

18. In particular both the CBD and IPPC will work together to avoid duplication, use each others expertise as appropriate and encourage cooperation at both the international and national levels.

E. DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING MATERIAL FOR PLANT HEALTH RISK ANALYSIS

19. The CBD Secretariat provided input into the development of plant health risk analysis training material to help ensure it addresses the needs of risk analysis used under the CBD framework, in particular for invasive alien species and living modified organisms. In October

2006, a representative from the CBD Secretariat attended a meeting of the steering committee which oversees the development of this training material (see STDF below).

V. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

20. The third meeting of the Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments was hosted by the joint FAO/IAEA division based in Vienna in December 2006. The joint division also funded the travel costs of participants from developing countries and an invited expert. Results from this meeting are reported under the standard setting programme.

21. The Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) has a member from the joint FAO/IAEA division. His expertise in fruit fly management and his responsibility in the joint FAO/IAEA Division for developing harmonized approaches to fruit fly control have helped coordination between the IPPC and IAEA programmes.

22. The IPPC Secretariat reviewed relevant sections of a FAO/IAEA joint publication on *Guidance for packing, shipping, holding and release of sterile flies in area-wide fruit fly control programmes* that was developed by the FAO/IAEA joint division.

VI. International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology

23. The IPPC Secretariat has established collaboration with the International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE), using its expertise in the African fruit fly initiative, to manage aspects of surveillance for *Bactrocera invadens* in the East African region. ICIPE has also been requested to develop a regional strategy for the management of invasive fruit fly species and other target pests that constrain the production and export of fruit from the region.

VII. International Forestry Quarantine Research Group

24. The International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) met in Rome, Italy in October 2006 and was hosted by the IPPC Secretariat. The Secretariat and several members of the Technical panel on forest quarantine (TPFQ) attended this meeting. IFQRG discussed and responded to several questions posed by the TPFQ in regards to risks associated with bark and other aspects related to the revision of ISPM No. 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*). In addition, IFQRG reached consensus on several other issues related to forest quarantine and put in place action plans to continue research. Results from these scientific discussions are contained in the meeting report which is posted on IFQRG's website (www.forestry-quarantine.org).

VIII. International Seed Testing Association

25. At its meeting in June 2006, the Bureau invited the Secretary General of the International Seed Testing Association (ISTA) to give a presentation. He described the international role of ISTA and how it functioned as an association, including how it was financed. The meeting considered areas where the two organizations could collaborate, which included: seed sampling, purity analysis of a seed lot (identifies all species occurring in the lot and would also detect invasive seed species) and methods for the detection of host-pathogen combinations.

26. In order to further the collaboration, the Bureau and ISTA agreed to pursue the idea of an open symposium for the two organizations. The symposium would involve presentations from both organizations and identify areas of overlap, ascertain how synergies may be obtained and identify areas where the two organizations could work together. Due to resource constraints within the Bureau and the Secretariat it was agreed that the symposium would be held in 2007.

27. The IPPC Secretariat also attended the Third Meeting of the ISTA Seed Health Committee held in Zurich in June 2006.

IX. Montreal Protocol

28. ICPM-7 (2005) noted Decision XVI/11 from the meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (16th Meeting, Prague, 22-26 November 2004) including the invitation “To encourage the importing Parties to consider accepting the wood packaging treated with alternative methods to methyl bromide, in accordance with standard 15”. ICPM members also noted several points related to the use of methyl bromide and stressed the importance of cooperation between the Montreal Protocol and the IPPC. Several members requested that the work on the development of alternatives to methyl bromide be accelerated. ICPM-7 also encouraged countries to liaise with their appropriate research organizations and to stress the importance and urgency in developing alternatives to methyl bromide for use for quarantine purposes.

29. In response to the ICPM-7 decision noted above, the Standards Committee requested the IPPC Secretariat to invite a representative of the Montreal Protocol to participate and provide information on strategies for limiting the environmental impact of methyl bromide for wood packaging. This information will be useful to the TPFQ, who is revising ISPM No. 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*).

30. A representative from the Ozone Secretariat (Montreal Protocol) attended the TPFQ meeting held in New York, USA in June 2006 and provided some guidance on how to increase the awareness of parties to the Montreal Protocol of the approved ISPM No. 15 heat treatment, which is a viable alternative to the use of methyl bromide for treating internationally moved wood packaging material.

