
REPORT

Rome,
Italy
25-28 August
2008

Twentieth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

20th TC-RPPOs (2008) REPORT

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

Rome, Italy 25-28 August 2008

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
2008**

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

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

© FAO 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report of the Twentieth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

List of Appendices

- I Agenda
- II Work programme of the Technical Consultation among RPPOs for 2008-2009
- III Tentative Agenda for the 21st Technical Consultation amongst RPPOs
- IV List of Participants and Observers

Note: The papers and power point presentations presented at the 20th Technical Consultation among RPPOs are available at <https://www.ippc.int/ID/201723>

Report of the Twentieth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

Rome, Italy

25 - 28 September, 2008

1. OPENING OF THE TWENTIETH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Richard Ives (IPPC Coordinator) opened the meeting and welcomed delegates to Rome. He noted that he had been involved in the Technical Consultations (TCs) since the first meeting of the Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and that, given his imminent departure from the Secretariat, this would be his last. He outlined the difficult situation facing the Secretariat as a result of the resignation of key Secretariat staff and that this had made preparation for the meeting difficult. Other activities, including in the area of Information Exchange, had needed to be cancelled or postponed in order to allow staff to attend and service this meeting. However, he felt sure the TC would still be a success and looked forward to participating as much as time allowed.

Appendix IV provides the attendance list for this meeting.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEUR

The meeting elected Mr. van Opstal (EPPO – European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organizations) as chairperson, and Ms. Olembo (African Union/IAPSC – Inter-African Phytosanitary Council) as vice chair. Mr. Ashby (UK/CPM Bureau) was elected rapporteur.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

NAPPO requested the Secretariat update to include details on Secretariat staffing. Ms. Olembo noted that item 19 - Other business – mentioned celebrating the 40th anniversary of the IAPSC and Mr Ives noted that there had been discussion of this celebration being back to back with the 21st TC in Africa. The agenda was adopted as per Appendix I.

4. ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE NINETEENTH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION

The following issues arising from the 19th TC were considered:

4.1 Definition of Public Officer: The FAO Legal Office's note, provided to the 19th TC after initial discussions in the 18th TC in 2006 still gave rise to concerns about the understanding of the term "public officer". The Chair also noted that there was increasing debate among EPPO countries on this issue. COSAVE had spoken with the Legal Office in the margins of CPM 3. COSAVE explained that paragraph 4 of the FAO Legal Office interpretation raises concerns and they asked for the text to be clarified to show that those issuing phytosanitary certificates have the "character of public officers" and that at all times the NPPO would retain legal responsibility for the issuance of the certificates.

The Legal Office explained that the IPPC is an intergovernmental agreement concluded by States under the FAO Constitution. Within the framework of the IPPC, any action is undertaken by or under the responsibility of the contracting states in their capacity as Contracting Parties. Consequently, any potential dispute will involve Contracting Parties, the legal persons concerned. The implication is that a Contracting Party may decide that a (physical or legal) person (placed under its jurisdiction), whether a government authority, a private company or a contractor, may act on its behalf but, in any case, the concerned Contracting Party cannot absolve itself from its responsibilities¹.

While the difficulty with the current issue was that the concept of “public officer” is not universally known, there was no doubt that should there be a WTO dispute over this issue, trade judges would rule that anyone can sign a phytosanitary certificate provided that this person is legally entrusted with this responsibility pursuant to the pertinent national legislation. In fact, the Convention makes it clear that such a person must be (a) duly authorised (by the state, the concerned Contracting Party) to do this and (b) technically qualified.

COSAVE said that for them, it is key that the designation as “public officer” must be compatible with the legal system of the country and that responsibility rests with each Contracting Party. They thought that each Contracting Party should provide information to the Secretariat on how it “duly authorises” an individual to sign a phytosanitary certificate. They had asked the Legal Office to make amendments to the explanatory note produced in 2006 but these have yet to be agreed. The meeting thought it would be useful to see the modified text.

4.2 Revision of ISPMs 7 & 12 - The Secretariat noted that the Expert Working Group (EWG) on the Revision of ISPMs 7 and 12 had gone well and draft revisions were produced but it is not known if they are ready for consideration by the Standards Committee (SC). The TC hoped that this issue would be moved forward quickly because there is an urgent need for these revisions. However, this would be dependent on resolving the interpretation of the term “public officer”.

4.3 Criteria for recognition of RPPOs – NAPPO asked about progress with the establishment of the Near East Plant Protection Organisation (NEPPO). The Legal Office clarified that, as provided for in Article XIX.4 of this Agreement (which has been concluded outside FAO but for which the Director-General has accepted to act as depositary), it shall enter into force on the date when 10 States, at least, have deposited an instrument of ratification or acceptance. As of today, only 9 States have sent the required instruments to FAO. On its entry into force, the Secretariat will undertake to verify whether it can be recognized as a RPPOs as per Appendix XIX of the report of the 7th Session of the Interim Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM).

COSAVE had doubts about the status of the RPPO in the Caribbean, specifically the recently established Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA). The Secretariat noted that Mr Pollard, the FAO regional plant protection officer whose role included that of Technical Secretary of the Caribbean Plant Protection Organization (CPPC), had retired and as yet not been replaced. The CPPC has not dissolved (this can only be done by the FAO Conference, even though CPPC member countries have agreed it is no longer practical to continue with the CPPC) and CAHFSA would need recognition if they deemed this necessary. The Chair noted that they cannot be recognised if there is no request for RPPO recognition.

4.4 NAPPO enquired if there was any intention of filling the vacant FAO position in the Caribbean sub-region. The Secretariat noted that the Chief of the Plant Protection Service (also the IPPC Secretary) was handling the issue of recruiting a new FAO plant protection officer and this would be reported on when he came to the meeting.

¹ Instruments of adherence deposited with the Director-General provide that “*the Government of ... adheres to the Convention and undertakes to abide by its provisions*”.

4.5 NAPPO asked about the situation of the Andean Community (CAN) as they seldom participate in the Technical Consultation. The Secretariat noted that there had been communication from CAN through OIRSA (as Chair of the Inter-American Group) and their participation in international meetings is hampered by financial constraints. The Secretariat noted that a regional Information Exchange / IPP editor's workshop had been held at CAN in Lima in November 2007. They continue to be active in the Phytosanitary field but with a limited budget.

4.6 COSAVE requested feedback on the outcome of the recent Open-ended Working Group (OEWG) on Possible International Recognition of PFAs. The Secretariat said that the 1st draft of the report was written and needs to be reviewed by Mr Lopian, the consultant for this work, and that it should be on the IPP by the end of August. The outcome will be discussed by the SPTA in October, and they should make recommendations to CPM 4, which would be asked to agree to another focus group to draw up final recommendations. The outcome was positive in that those present at the OEWG agreed that a recognition system was feasible and logical. Whilst all mechanics of a system had not been discussed, very useful advice had been provided by the OIE representative about their experience of recognition of PFAs for animal diseases. Areas not discussed in detail had included the possibility of a 3rd party accreditation, from the point of view of using institutions which are internationally recognized - expertise on this had not been available at the meeting. When the issue goes forward to the Fourth Session of the CPM the Secretariat would recommend that this expertise should be available at any further meeting. Overall it was important to appreciate that the lack of funds could mean that operations in this area may not commence for years.

5. REVIEW OF RPPO ACTIVITIES

5.1 Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)

Mr. Yongfan Piao, Executive Secretary of APPPC Secretariat, reviewed the APPPC's main activities since the 19th TC-RPPOs.

5.1.1 Development of Regional standard for phytosanitary measures (RSPM)

Three new draft RSPMs have been prepared and approved by the APPPC Standard Committee (SC) during the APPPC SC review meeting (14-20 July 2008, Bangkok, Thailand) for country consultations. These are "*Guidelines for the Exterior Cleanliness of Containers*", "*Guidelines for Protection against South American Leaf Blight of Rubber*" and "*Guidance on Land Border Plant Quarantine*".

Several RPPOs asked about the new standard on SALB – was this draft available and are non-APPPC members provided opportunity to comment on this draft RSPM? The APPPC said that the draft was on the IPP but only hard copies distributed for comments from APPPC members. After discussions COSAVE and the PPPO formally asked for access to the SALB regional standard in order to provide comments.

NOTE: Subsequently to the 20th TC meeting, the APPPC Standards Committee advised that the above draft standard (in fact all RSPMs) are generally available for country comment, including from non-APPPC members. They are all posted on the IPP as they become available for country consultation.

