



REPORT

Rome,
Italy,
15-23 May
1995

Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures Second meeting



Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of the
United
Nations

**Meeting Report
AGP/1995**

**REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE
COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

Rome, Italy : 15-23 May 1995



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Rome, Italy - 1995

The designations employed and 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 or 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, Publications Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.

© FAO 1995

(i)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. SUMMARY OF THE REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE CEPM	1
1. Opening of the meeting	3
2. Election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson	3
3. Adoption of report of the first meeting of the CEPM	3
II. DISCUSSION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES	3
4. <i>Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis</i> standard	3
5. <i>Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of Exotic Biological Control Agents</i> standard	4
6. <i>Guidelines for Survey and Monitoring Systems</i> standard	5
7. <i>Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free Areas (PFAs)</i> standard	7
8. <i>Inspection Methodology</i> standard	8
9. <i>PRA: Pest Categorization</i> supplementary standard	10
10. Other PRA supplementary standards (<i>Economic Impact Assessment, Assessment of Probability of Introduction and Pest Risk Management</i>)	11
11. <i>Framework for an Export Certification System</i> standard	11
III. OTHER MATTERS	12
12. Review of the International Plant Protection Convention	12
13. Priority of future work	13
14. Close of the meeting	13

(ii)

- ANNEX 1:** Summary of comments on *Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis*
- ANNEX 2:** Summary of comments on *Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of Exotic Biological Control Agents* standard
- ANNEX 3:** Summary of general comments on *Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free Areas*
- Appendix 1:** Provisional Agenda
- Appendix 2:** List of Participants

1. SUMMARY OF THE REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE CEPM

The second meeting of the Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures (CEPM) was held 15-23 May 1995 at FAO Headquarters, and chaired by M. Vereecke, F. Canale and L.W. Small. It was attended by 13 quarantine experts nominated by eight Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs), the European Union, the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, and the Moroccan Ministry of Agriculture and Agricultural Resources. Also participating were staff of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat at FAO, FAO Legal Counsel, and A. Stahevitch from Agriculture Canada as an invited speaker. Mr S. Pone joined the group as a new member nominated by the newly established Pacific Plant Protection Organization. The task of the Committee was to review new International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures prepared by Working Groups organized under the auspices of: the IPPC Secretariat, and to make recommendations applicable to the use of these standards by FAO Members in their national plant quarantine programmes.

Results and recommendations of the meeting

1. The Committee considered a summary of the comments by FAO Members on the *Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis* standard provided at the meeting of the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) held in March 1995 at Headquarters. A number of recommendations for amendments were made. The revised draft standard will be considered by Council and Conference of FAO later this year.
2. *The Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of Exotic Biological Control Agents* standard was discussed at length by the CEPM. The concerns expressed by COAG were met, to the satisfaction of the Committee, by a number of amendments. The revised draft standard will also be considered by Council and Conference this year.
3. The Committee considered a draft of the standard on *Guidelines for Survey and Monitoring Systems*. This was amended and recommended for distribution to FAO Members and RPPOs for comment.
4. The Committee discussed and reached consensus on the text for the standard on *Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free Areas*. The reexamination of a modified draft of the standard provided by the IPPC Secretariat had been requested by COAG. The amended draft will be distributed to FAO Members for their information prior to the October meetings of Council and Conference. This was in followup to COAG's recommendation that, in view of the urgency for this standard, Council and Conference consider the standard without further reference to COAG, provided that a consensus on the text was reached by the CEPM.
5. The Committee reviewed the draft of the standard *Inspection Methodology*. This was amended and recommended for some redrafting and reconsideration by the Committee, and for distribution to FAO Members and RPPOs for comment.
6. Four supplementary standards to the *Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis* were considered by the Committee. The first, *Pest Categorization* was amended and the remaining three (*Economic Impact Assessment*, *Assessment of Probability of Introduction* and *Pest Risk Management*) were recommended for future consideration. The Committee agreed to forward comments to the Secretariat by the end of November 1995 so that these can be collated for the next CEPM meeting in May 1996.