31. A representative of the IPPC Secretariat attended the open ended working group of the Montreal Protocol held in Montreal, Canada, in July 2006. The agenda item on quarantine and pre-shipment use was the point of joint concern. It was stated that the CPM recognized the need to retain methyl bromide for critical quarantine treatments until alternative phytosanitary treatments or procedures were available but had called its contracting parties to take the necessary and possible actions to minimize the use of methyl bromide, to increase the use of alternative measures, to reduce, as far as possible, the incidence of emergency action fumigation and to reduce the loss of methyl bromide to the atmosphere when used for quarantine purposes.

32. The open ended working group of the Montreal Protocol also noted that the CPM wished to have continued cooperation between the relevant bodies of the Montreal Protocol and the IPPC in order to obtain a greater understanding of each organization’s respective work and to raise the phytosanitary concern relating to reduced or lost availability of methyl bromide. Attention was drawn to the treatments adopted in ISPM No. 15. It was pointed out that in addition to the methyl bromide fumigation treatment, heat treatment was an effective, safe alternative to methyl bromide treatment, which had also been adopted as part of the standard.

33. The 18th Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on the protection of the ozone layer took place the week of 30 October – 3 November 2006 in New Delhi, India. Based on the interactions at the open ended working group of the Montreal Protocol, a decision (XVIII/14) was made by the parties regarding Montreal Protocol and IPPC cooperation on the use of alternatives to methyl bromide for quarantine and pre-shipment. This decision requested several actions, amongst them were to:

- request the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (of the Montreal Protocol) to cooperate with the technical bodies of the IPPC;
- request the Ozone Secretariat to continue liaising with the IPPC Secretariat as appropriate in line with decision XVII/15, to build on interactions already developed, and to report comprehensively to the Parties on secretariat-level cooperation and joint activities;
- request the Ozone Secretariat to provide factual information on the definitions of quarantine and pre-shipment under the Protocol and the IPPC; and

- encourage national level officials working on Montreal Protocol and IPPC issues to cooperate more closely to ensure that the objectives of both agreements are being met when domestic actions are undertaken in relation to methyl bromide use for quarantine and pre-shipment purposes and in the lead-up to future decision-making by Parties in both multilateral agreements.

34. In November 2006, an IPPC expert working group (EWG) was held in Orlando Florida to develop a draft ISPM on alternatives to methyl bromide. One expert was a representative of the Ozone Secretariat and several other experts had been involved nationally with both phytosanitary issues as well as issues related to the Montreal Protocol (methyl bromide). When developing the ISPM the EWG considered the Recommendation on the future of methyl bromide for phytosanitary purposes adopted by ICPM-5 (2003) and noted that it could be further improved. The Secretariat will attempt to update this recommendation in consultation with experts and forward it to the Informal working group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) for consideration at its next meeting and for possible adoption at CPM-3. Any interested contracting parties who would like to input into this process are welcome to contact the IPPC Secretariat.

X. Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)

35. The strategic aim of the STDF is to assist developing countries to enhance their expertise and capacity to analyze and implement international sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) standards, improving their human, animal and plant health situation, and thus ability to gain and maintain market access. In addition to facilitating international trade, SPS capacity building, notably in the area of food safety, can result in improved health conditions for local markets and so favour economic and social development. The STDF working group reviews and approves applications for funding.

36. The IPPC Secretariat is a member of the STDF working group, which met on three occasions in Geneva in 2006 (February, June and October).

37. The STDF and Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) are the implementing agencies for a project that will develop pest risk analysis (PRA) training materials and conduct a training workshop in India in early 2007. The IPPC Secretariat is involved in this project in an advisory capacity and is represented on the international steering committee providing guidance to the project.

XI. WTO-SPS Committee

38. The IPPC is an official observer organization at the regular meetings of the WTO Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. The SPS Committee met three times in Geneva in 2006 (March, June and October) and the IPPC Secretariat provided information to the meeting on general IPPC matters as well as commenting and updating on activities being undertaken on specific items of interest to the SPS Committee, such as equivalence and pest free areas.

39. Members of the Secretariat and a FAO Regional Plant Protection Officer took part in various workshops organised by the SPS Committee during the year.

XII. World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE)

40. Informal discussions were held between members of the Secretariats of the OIE and IPPC, particularly relating to the structure and funding mechanisms of the OIE.

41. The CPM is invited to:

1. Note the report.