5.1.2 Working Group Meeting on the Procedures for Finance, Administration and Planning for the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)

The working group meeting was held from 21-23 July 2008 in Bangkok, Thailand, in order to prepare arrangements for the coming into force of the 1983 amendments concerning mandatory contributions for funding of the Commission. During the meeting, the APPPC working group had to attend to various administrative duties to set up the levels of contributions from members that had accepted the

amendments, administration procedures associated with the trust fund for the admission and expenditure of funds. The recommendations of the meeting will be submitted to the 26th Session of APPPC in 2009 for further discussion and possible adoption. The adoption will be subject to approval of FAO Council meeting.

5.1.3 Regional review of draft ISPMs

APPPC facilitated a regional workshop on the review of draft ISPMs, which was organized from 28 July to 1 August 2008 in the Republic of Korea. Twenty-five senior-level Plant Protection officers and experts from 19 countries attended the workshop.

5.1.4 Projects of capacity building on plant health

5.1.4.1 GCP/RAS/226/JPN: Cooperation for the improvement of phytosanitary capacity In Asian countries through capacity building (US\$ 1,436,530, 2007-2011):

This project is to assist in strengthening phytosanitary capacity of targeted countries in the Asian region in order to reduce the capacity gap between their current situation and what is needed to meet the requirements of IPPC and ISPMs. Ten countries are participating in the project.

5.1.4.2 TCP/CMB/3104 (D)-Strengthening the SPS services project (2008-2009):

The primary objective of the project is to assist the Government of Cambodia to develop and strengthen the regulatory SPS services to effectively undertake its statutory functions in compliance with international standards and treaties.

5.1.4.3 “Phytosanitary Capacity Building Project for the Mekong Region”:

Based on the evaluation of the implementation for the period of Feb. 2001- June 2004, a three year project (2006-2009)-“Phytosanitary Capacity Building for the Mekong Region”- has been designed to build credible phytosanitary services in each of the four countries with the goal of enhancing phytosanitary capabilities in the four Mekong countries, in order to promote trade and rural income generation, thereby reducing poverty.

5.1.6 Other developments

The Sub-regional Workshop on Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) for Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam (CLMV), was convened from 9-13 June 2008 in Hanoi, Vietnam. The workshop provided an opportunity for CLMV countries the first-hand exercise of PRA for acquiring expertise and skills in implementation of PRA to utilize their practical work in the future. The participants were required to perform a PRA exercise where several situations were put forward by the facilitators.

Senior Officials Meeting (SOM) on phytosanitary capacity building in the Mekong Region (2-3 April, 2008 in Vietnam-NZLAID project) prepared a priority work plan for 2008.

Training workshop on surveillance-pathology was conducted in Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam respectively-2007 (by NZAID project).

Training workshop on plant quarantine for ASEAN countries (May 2008, Korea) invited 2 senior officials from the NPPO of each ASEAN member country for a week’s trainings in Korea.

5.2 Andean Community (CA)

No representative was present from CA

5.3 Southern Cone Plant Health Committee (COSAVE)

COSAVE Coordination Secretary, Mrs. Ana Peralta, presented a review of activities since the last TC and informed that Headquarters had been changed to Paraguay. She also mentioned that they were

studying the possibility of maintaining a permanent Headquarter and thanked EPPO and NAPPO for providing advice to help with this decision

Since last TC, COSAVE Ministers approved a new biannual working plan and continued to agree on the importance of regional cooperation and looking for common positions for standard setting. For commenting on draft ISPMs, COSAVE implemented a multilayered system for consultation, that in 2008 involved Ad-hoc working groups on Fruit flies, Analytical Methods and Procedures and Quarantine Issues. These were followed by consideration by the IPPC Issues Ad-hoc working group and finally by COSAVE Directive Committee.

Also, all COSAVE members called for public comments on draft ISPMs through their Websites. Response was limited, but to assist members of the public considering the drafts, countries had developed clear explanation of the process. Comments this year from industry had mainly been on the modification of ISPM 15.

Documents of common positions had also been produced on the feasibility to operate a recognition system for pest free areas and on pre-clearance.

In 2007, \$25,000 had been spent by COSAVE supporting participants in IPPC standard setting activities, including the Standards Committee, all Technical Panels and Expert Working Groups. Expenditure in 2008 had already exceeded that in 2007 and may reach \$50,000.

In the case of Regional standards, REPP 3.16, version 1.1.1, *Guidelines to establish the list of the main regulated pests for the COSAVE region* states that the list must be reviewed each two years. The process had been initiated and according to planned activities, the list was going to be approved next December.

COSAVE was also looking at a standard on Emergency Action Plans focused on a advanced planning approach to deal with emergencies.

On ISPMs implementation, they were also considering how ISPMs were implemented in the region – a questionnaire had been released to member countries with interesting results in terms of proposals for activities to improve implementation issues, including initiatives for cooperation between countries.

Regarding capacity building, a regional training activity had been organized jointly with USDA and SAG-Chile, on Pierce disease diagnostics (*Xylella fastidiosa* on grapes), considering the importance of the crop and the absence of the pest in the region.

Additionally, a workshop on the impact of ISPMs on family growers was planned as a joint activity with the regional network of family growers (REAF) with the objective to build capacity to participate in the mechanisms of setting and applying ISPMs.

Looking for improvement to risk analysis processes a joint project was prepared with the regional research net (PROCISUR) on the “Impact of variability and climate change on the vulnerability of crops to the main regulated pests for the Southern Cone of America.

COSAVE was also preparing for participation in the Workshop of the Seed Association of the Americas (SAA) on Phytosanitary Issues and Regulation in World Trade with the objective to adequately understand phytosanitary regulatory programs of SAA member countries

Finally, COSAVE had developed a new website that it was thought to be tested and ready at the end of the year. COSAVE activities related to database management in its website included details of Inspectors authorized to sign phytosanitary certificates. This had been continuously reviewed and now

included 3 signatures per inspector. The database on Pest Risk Assessment was also being completed reaching a substantial number of cases of national assessments.

The PPPO commented that they had identified the same issues related with emergency response – when was a new pest outbreak an emergency and when was it just an incursion? Governments would not devote more money to this type of issue, although were prepared to give much support in the case of other natural emergencies e.g. in PNG the Coffee Berry borer was a threat and the RPPO, NPPO and industry had developed its own contingency plan. The PPPO took the “triple P” approach – prevention, preparedness, pest management.

The African Union noted the support programme for small-scale farmers, who were not geared up to changes in international trade arrangements and commented that it would be very interesting to compare notes on the different crops being considered. Mrs. Peralta noted that the organisations of small growers were powerful politically and economically, having a strong social impact, as they represented a large volume of production. COSAVE’s meeting was aimed at empowering these groups in respect of their ability to participate in the standard setting process, but there were concerns, even about what type of language to use, given the wide gaps between the interests of regulators and those of the small farmers. COSAVE would happily share their information with the African Union.

NAPPO asked about the COSAVE concerns about the deviation from intended use in the draft classification of commodities standard and noted that it would be useful to share documents on emergency planning at these meetings. It would like also discuss in the TC on the use of regional pest lists. NAPPO also commented that they were considering the economic impact of plant protection programmes; this information would help justify increased expenditure on NAPPO activity and it would be useful to have some sort of document bank for the TC, in order to develop an ongoing archive.

Mr. Mezui M’Ella asked if there was a single PC for the COSAVE region. It was explained that each country had its own certificate, but in the past this had mentioned COSAVE in its watermark. There had been a decision to drop this, because COSAVE could be held legally responsible for false certificates and considering that ISPMs related to certification do not contemplate this possibility.

Answering an EPPO question on the Pest Risk Assessment database, COSAVE commented that its Directive Committee members were reflecting on whether COSAVE should make publicly available this information.

5.4 Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)

No representative was present from CPPC.

5.5 European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)

The Director General of EPPO, Mr Nico van Opstal highlighted the progress made in EPPO’s strategic plan over the last year. There is a strong emphasis on PRA work and EPPO is both conducting PRAs, as well as reviewing national PRAs from its members. EPPO is involved in a research programme, funded by the European Union, which focuses on development of more efficient risk analysis techniques for pests. Training of national experts in using the EPPO PRA scheme is currently also an important activity.

Much activity is ongoing in support of diagnostics. More than 120 diagnostic laboratories from the EPPO region have entered data in to the database on diagnostic expertise. This database is now freely accessible on the EPPO Website. Guidance on implementation of ISO standard 17025 is drafted and discussed with the European Accreditation body.

Work is ongoing regarding Invasive Alien Plants and five species have been recommended for regulation, based on PRA. A workshop on *Eichornia crassipes* & *E. azurea* was held. These species can spread further in the EPPO region and may lead to substantial economic impacts.

Three workshops on implementation of ISPMs took place, including two workshops for Russian speaking countries. Important for good understanding of ISPMs is the ongoing translation program of ISPMs and in 2007 four ISPMs were translated into Russian.

A short overview was presented of the standards recommended for adoption by the EPPO Council, including several diagnostic protocols, several phytosanitary treatments, guidance on official control of *Ambrosia artemisiifolia* and certification schemes for grapevine and strawberry.

The APPPC asked about the positive list of biological control agents (BCAs). EPPO explained that the panel that developed this list consisted of experts and 20 countries are involved. Advice is based on good experience in at least 5 EPPO countries over at least 5 years.

The IPPC Secretariat noted the wish for increased involvement in Russian speaking countries through the FAO sub-region in Turkey. It has been tentatively suggested a sub-regional consultation on draft ISPMs should be held in 2009. The problem was that some Russian speaking countries are not IPPC members and the available EU funding was only for IPPC members, but it was agreed that EPPO and the Secretariat would work together to see if such a workshop was possible in 2009. FAO is not able to undertake Russian translation from the regular programme budget in this biennium. However, should extra-budgetary resources become available for this purpose, then it would be possible to at least translate the IPP.

The African Union noted they are interested in risks from composted organic waste and management options apart from steam sterilization. EPPO noted a regional standard covering this topic is available on the EPPO website.

5.6 Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)

Mr. Mezui M'ella J.G, Director, IAPSC and Ms. Olembo, Senior Policy Officer representing the Commissioner for Rural Economy Agriculture (DREA) and the Commission of the African Union, attended the TC. The IAPSC reports directly to DREA, and Ms. Olembo is the officer responsible for back -stopping the IAPSC programs. She presented this report.

The Report was based on the 23rd General Assembly of the Inter-African phytosanitary Council that was held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia 22-28 March 2008. This is a statutory meeting of the Council that is held every two years and mainly serves as an information exchange forum. The 2008 Assembly brought together 37 NPPOs, who among other issues, approved the work program of the IAPSC for the period 2008-2009.

Preceding the Council meeting, the First ad hoc meeting of African Experts on phytosanitary measures met on 22-23 to discuss an urgent matter that was tabled by the IITA regarding germplasm exchanges of vegetatively propagated planting materials in Africa. The particular issue touched on CIAT (Columbia) cassava germplasm materials that were being introduced into Mozambique through the Catholic Relief Services instead of through the NPPO of

Mozambique and through which some high risk quarantine pests of cassava had been introduced into the continent. Attending this meeting were experts from CIAT, Columbia, Bioversity, ICARDA, IITA, CPAC, IAPSC, and the African Union Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture. The discussions were charged and resolved as follows;

- That posters should be created to create awareness at all entry points in Africa on the role of IAPSC in Africa;
 - That announcement must be made to all travellers entering Africa to declare if they are carrying plant materials;
 - Declarations and penalties should be re-introduced on all entry forms for travellers entering Africa;
 - Manuals for inspections and inspection procedures should be harmonised throughout Africa;
 - Officers signing phytosanitary certificates should be accredited;
 - The experts proposed regional laboratories in every sub-region as follows
 - East African Region - KEPHIS
 - North African Region- CAIRO-Egypt
 - West and Central African Region- IITA; and
 - Creation of an Emergency response fund for the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council
- The Director of the Inter-African Phytosanitary attended the last meeting of KEPHIS regarding progress in the elaboration of the Centre of excellence for phytosanitary capacity building. These proposals were approved by the Assembly.

The Experts meeting was followed by the meeting of the Steering Committee which examined the work program for the 2008-2009 and recommended it to the General Assembly; key among was the PAN-SPO project an EU funded program to assist African countries to participate in standards setting activities – this funding could be used to ensure African participation in the annual draft ISPM workshops.

Ms. Olembo indicated that the English workshop on draft standards had recently been completed in Accra. This meeting has been partially funded by a US contribution through the IPPC Secretariat and SADC contributions. However a similar workshop for the Francophone countries was not possible due to lack of funds. This is rather unfortunate but in future it would be possible to organize this workshop using funds from the EU funded PAN-SPSO. Funds from this program are to be shared between the IAPSC and the IBAR(Inter- African Bureau for Animal resources) of the AU. The Director attended the 1st meeting of the PAN-SPSO with the Regional Economic Cooperation (RECs) in Nairobi and has been requested to follow-up with IBAR on the possibility for the PAN-SPSO to fund the workshop on draft ISPMs for the Francophone African countries

Ms. Olembo referred to the USAID funded East African Information Committee (EAPIC) project in which the East African countries aim at harmonising their phytosanitary protocols with respect to pest listing, surveillance, diagnostics and inspection procedures. Initially EAPIC covered just Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. But now Zambia has joined, and this year, Rwanda and Burundi have also joined. In the 4th meeting in Lusaka in April 2008, IPPC Secretariat and FAO was represented and presented on the IPP and how EAPIC can link into the IPP and FAO activities. The 5th meeting of EAPIC is planned for 3rd November in Kigali, Rwanda. It is foreseen that with the coming on board of the IPPC, EAPIC may in the near future cover all the East African countries as covered by the East African FAO desk (9 countries). It is planned that this system will directly provide IPPC reporting obligations directly to the IPP. Nigeria and Ghana have expressed an interest to initiate a similar project

for ECOWAS countries. A similar expansion of this project into the SADC region is also planned.

On invasive alien species, the RPPOs were informed that Ms. Olembo presented a paper on the invasive Alien species entering Africa in the past 25 years. The Conference was organised by IUFRO in Sherperdtown, West Virginia, USA (May 2008). The highlight in this paper is that most of the pests come into Africa from Asia, and South America with which Africa shares the same climatic conditions. The paper underscores the need for concerted action and the need for regulating articles that may be a pathway for the invasive Alien species.

There had been no developments in regional standards.

The PPPO noted that the issue of the exchange of germplasm should remain on the TC agenda and suggested it as one of the topics for next year. RPPOs should investigate the situation in their regions and report back. COSAVE recalled that at the last meeting of the COSAVE Directive Committee there had been a concern expressed about other FAO activities which had an impact in the region.

5.7 North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)

Introducing the report, Mr. Ian McDonell, Executive Director of NAPPO, recalled that at last year's TC in Ottawa various participants had been interviewed by evaluators. The conclusions of the evaluation of NAPPO have been received and showed that there was strong public and private support for NAPPO's activities both within the region and internationally. NAPPO's performance and effectiveness have been demonstrated by the fact that various regional standards were used as the basis for ISPMs.

NAPPO has a small Secretariat which relies on the contribution of scientists within the region. It has 18 panels and several Technical Advisory Groups. The evaluation found that this structure works well. The evaluation also recommended that the NAPPO Strategic Plan be updated. It noted that there was a small budget for an international organisation, especially considering its major contribution to regional and international plant protection and recommended that the annual contribution of each country be increased on an equitable basis.

Mr. McDonell expressed his thanks to those who participated in interviews for the Evaluation.

NAPPO has 5 draft regional standards currently on its website for comment.

RSPM 29 – Guidelines for the release of non-*Apis* pollinating insects into NAPPO countries

RSPM 30 – Guidelines for the determination and designation of host status of a commodity for fruit flies (Diptera- Tephritidae)

RSPM 31 – Guidelines for conducting pathway risk analysis.

RSPM 32 – PRA for plants as pests – guidelines for screening plants for planting proposed for import into NAPPO Member Countries

RSPM 33 Guidelines for regulating the movement of ships and cargo from areas infested with Asian Gypsy Moth

The 2008 NAPPO Annual Meeting and Symposium on Irradiation as a Phytosanitary Treatment will take place on 20-24 October 2008 in Guadalajara, Mexico.

5.8 Regional International Organization for Agricultural Health (OIRSA)

Mr. Plutarco Elias Echegoyen Ramos gave a presentation on the work of OIRSA. He stressed that this was a short presentation and did not cover all of the work of OIRSA.

A regional consultation on the draft standards had just been held in Honduras, attended by all OIRSA countries apart from Nicaragua. 5 days had been spent on this work and consensus comments added to the templates.

OIRSA had studied the current situation of diagnostic laboratories of plant pests in the OIRSA region, using 11 evaluation criteria. Based on this work, they would be presenting a request to FAO for a regional TCP – to get investment in diagnostic laboratories and to sustain the working of these laboratories. In collaboration with FAO they had published a Spanish version of the book “An illustrated guide to the state of health of trees: recognition and interpretation of symptoms and damage”. In cooperation with the Consejo Agropecuario Centroamericano (CAC), OIRSA had worked to prepare a project to strengthen plant quarantine at the periphery entry points of Central America, including Belize and Panama, taking into account also the airports of this region.

In Panama, support was given to the creation of a Commission for the production chain for citrus and other tropical fruits, to help improve production conditions. They had also supported the declaration of a PFA for Medfly in the region of Azuero, and participated in programme for control and/or possible eradication of *Thrips palmi*. They had also helped with the creation of a pest free germplasm collection for citrus in this country.

In Nicaragua, they had helped with a PFA for fruit flies in a zone to the north of lake Xolotlan. A programme against Citrus leprosis virus is supported in order to contain that pest and maintain a PFA on the south west side of the country. Support also was given to verify the eradication of pink cotton bollworm (*Pectinophora gossypiella* Saunders) from Corn Island, labour that were achieved more than one year ago for the NPPO of Nicaragua with OIRSA cooperation.

In El Salvador – a panel was looking at the use of Phosphine for phytosanitary treatment and discussed substitutes for Methyl bromide.

In Guatemala, work on phytosanitary programmes for Chinese pea and potato was supported.

The PPPO commented that a regional approach helped neighbours adopt similar approaches and improves the general situation for border control. Mr. Hesham Abuelnaga (USA, NAPPO) asked whether information on infected consignments would be shared between entry points. For many years there has been work on a Central American Free Trade and Economic Integration System, with the intention of eliminating internal control borders.

EPPO enquired about the diagnostic lab work and the inventory, particularly on the criteria for the qualification of laboratories for such status. OIRSA said that they would make the 11 criteria available to all members of the TC. NAPPO requested further elaboration on the role of OIRSA inspectors who undertake phytosanitary work on behalf of NPPOs, unlike other RPPOs. OIRSA noted there was a formal agreement for all countries to delegate their inspection services to OIRSA. Administrative and operational services could be provided (if requested) by OIRSA, but any decision making remained with the NPPOs. The system is

well defined – the agreement includes criteria for sustainable use of the system. Money for services goes to OIRSA. To make this work all systems must be well defined and documented to avoid the situation where an OIRSA inspector has to make decisions for an NPPO.

COSAVE noted that OIRSA was currently chairing the Inter-American Coordination Group in Plant Protection Working Group.

5.9 Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO)

Mr. Sidney Suma, Executive Secretary, presented the PPPO work since the last TC. They had worked on a regionally harmonised Biosecurity (model) Bill and have been working with their members on national adaptations. He hoped that a couple of countries would enact the bill into national law in 2008. This was a holistic bill and included animals, plants and environmental issues as they related to the IPPC and OIE, and its linkages with CBD and other international treaties.

The PPPO is working on the Biosecurity information facility which consists of an operational manual and interlinked database that is looking to automate export certification and import permitting. This project is funded by EU, and is coming to an end in June 2009.

Phytosanitary capacity evaluations (PCE) have been undertaken through the STDF in 8 countries. Results from the evaluations would be posted on the IPP by the individual countries. PCE results show there is a need to update phytosanitary legislation; improve documentation of phytosanitary activities and improve export facilitation.

The PPPO is working with APHIS in respect of the US territories in the region. PPPO (SPC) has been involved conducting quarantine operations in American Samoa linked with big regional cultural festival in July 2008. This is part of a regional programme linked to major events in the region.

The PPPO also made some general comments on draft ISPMs based on the SWP regional workshop on draft ISPM held last week and mentioned that the comments would be submitted to IPPC Secretariat for consideration by SC. One matter the PPPO wanted to highlight was with respect to the draft annex to ISPM 26 where the technical data regarding the fruit fly species specific to the Asia Pacific were wrong and they would be providing comments regarding this matter.

The PPPO also mentioned the close working relations with other border management agencies in their region including Customs, Maritime and Security enforcement.

The AU enquired how the PPPO took separate treaties and inserted all the provisions into one draft Biosecurity Bill. The PPPO explained that this included only Biosafety issues which related to IPPC, e.g. trans-boundary movement of LMOs. The Secretariat wondered if this was enabling legislation and queried the need for export certification legislation. The PPPO said that the Biosecurity Bill was enabling and elaborated that the current laws didn't provide for export facilitation (even the issue of phytosanitary certificates). The Secretariat was also concerned about exporting countries carrying out risk analysis. The PPPO said that the point was to collect data so that the data could be availed to the importing country to undertake the risk analysis without having to wait for the necessary information.

5.10 Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO)

According to the FAO Legal Office this RPPO had not entered into force yet.

5.11 Follow-up on review of RPPO activities

The TC discussed and concluded that there would be considerable benefits for RPPOs seeking comments from other RPPOs. The TC recommended that those RPPOs which do not currently invite comments from outside their region on draft ISPMs which have an impact beyond their own region, discuss this practice within their region and then report back on this issue to the next TC.

6. IPPC SECRETARIAT UPDATE

The IPPC Coordinator explained the current situation with the IPPC Secretariat with regards staffing. The Secretary currently allocates only 5-10% of his time because of other commitments. The job description for a new Secretary has been prepared but is in the Office of the Director General office for clearance. The arrival of a new Secretary before CPM 4 looks optimistic.

CPM meetings take 6 months to prepare and this would start in September 2008. Ideally the Secretary should not be involved in this work, which should fall to the coordinator, but no decision would be made on replacing the coordinator until the Secretary is appointed. It is anticipated that the Secretariat will be losing 2 permanent staff, normally heavily involved in CPM preparation work, by the end of November 2008. Ms Fabienne Grousset, the information liaison officer had already left the Secretariat. Further staff issues included the retirement of Mr. Jeff Jones, who managed the Technical Assistance work, and Isabella Liberto, a key member of support staff, in 2009.

Recommendations had been made to the employment committee to fill the vacant G3 administrative full-time position but there is no progress as yet. The Secretariat is also in the process of trying to find administrative support for the Technical Panels (TPs). The Secretariat has advertised for a P3 position (based on the IPPC Trust Fund), looking at the role of standards implementation. It is anticipated that a P3 project post work would also be created to cover the area of information exchange and temporarily standards implementation officer. A new P4 post has been transferred from FAO to the IPPC Secretariat and this will need to be developed and advertised. Next month the Secretary (Mr. Peter Kenmore) and the chairperson of the CPM Bureau (Ms. Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde) would be meeting to undertake a needs analysis in order to develop a clear strategy as to immediate staffing was required. The OEWG on phytosanitary capacity building had been deferred until December.

There are 2 Associate Professional Officers (APOs) from the US – one working as IPP Webmaster and one working on standards development. Although APOs have a training role, the USA said they would fund these positions and have been extremely useful as the Secretariat was able to undertake the recruitment of the most appropriate candidates. These are junior temporary staff and it is not the same as having a full-time professional position. One other APO is from Japan who is very competent and doing a great job assisting on the standard development.

The meeting wondered how the work programme will be affected with so many vacancies? The Secretariat Coordinator said that Mr. Ralf Lopian has been contracted for 6 weeks to help prepare for SPTA and the OEWG on a Phytosanitary Capacity Building Strategy. Standard setting would continue under Mr. Brent Larson; whilst two Technical Panels (TPs) had been cancelled, members of these groups had offered to provide normal Secretariat assistance. For CPM 4, Australia has offered to assist with papers in January, although that is a bit late. There will be a greater need for more input from the Secretary in the absence of the coordinator and other staff. A major concern was the loss of the Information Officer (Ms Grousset), although it was hoped that a new member of staff from US would be able to help.

The meeting noted that EPPO will host the upcoming TP on the Glossary.

6.1 Budget update

The Coordinator noted everything is on track for the standard setting programme as agreed at CPM. Staff resources are now the concern rather than the money. Brazil would host November's Standards Committee – this should save about \$50,000 in interpretation costs because of access to local interpreters. The Secretariat would still have a major input and the arrangement with Brazil is an experiment to see if costs could really be saved. The TC agreed that it would be useful to receive feedback on the success of this arrangement.

Whilst some Regional Workshops on draft standards had taken place using Trust Fund money the intention is that most of these meetings should become self financing. A new EC project with the AU would fund African Regional workshops next year.

The RPPOs asked how they could support the Secretariat. The Coordinator replied that assistance with regional draft ISPM workshops is important, while the FAO Plant Protection Officers and regional CPM Standards Committee representatives could also play a part in these meetings to reduce the Secretariat's involvement.

COSAVE noted there is still a need to clarify the language regime in developing country comments and suggestions through regional workshops so that comments could be submitted in languages other than English – this is in response to the request from the Secretariat to use English if possible as this would facilitate the SC understanding the comments. COSAVE had sent suggestions for improvements in the past but thought these were ignored because they were sent in Spanish.

Another possibility for RPPO support could be in hosting and possibly running workshops for IPP Editors. The Secretariat was developing on-line training systems and this should help NPPOs and RPPOs take on this work. However, issue of access rights and passwords would remain with the Secretariat in all cases, because of FAO security considerations. The Secretariat and FAO would continue with capacity building at the national level.

The RPPOs should also be able to assist the Secretariat by ensuring that Secretariat messages are reaching the right people in their member countries; this is especially needed for RPPOs with many members. In addition, RPPOs could play a valuable role in ensuring the Secretariat is notified of changes to the IPPC contact points as soon as practically possible.

7. PCE UPDATE

The Secretariat reported that the version of the PCE currently used in the field was that from 2005. The informal working group on the PCE had met in August 2007 and made recommendations for a new version. Mr. Felipe Canale (a past chair of the ICPM) was appointed consultant to undertake an initial revision and had advised on necessary changes. A new PCE prototype has been developed (FAO did not own the old source code) and the module detail will be revised before it is field tested (5-6 countries which have expressed an interest). A meeting in January 2009 would consider a final version; release of the new version should follow and would be translated into 5 FAO languages if resources are available for this purpose. Whilst the new version is similar in structure and process to the previous version, it should be easier to use and more comprehensive than the old version.

The new version would ask questions in a different way to make the answers more meaningful and has been expanded to cover the latest ISPMs. Output currently depends on the country and consultant involved but the new version should produce more consistent results. It would include automatic transfer of some information into the report. The new version could be operated without a consultant, although maximum benefit could be obtained under the guidance of someone with experience in phytosanitary capacity evaluation.

One benefit of the PCE 2008 is the production of summary graphics and other information. When a country finalises a report it could decide whether or not to include the summary graphics. Each country usually wants a different type of report – this depends upon the purpose and intended audience. The new system would also ensure that information collected is retained for future use or repetition of the PCE process to measure progress. One issue still being considered is how to generate a shorter report for management, donors etc.

The PCE 2008 prototype would be produced in English only but would be easy to translate. The new system would also be linear in terms of workflow and would allow sections to be completed by different people in an administration before being entered automatically when that section was returned.

The TC welcomed the development of the new system and looked forward to seeing it in operation.

8. DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UPDATE

The Secretariat reported that there had been no developments since CPM 3, but since the last TC there had been a lot of activity about “public officer” and who is authorised to issue PCs. There had been enquiries from various countries about trade issues and in all cases the Secretariat defused the situation before the countries involved decided to initiate a formal dispute settlement process. There was one potential case originating in Southern Africa and this might become a more formal enquiry in the next few months. Although the Secretariat performs a low level function all the time, the \$20,000 provision for supporting cases had been reallocated to other work as there is no suggestion that a formal dispute would be launched in 2008.

The Secretariat was asked if they document cases which have been defused and if this information is reported to the WTO-SPS committee. Reports every 6 months are made to

the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS). A more detailed report is now provided for each session of the CPM.

9. ROLE AND CRITERIA FOR THE ONGOING RECOGNITION OF AN RPPO

The Secretariat noted that this point was important in view of the possibility of the establishment of NEPPO and the anticipated change in Caribbean from CPPC to CAFPSA. On this point, the Legal Office clarified that two categories of RPPO exist: intergovernmental organization recognized under the provisions of Article XVI of the IPPC, and commissions or agreements concluded under the provisions of the FAO Constitution.²

The meeting noted that sections 19.2 and 19.3 of the IPPC Procedure Manual (2007) deals with the recognition, role and functions of RPPOs as developed by ICPM 3 (2001). The meeting emphasised there should be more input on performing actions in the interest of the IPPC. In 2005 the TC had clarified the relationship of RPPOs to the IPPC (Appendix XIX of the report of the 7th Session of the ICPM). The included detailed list of cooperation activities between RPPOs and IPPC would help the TC in assessing whether the prospective RPPO meets the ICPM guidelines for the recognition of RPPOs.

The question of the formal recognition process was considered, as well as the criteria which an RPPO should meet in order to be recognized. For example, this should include geographical coverage, especially given SPS article 6 which considers regionalisation.

On the issue of the procedure for recognition of an intergovernmental regional entity acting in the field of plant protection as a RPPO in the sense of the IPPC, the Legal Office stressed that, in case a member of such a RPPO is not a Member of FAO, the United Nations or of any of its specialized agencies or of the AIEA, it could not be recognized as a member of the RPPO. Considering this point, the meeting agreed that RPPOs exist to serve their members and cannot pick and choose only those countries who are contracting parties.

Screening of applications for recognition as RPPOs is the responsibility of the Secretary, following the guidelines for recognition of RPPOs adopted by the ICPM in 2001. Their responsibilities are as shown in Article IX of the IPPC. The FAO Legal Office stressed that this is guidance. He pointed out that there was no article in the IPPC which would allow the CPM to recognise any body as the unique representative of an area.

² Entities recognized (under Article IX of the IPPC) as RPPOs are:

- FAO statutory bodies (established under Articles VI or XIV of the FAO Constitution, (a) either as Supplementary agreement of the IPPC under its Article XVI, or (b) without reference to the IPPC);
- intergovernmental organizations.

The Plant Protection Agreement for Asia and the Pacific was approved by the FAO Council, under the provisions of Article XIV.1(a) of the FAO Constitution, for “*questions relating to food and agriculture which are of particular interest to Member Nations of geographical areas...*” and as a supplementary agreement under the IPPC. Within its framework, the contracting parties have established the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC).

The Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC) has been established by the FAO Council under the provisions of Article VI.1 of the FAO Constitution “*to advise on the formulation and implementation of policy and to coordinate the implementation of policy*”.

The main differences between Article XIV and Article VI bodies rest with their source of financing and the membership, but mainly with their mandate and power: Article VI bodies can adopt recommendations on management issues which are not binding, while Article XIV may have regulatory powers to adopt management measures of a potentially binding nature.

As of today, other RPPOs are autonomous intergovernmental organizations.

10. INFORMATION EXCHANGE

10.1 All RPPOs to encourage their members to make active use of the IPP as a means to improve information exchange among IPPC contracting parties

The Secretariat reported on developments in the use of the IPP to meet information exchange obligations. The Secretariat could provide detailed information to RPPOs on the extent to which their members are meeting requirements in this respect to enable them to encourage better use. IPP Workshops have covered the issue of IPPC reporting. Many official contact points have nominated editors to take responsibility for entering information – since this occurred, many countries have started to supply the relevant information through the IPP.

The next development for the IPP includes a revision of layout and improved usability by the end of October, given short-term availability of additional staff resource. However, the site uses 10 year old software and this creates problems in some cases. The new home page would have more direct links to RPPOs to make them more contactable than currently is the situation. The intention is for the site to be used as a portal so that a much wider range of information could be reached via links to other sites.

The TC considered how to encourage contracting parties to use the IPP and agreed that information exchange should be a permanent point on the TC agenda. RPPOs would be asked to report back on how they promote information exchange of their members within IPPC.

10.2 Linking RPPO databases to the IPP

The FAO Legal Office advised that NPPOs could report through their RPPO as long as they had provided a notification to the Secretariat that this was how they would meet their reporting obligations. If a country decides to communicate via its RPPO it is clear that responsibility for the information rests with the NPPO. The meeting welcomed this information, which would streamline procedures and enable countries to fulfil their reporting obligations more easily. In particular, this would greatly facilitate national pest reporting through RPPO databases / reporting systems.

Under this point Mr. Plutarco Echegoyen (OIRSA) gave a useful presentation on reporting mechanisms. He has long been concerned about the issue of national responsibility for meeting IPPC obligations. The issue was analysed at an inter-American meeting. A working group during ICPM 3 produced recommendations on the use of the IPP for obligatory and optional information. The Interim Standards Committee had also recommended this. This proposal included a standard format for submission of information about the presence, outbreak or spread of pests. Steps were necessary to send, receive and process information. RPPOs could have the form available on their websites, allowing NPPOs to post information in that way. Alternatively the NPPO could submit directly to the IPP using the standardised format. RPPOs would receive information automatically from others and then could decide which information to send out to their NPPOs. This would avoid NPPOs receiving too much information. All notifications would be stored in the IPP and by RPPOs possessing the necessary capacity. NPPOs would have access to this information at any time. The database would be inter-relational.

Comparing this proposal with the current IPP system, the Secretariat noted that the IPP reporting system was largely designed in 2003 by the first meeting of the IPP Support Group

and contained most of the design elements mentioned by OIRSA. For pest reporting, fields from ISPM 17 and 8 were used. One forthcoming improvement would be the replacement of the current free text area for the pest name with the EPPO codes system (former Bayer codes) of Latin names - this would overcome problems of misspelling of Latin names of pests. The pest reporting system is built on a relational database, which requires a minimum level of information to meet the requirements of the relevant ISPMs. But additional useful information can be added. There is also an automatic notification system which enables contracting parties to automatically inform their trading partners, etc. of the pest report and thus specifically meet IPPC obligations. It currently does not provide automatic copies to the relevant RPPO and it would be an improvement if it does.

Regional IPP workshops have been used to explain to countries how to complete the information. For countries that wish to automatically report through RPPOs there would be a need to standardise much of the information to ensure compatibility. The Secretariat noted that in all cases NPPOs do not want the Secretariat to filter the reports. The output was currently a single page report and all information entered was publicly available.

The TC was grateful for OIRSA's presentation and noted that the evolution of the IPP covered his proposals.

For those RPPOs which don't have the capacity to maintain their own websites, there was provision in for RPPOs to maintain their data in the IPP. The Secretariat would work with these RPPOs to design more appropriate displays and functionality.

10.3 Electronic certification update

The Secretariat provided an update and noted there concern has been expressed by some contracting parties that countries would need to have a large information technology capacity to operate most proposed electronic certification systems. An informal recommendation was that continue relations with the UN CEFACT group is probably not cost effective as this group deals with all e-certification, recommended meta-data standards during previous meetings seemed unduly complex, and a relatively small proportion of this standard is relevant to the IPPC.

The Secretariat noted that there has been a suggestion during the revision of ISPMs 7 & 12 that there should be an annex to ISPM 12 which would prescribe e-certification requirements. From a purely technical perspective, there was concern by some that this was drawn up by bureaucrats and did not recognise the technical complexity and possible complications of such an action. In addition, the lack of Secretariat resources would mean no participation in e-certification processes in the future. The TC noted some countries, e.g. Canada, USA, Australia, New Zealand, Korea and Netherlands, are making progress. A NAPPO organised workshop in February 2009 in Ottawa would look at developments and should improve understanding in this area and hopefully provide some practical solutions to move this process forward. An e-certification system would have advantages in reducing the administrative burden and fraud, as well as meeting the needs of many by further facilitating trade.

Within NAPPO, the 3 countries are developing an e-certification system but have concerns about the UN CEFACT system. They are looking at a unique system to the requirements of phytosanitary certification rather than using a generic system.

The meeting noted it is important that the CPM appreciates the state of progress on this issue. The Secretariat would need firm directions from the CPM if there was a wish to make more progress. The findings of the Ottawa workshop would be valuable and the outcomes in the Business Plan might need reconsideration.

The next TC would consider the issue in more detail, with preparation undertaken by NAPPO, EPPO and APPPC. There are important issues of access to software, maintenance of any system developed, etc. that need to be addressed.

11. FOLLOW-UP FROM CPM-3

The Coordinator gave a report on progress with action points arising from CPMs 1, 2 and 3.

Action is underway on most points, although staff changes, etc would cause some delays. The Secretariat noted that the papers which need to be prepared for the CPM are specialised and required understanding of the history, etc.

The Secretariat gave an update on the registration of the ISPM No. 15 symbol. Three registration procedures are currently under way. One procedure will see the registration of the symbol in seven countries which have become new members of the Madrid Protocol/Agreement of the WTO; one registration will be undertaken through the Organisation Africaine de la Propriété Intellectuelle (OAPI) to cover 16 French-speaking African countries and another registration will be done through the African Regional Industrial Property Organisation (ARIPO) to cover 4 English-speaking African countries. In addition, depending upon resources, efforts will be made to register the symbol in 14 other countries, using their national legislation governing the registration of intellectual property.

The meeting noted the staff situation in the Secretariat and that progress on some of the follow-up actions may be delayed. Continuity in staffing is vital and the necessary resources need to be provided.

Continued external funding, which currently comes from the EC, to enable developing countries to participate in the CPM work programme was recognised as vital to ensure that the CPM had a quorum. It is necessary for the Secretariat to apply every year to the European Commission for this funding and so there is no certainty that funds would continue to be provided. Separate EU funding for African countries' participation in the standard setting process is managed through IBAR (AU), which is also connected to funding of AU countries to OIE meetings.

12. CPM-4: TOPICS FOR AN EXTERNAL PRESENTATION

The Secretariat noted that the Bureau had requested the TC consider subjects for possible discussion at CPM4. The meeting noted that the Bureau had favoured the topic of "*invasive species moving in food aid*". The development of a draft commodity standard for grain movements could be related to this subject. Topics from the list from the last TC remain valid with several RPPOs favouring a session on "*the risks of aquatic plants as pests*". Several RPPOs also suggested the issue of "*the safe movement of germplasm*" would also be of interest, given concerns about whether the work of the International Treaty for Plant Genetic

Resources (ITPGR) creates phytosanitary risk or plant quarantine issues. The previous list of possible topics included:

- Implementation and the practice of using PRA Standards
- Databases of diagnostic laboratories in terms of where experts are located and their expertise
- Implementation of Systems Approaches
- PIPE – Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education
- Aquatic plants

The TC thought that it would be very useful for more than one topic to be covered in an extended session.

13. CPM BUSINESS PLAN – ROLE/ACTIVITIES OF RPPOS

The Secretariat explained proposed changes in the Business Plan arising from the outcome of the External Evaluation and the Bureau's consideration. The changes are in Goals 1.1, 2.1, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 6.1 & 7.2.

In 7.2, the TC suggested that “compliance” should be replaced by “implementation”, as agreed at CPM3.

14. IPPC IMPLEMENTATION, REVIEW AND SUPPORT SYSTEM (IRSS)

This work programme was adopted by CPM3. The Secretariat reported that implementation has started and there is now a need for a questionnaire to be developed and ultimately sent out to countries on how they implement the IPPC and ISPMs. Staff changes in the Secretariat may mean that there is no further progress in this area this year. The Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS), which proposed the system, could be asked to assist.

The TC for RPPOs is expected to provide input to this new IRSS to help identify implementation and phytosanitary challenges. RPPOs would be asked to provide specific feedback on trends in implementation difficulties regarding ISPMs of their member countries. ISPM 15 has illustrated the challenges associated with implementing ISPMs. The intention is for CPM to understand where the challenges lie so that future standards can take account of experiences gained. This would also allow programmes to be developed to facilitate or assist in meeting these implementation challenges, possibly before they became major obstacles to trade.

RPPOs should be prepared to provide input on capacity building and implementation challenges at the next TC. The Secretariat could provide a series of questions or subjects that should be addressed.

In COSAVE, questionnaires were sent to all countries on IPPC and ISPM implementation issues. Good responses had been received and common problems identified and possible activities to solve the issues. The Secretariat understood that information gathered for the IRSS would be used to look at trends, possibly on a regional basis, rather than considering specific national issues and this information would be used to support IPPC and ISPM implementation.

It was noted that information already gathered in country's PCE could be of use in responding to the questionnaire. The trends that are apparent from the use of the PCE would also be used in the 3-year analysis.

The initiative is seen as part of the IPPC Capacity Building initiative which would be taken forward in the OEWG in December. A new approach to Phytosanitary Capacity Building is being developed in order to pursue the issue a global and coordinated strategy.

15. PROCEDURE FOR ORGANIZING A TC

15.1 Invitation arrangements for the TC for RPPOs

In respect of invitations to the Technical Consultation, the meeting noted that it was the responsibility of the Secretary to invite respective RPPOs. However, the legal officer pointed out that every meeting in FAO is under the authority of the Director-General. The meeting thought that there is still value in maintaining the link with FAO.

16. TC AMONG RPPOS WORK PLAN FOR 2008/2009

The following Topics for the TC in 2009 were agreed, along with responsibilities for preparing papers for the 21st TC.

Topic	RPPO to prepare
1. Emergency response and contingency planning– exchange	EPPO/COSAVE
2. Purpose and use of regional pest lists	all RPPOs
3. Economic impact of plant protection programmes	NAPPO/PPPO
4. Movement of germplasm	PPPO
5. Electronic certification	NAPPO/EPPO/APPPC

It was agreed that the host RPPO for the TC in 2009 should send out quarterly reminders to all RPPOs about the tasks to be undertaken in the work programme. See Appendix II for a summary work programme for the RPPOs and Secretariat to be undertaken before the 21st TC.

16.1 Pick A Topic For An Explanatory Text

The TC did not make any nominations.

17. CURRENT AND EMERGING MAJOR PEST ISSUES

The PPPO noted that climate change would lead to increased requirements for developing surveillance for pests. The Secretariat noted that within FAO the issue of surveillance is being promoted in response to climate change. Concern was also being expressed about biofuel crops as some of these crops are reported to be invasive when introduced into some new

areas. EPPO had already agreed a statement alerting its members to these risks. The TC agreed to monitor this and report back to the next TC if relevant.

18. REPERCUSSIONS OF FAO HIGH LEVEL MINISTERIAL MEETING REGARDING IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE; DOES IT HAVE ANY IMPACT ON IPPC WORK PROGRAMME

The Secretariat had given presentations to the High Level Ministerial Meeting on the impact of climate change on the trans-boundary movement of pests. Resulting discussion was general; the meeting had focussed on food prices as much as climate change. The conclusions drawn were that climate change will enhance risks for all countries, both from pest distribution and host plant distribution. The coordinator repeated his presentation for the TC.

19. OTHER BUSINESS

The 40th Anniversary of the IAPSC would occur in 2009. The organisation was created in London in 1954 and had operated in Africa since 1967. However, due to budget constraints there may be no formal celebration, but IAPSC had the wish to organise the TC to mark this anniversary.

Concerns were expressed about IPPC related work being undertaken elsewhere in FAO which may overlap and conflict with work done under the auspices of the IPPC. Experts in these areas were invited to attend the TC to explain the nature of their work (see 19.2 – 19.4).

19.1 Phytosanitary Treatments

NAPPO raised the issue of recognition of phytosanitary treatments. The member countries had agreed which were the most commonly used and had submitted them to the Technical Panel. However, they had been rejected because there was not full technical research information to support the treatments, despite their evident efficacy in practice. Mr. Abuelnaga (NAPPO) mentioned the previous history of use aspect that was thought by some to be important in the considerations of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments.

COSAVE recalled that they had expressed concerns about the need for a complete dossier on each treatment when ISPM No. 28 was agreed and that any change in procedures to approve phytosanitary treatments has to be performed through the review of the standard. The TC expressed concerns that phytosanitary treatments are not being accepted because of inadequate research information in the dossier and noted that the Bureau is examining this problem.

The Secretariat reported that they had been asked to develop a Treatments and a Diagnostic database, to bring together information from all countries.

19.2 Procedures for Risk Assessment on Weeds

Mr. Ricardo Labrada, a weed scientist with FAO, explained to the meeting the procedures developed to carry out risk assessments of weeds. Risk assessment work for weeds has been developed by FAO in the past few years. Although there are close links with the IPPC

Secretariat, and the relevant ISPMs were considered, this work has not been promoted as an international standard because it would need a country to promote it.

Essentially 3 procedures have been developed:

1. Risk assessment of herbicide- and insecticide-resistant Crops focussed on weeds.
This had looked at the potential transfer of resistant genes into wild plants
2. Weed risk assessment – based on experience in Australia and New Zealand and on the PRA techniques developed by the IPPC
3. Post entry risk management

Following the presentation concerns were expressed by some RPPOs that this process does not follow the exact intent or spirit of the ISPMs. The TC did not want to see the work used as the basis for the forthcoming development of an ISPM on plants as invasive species, although it was noted that the work has been recognised by other international bodies.

19.3 International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

Mr. Kent Nnadozie of FAO gave a presentation on the International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. This treaty was adopted by the FAO Conference on 3 November 2001. The need arose for plant genetic resources to be protected worldwide, whilst recognising countries' sovereign rights to protect resources within their own countries. Behind the treaty was also the need for food security for survival. Genetic resources are seen as the heritage for all humanity, even though countries have the sovereign right to protect their own resources.

Biocontrol agents are not currently covered and the Treaty is silent on the issue of new technology. These issues would be covered by the CBD. If countries take material, then adapt it and acquire new intellectual property rights, a percentage of the benefits must be repaid to the country and people of origin.

Concern was expressed that although the treaty doesn't exclude other legislation, there are documented reports that transfer of material is taking place without phytosanitary controls, with some organisations or centres taking the view that their guidelines take precedence over IPPC provisions and the associated ISPMs. There is a need for the respective Secretariats to collaborate to promote awareness of international and national phytosanitary requirements and ensure respect for the provisions of the relevant treaties.

Finally, the Treaty plays a clear role in representing rights under UPOV and WIPO, which see a benefit in the Treaty because the exchange of material is regulated and potential benefits are shared appropriately.

19.4 Forest invasive species network

COSAVE expressed concern about a forest invasive species network that is being established in South America by the FAO Forestry Department as there is great potential for duplicating and confusing initiatives already underway within the framework of the IPPC e.g. pest reporting and risk assessment. The Secretariat noted that these networks had already been established by the FAO Forestry Department in other regions and whenever possible this is done with the input of the IPPC Secretariat. The FAO Forestry Department believes they are a valuable component of their forest health work programme.

The plant health experts in the FAO department were on duty travel and unable to attend the TC to provide background on this initiative.

20. DATE AND LOCATION OF THE TWENTY FIRST TC-RPPOs

The TC-RPPOs agreed that the next TC-RPPOs would be held at approximately the same time – end August-early September in 2009. IAPSC offered to host the 21st TC meeting and would provide details about the date and venue by the end of September 2008. EPPO offered the possibility to host the meeting in Portugal if the IAPSC is unable to identify a location by this date.

The meeting discussed the desirability of some forward-planning so that RPPOs were aware of when it would be their turn to host the meeting. Next year's meeting would establish a rota. See Appendix III for tentative agenda for the next TC.

21. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The meeting adopted the report with the understanding that the Secretariat would provide a final edit before circulation to RPPOs for comment. The comment period would be for 2 weeks.

The Chairman thanked the participants for their very positive input into all the discussions held during the week.

Appendix I

20th Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations 25 – 28 August 2008

Agenda

1. Opening of the Technical Consultation
2. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-chair and Rapporteur
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Actions arising from the Nineteenth TC-RPPOs
5. Review of RPPO activities (incl. organisation, regional standards, workshops) and this will also include specific feedback on:
 - ✓ RPPO activities to realize the goals of the CPM Business Plan as listed in
 - 1.2 Standard implementation
 - 2.1 Implementation of information exchange as required under the IPPC
 - 3.1 Encouragement of the use of dispute settlement systems
 - 4.2 The work programme of the IPPC is supported by technical cooperation
 - 5.1 The IPPC is supported by an effective and sustainable infrastructure
 - 6.3 Efficient and effective communication between the RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat
 - 7.1 Regular examination of the overall strategic direction and goals of the CPM with the adaptation of programmes to reflect/respond to new and emerging issues
 - ✓ Listing of RPPO databases for linkage through the IPP
 - 5.1 APPPC
 - 5.2 CA
 - 5.3 COSAVE
 - 5.4 CPPC/CAFHSA
 - 5.5 EPPO
 - 5.6 IAPSC
 - 5.7 NAPPO
 - 5.8 OIRSA
 - 5.9 PPPO
 - 5.10 NEPPO
6. Secretariat update
7. PCE Update
8. Dispute settlement update
9. Role and criteria for the ongoing recognition of an RPPO
10. Information Exchange

- All RPPOs to encourage their members to make active use of the IPP as a means to improve information exchange among IPPC contracting parties
 - Linking RPPO databases to the IPP
 - Improving the efficacy of national reporting to meet the provisions of the IPPC
 - electronic certification update
11. Follow-up from CPM-3
 12. CPM-4: Topics for an External presentation
 13. CPM Business Plan – role/activities of RPPOs
 14. IPPC Implementation, Review and Support System (IRSS)
 - The TC-RPPOS to be used as a forum to assess and establish priorities on workshops aimed at improving the phytosanitary capacity of members.
 15. Procedure for organizing a TC
 16. TC among RPPOs Work plan for 2008/2009, including:
 - Look further ahead than 1 year
 - Pick a topic for an explanatory text.
 17. Current and emerging major pest issues
 18. Repercussions of FAO high level Ministerial meeting regarding impact of climate change; does it have any impact on IPPC work programme
 19. Other Business
 - IAPSC celebrating 40 years of existence
 20. Date and location of next TC
 21. Adoption of the Report of the 20th TC-RPPOs

Appendix II

**WORK PROGRAMME OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION
AMONG RPPOS FOR 2008/2009**

	Activity / Topic	Responsible body
1	In 7.2 of the Business Plan, the TC suggested that “compliance” should be replaced by “implementation”, as agreed at CPM3.	Secretariat
2	Subjects for possible discussion at CPM4 to be present to the SPTA	Secretariat
3	Include RPPOs databases as an active avenue for reporting under the IPPC	Secretariat
4	Should NEPPO and CAFPSA enter into force during 2008/09, then they should be made aware of the requirements for recognition as RPPOs.	Secretariat
5	Increased involvement by RPPOs in regional workshops on draft ISPMs available for country consultation	all RPPOs
6	Possible increased involvement by RPPOs in the training of IPP editors	all RPPOs
7	Emergency response and contingency planning – exchange	EPPO/COSAVE
8	Purpose and use of regional pest lists	all RPPOs
9	Economic impact of plant protection programmes	NAPPO/PPPO
10	Movement of germplasm	PPPO
11	Electronic certification	NAPPO/EPPO
12	IRSS – input from RPPOs on priorities seem in different regions. Secretariat to provide guidance to RPPOs	IPPC Secretariat
13	16 Quarterly reminders to all RPPOs about the tasks to be undertaken in the work programme	IAPSC (or EPPO)
14	20 IAPSC to confirm the date and venue of the 21 st TC <u>by 30 September 2009</u> If hosting by IAPSC not possible, then EPPO to host 21 st TC in Portugal.	IAPSC EPPO
15	19.2 TC did not want the FAO Weed Risk Assessment work to be used as the basis for the forthcoming development of an ISPM on plants as invasive species as it was not appropriate	Secretariat
16	20 Establish a rota for TCs for the next 5 years	21 st TC
17	19.3 IPPC and ITPGR Secretariats to collaborate to promote awareness of international and national phytosanitary requirements	Secretariat

Appendix III

21st Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations 2009

Tentative Agenda

1. Opening of the Technical Consultation
2. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-chair and Rapporteur
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Matters arising from the 20th TC-RPPOs
5. Review of RPPO activities (incl. organisation, regional standards, workshops) and this will also include specific feedback on RPPO activities to realize the goals of the CPM Business Plan as listed in:
 - 1.2 Standard implementation
 - 2.1 Implementation of information exchange as required under the IPPC
 - 3.1 Encouragement of the use of dispute settlement systems
 - 4.2 The work programme of the IPPC is supported by technical cooperation
 - 5.1 The IPPC is supported by an effective and sustainable infrastructure
 - 6.3 Efficient and effective communication between the RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat
 - 7.1 Regular examination of the overall strategic direction and goals of the CPM with the adaptation of programmes to reflect/respond to new and emerging issues
 - 5.1 APPPC
 - 5.2 CA
 - 5.3 COSAVE
 - 5.4 CPPC/CAFHSA
 - 5.5 EPPO
 - 5.6 IAPSC
 - 5.7 NAPPO
 - 5.8 OIRSA
 - 5.9 PPPO
 - 5.10 NEPPO
6. Secretariat update
7. PCE Update
8. Dispute settlement update
9. Information Exchange update
10. Electronic certification (NPPO/EPPO)
11. Follow-up from CPM-4
12. CPM-5: Topics for an External presentation
13. CPM Business Plan – role/activities of RPPOs

14. IPPC Implementation, Review and Support System (IRSS)
 - RPPOS to report on IPPC and ISPM implementation.
15. TC among RPPOs Work plan for 2008/2009, including:
16. Current and emerging major pest issues
17. Emergency response (EPPO/COSAVE)
18. Purpose and use of regional pest lists (all RPPOs)
19. Economic impact of plant protection programmes (NPPO/PPPO)
20. Movement of germplasm (PPPO)
21. Other Business
22. Date and location of next TC
23. Adoption of the Report of the 21st TC-RPPOs
24. Closure

Appendix IV

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS

Participants	
<p>Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)</p> <p>Mr. Yongfan Piao Technical Secretary Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission c/o FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific Maliwan Mansion 39 Phra Atit Road Bangkok 10200 Thailand Tel: +66 2 2817844 - Ext. 268 Fax: +66 2 2800445 E-mail: Yongfan.Piao@fao.org</p>	<p>Comite de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE)</p> <p>Ms. Ana Peralta Coordination Secretary Independencia Nacional 821 c/ Humaitá, Edificio Lider VI 5 Piso, oficina 4 y 5 Asunción Paraguay Tel./Fax.: +59521-453922 Email: Anaperalta@senave.gov.py or aperaltaottonello@yahoo.com</p>
<p>European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)</p> <p>Mr. Nico van Opstal Director-General European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 1, rue le Nôtre 75016 Paris, France Tel.: +33-1 4520 7794 Fax.: +33-1 4224 8943 Email: vanopstal@epo.fr</p>	<p>Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)</p> <p>Mr. Plutarco Elías Echegoyén Ramos Especialista en Sanidad Vegetal Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA) Calle Ramón Belloso y Final Pasaje Isolde, Colonia Escalón, San Salvador, El Salvador, Centro América Tel: +503-2263-1123; +503-2209-9222 (direct) Fax: +503-2263-1128; Email: pechegoyen@oirsa.org or svegetal@oirsa.org</p>
<p>Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)</p> <p>Mr. Sidney Suma Executive Secretary Biosecurity & Trade Facilitation Adviser Land Resources Division Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) Private Bag Mail Service, Suva Fiji Islands Tel.: +679 337 0733; 9233 Fax: +679 337 0021 Email: sidneys@spc.int</p>	<p>Mr. Andrew Yamanea Chairperson PPPO Managing Director National Agriculture Quarantine and Inspection Authority P O Box 741 Port Moresby NCD Papua New Guinea Tel: +675-325 9977 Fax: +675-325 9310 Email: ayamanea@datec.net.pg</p>
<p>Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)</p> <p>Mr. Jean Gerard Mezui M'ella Director of AU/IAPSC P.O.Box. 4170 Nlongkak, Yaounde Cameroon Tel: (237) 22 21 19 69</p>	<p>North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)</p> <p>Mr. Ian McDonell NAPPO – Executive Director 1431 Merivale Rd., 3rd Floor, Room 309 Ottawa, ON KIA 0Y9 Canada</p>

<p>Mob: (237) 94 89 93 40 Fax: (237) 22 21 19 67 Email: au-cpi@au-appo.org or jeangerardmezuimella@yahoo.fr</p>	<p>Tel.: +1-613 221 5144 Fax.: +1-613 228 2540 Email: imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca</p> <p>Mr. Hesham Abuelnaga International Trade Specialist Africa, Canada, China, C & E Europe, Middle East and Russia Foreign Agricultural Service/OSTA (Plant Division) 1400 Independence Ave, SW (Stop 1011) # 5965 South Washington, DC 20250 USA Tel. : +202-720 0330 Fax. : +202-690 0677 Email : Hesham.abuelnaga@fas.usda.gov</p>
Observers	
<p>African Union</p> <p>Ms Sarah Olembo Senior Policy Officer Department for Rural Economy and Agriculture African Union Commission Box 3243 Addis Ababa Ethiopia Tel.: Fax.: Email: ahono_olembo@yahoo.com</p>	<p>CPM Bureau</p> <p>Mr. Stephen Ashby Plant Health Strategy and Bee Health Branch Plant Health Division Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Foss House, King's Pool 1-2 Peasholme Green York YO1 7PX Phone: +44 1904 455048, gtn 5137 5048 Email: steve.ashby@defra.gsi.gov.uk</p>
IPPC Secretariat	
<p>Mr. Richard Ivess Coordinator IPPC Secretariat Plant Production and Protection Division FAO 00153 Rome Italy Tel.: +39- 06 5705 3588 Fax.: +39-06 5705 4819 Email: Richard.Ivess@fao.org</p>	<p>Mr. David Nowell IPPC Secretariat Plant Production and Protection Division FAO 00153 Rome Italy Tel.: +39-06 5705 2034 Fax.: +39-06 5705 4819 Email: Dave.Nowell@fao.org</p>
<p>Ms. Gloria Mintah IPPC Secretariat Plant Production and Protection Division FAO 00153 Rome Italy Tel.: +39-06 5705 2707 Fax.: +39-06 5705 4819 Email: Gloria.Mintah@fao.org</p>	<p>Ms. Melanie Bateman IPPC Secretariat Plant Production and Protection Division FAO 00153 Rome Italy Tel.: +39-06 5705 3071 Fax.: +39-06 5705 4819 Email: MelanieLynn.Bateman@fao.org</p>