7. The Committee considered a draft of the standard Framework for an *Export Certification System*. This was amended and recommended for distribution to FAO Members and RPPOs for comment.
8. The Committee discussed the possibility of a review of the International Plant Protection Convention. This review was requested by COAG. The IPPC Secretariat will be requesting comments from FAO Members on suggested modifications to the Convention, and these may be discussed at the Seventh Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations to be held in September 1995 in Noumea.
9. The Committee considered proposals for the development of further standards and their priority. The IPPC Secretariat agreed to draft a diagrammatic representation of the framework for production of standards introduced at the first meeting of the CEPM in May 1994. An activity chart and timetable would be presented at the Technical Consultation among RPPOs in September, for discussion and positioning of present and future priority standards.

1. Opening of the meeting

The meeting was opened by Dr M. Zehni, Director of the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division, with additional comments by Dr N.A. Van der Graaff, Chief of the FAO Plant Protection Service, giving a background perspective to participants on the events leading to the production of the International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) to be reviewed. The meeting was held at FAO Headquarters and attended by 13 nominated experts representing eight Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs), the European Union the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, and the Moroccan Ministry of Agriculture and Agricultural Resources. Also participating were staff of the IPPC Secretariat and FAO Legal Counsel. Dr A. Stahevitch from Agriculture Canada also attended as an invited speaker on Pest Risk Analysis. Mr. S. Pone of the South Pacific Commission joined the group for the first time as the quarantine expert nominated by the newly established Pacific Plant Protection Organization. The purpose of the meeting was to review a series of standards prepared by Working Groups organized under the auspices of the IPPC Secretariat and to make comments and recommendations on these standards for use by FAO Members in their national plant quarantine programmes.

2. Election of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson

Dr M. Vereecke and Dr F. Canale were confirmed as Chairperson and Vice Chairperson of the Committee, respectively.

Adoption of the agenda

The provisional agenda (see Appendix 1) was presented and adopted.

3. Adoption of report of the first meeting of the CEPM

The participants found the form of the report of the first meeting of the Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures, held in Rome from 16 to 20 May 1994, to be satisfactory, and approved the report.

II. DISCUSSION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

4. *Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis* standard

The Second Meeting of the CEPM commenced with the review of the *Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis* (PRA) standard. The Committee considered the summary of comments (see Annex 1) provided by the IPPC Secretariat, that had been made by FAO Members at the FAO Committee of Agriculture (COAG) meeting in March 1995 at Headquarters and made the following recommendations:

- 4.1 Figure 2 should be modified (as shown in Annex 1 of the PRA draft standard) to take into account the comments of the Netherlands and Germany concerning the Section on Official Control. It was recommended that the Figures should remain with the text.
- 4.2 The reversal of the order of the points entitled “Evaluate introduction potential” and “Quarantine pest” was not supported by the Committee.

- 4.3 Regarding the addition to Section 2 at end of the text, proposed by Japan, this was agreed to with some modifications of the original proposal to read:
- “Countries where the pest(s) is/are present may provide available information for the country conducting the PRA, on request”.
- 4.4 Regarding the proposal from COSAVE concerning “protected zones” at end of Section 3, after considerable discussion, the Committee reached consensus on recommending a proposed addition to this Section reading:
- “...Phytosanitary measures should be applied to the minimum area necessary for the effective protection of the endangered area”.
- 4.5 Regarding the addition to Section 3.2 in the second paragraph, proposed by Japan, this was agreed to with some modifications to read:
- “While it is recognized that countries according to the sovereignty principle may exercise their sovereign right to utilize phytosanitary measures, countries should also take particular note of the *Minimal Impact* principle: “*Phytosanitary measures shall be consistent...*”.
- 4.6 The proposals that the terms “introduction” and “introduction potential” be deleted were not accepted by the Committee.

Conclusion

The Committee endorsed the revised draft standard to proceed to Council and Conference for consideration this year.

5. Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of Exotic Biological Control Agents standard

The Committee considered the summary of comments provided by the Secretariat collected from FAO Members at the COAG meeting in March 1995 (see Annex 2), and made the following recommendations concerning the below proposed amendments:

- 5.1 Amendment to definition of “Inundative release” proposed by the USA. This was amended to read:
- “The release of overwhelming numbers of a mass-produced, invertebrate biological control agent in the expectation of achieving a rapid reduction of a pest population without necessarily achieving continuing impact”.
- 5.2 Amendment to definition of “Predator” proposed by the USA. This was amended to read:
- “A natural enemy that preys and feeds on other animal organisms, more than one of which are killed during its lifetime”.
- 5.3 Amendment proposed to 3.1.5 by the European Union (EU). This was amended to read:
- “If appropriate, ensure entry and where required, processing through quarantine facilities or consider...”.
- 5.4 No action was recommended on amending 6.1.1 as proposed by the EU.

- 5.5 Regarding Section 3.2, a proposal was made by the USA to add: “The authority of an exporting country, to the extent possible, should:...”.

Further discussion ensued on the insertion of “help” so as to read: “...exporting country should help, to the extent possible,...”. This was not agreed to. Later extensive consideration of the Committee on the deletion of Section 3.2 confirmed the earlier recommendation to retain the Section with the addition of the phrase “to the extent possible”

- 5.6 Regarding the concerns over Sections 4.1 to 4.3 as expressed by the EU, the Committee recommended changes so that Sections 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 be preceded by “At the first importation...”.

- 5.7 Recommended change to 6.1.1 by the USA. The term change of “formalities” to “requirements” was recommended.

- 5.8 The definition of “Pest” was questioned. The definition was regarded as too extensive with the references to “human, animal health or the conservation of natural habitats”. The definition from the *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* is recommended to be used instead; i.e:

“Any species, strain or biotype of plant or animal, or pathogenic agent, injurious to plants or plant products”

- To cover the points noted here an addition to the Outline was recommended as a fifth paragraph:

“It is possible that this code, after due evaluation, could also be applied for the introduction of exotic biological control agents to control pests affecting human or animal health or the conservation of natural habitats”.

- 5.9 Regarding Section 7.1.3, No 4 of the USA interventions, the discussion resulted in the recommendation that there should be no change to the draft.

Conclusion

The Committee recommended that the revised draft standard proceed to Council and Conference for consideration by this year.

6. *Guidelines for Survey and Monitoring Systems standard*

The Committee considered the draft of this standard. General comments included the recommendation that the references be standardized in accordance with earlier standards. Other comments covered the following:

- 6.1 Regarding Definitions:

- The definition of “Area of low pest prevalence” was modified to read: “An area in which a specific pest occurs at low levels and which is subject to effective surveillance, and/or control measures”.
- An asterisk was added to “Commodity Pest List”. Also “lists” changed to “list”
- “New Occurrence” deleted
- “Pest” definition: “a” removed
- It was recommended that the terms “survey” and “surveillance” be examined to ensure they are appropriate

6.2 Regarding "Outline...".

- First paragraph, "limited distribution" has "or low pest prevalence" added
- Second paragraph was deleted
- Line 3: "Import regulations" changed to "Phytosanitary regulations". "Scientific data and" was deleted
- Line 5: "importing countries" deleted so the sentence reads "The implications...".
- Last two paragraphs rewritten to read:
"The information acquired may be used to determine the presence, distribution or prevalence of pests in an area, or on a host or commodity, or their absence from an area in the establishment and maintenance of pest free areas".

6.3 Regarding "General Requirements...", title changed to "Requirements" only

- Re Section 1.1, added "Scientific and trade journals, unpublished historical data and contemporary observations" to the list in paragraph 1. Sentence added:
"In addition, the NPPO may obtain information from international sources such as FAO, RPPOs etc".
- Re Section 1.2: "coordinator" changed to "contact personnel"
- Re Section 1.3: "claims" changed to declarations"
- Re Section 2, indent 1: "requirement to be achieved" changed to "regulations to be met"
- Indent 3: "area of cultivation, production type" changed to "production system"
- Indent 3: "ecoregion" changed to "ecoarea"
- Indent 6: suggested that "quality management" be defined

6.4 The first section of Technical Requirements under Sampling was moved to Requirements to become 2.1 - 2.4

- In the new 2.1, third to last indent: "area of production" was changed to "production area"

6.5 Section 2 then became Section 3. Technical Requirements for Diagnostic Services

- Last sentence changed to:
"Verification of the soundness of the diagnostic service by other recognized authorities will provide increased confidence in the survey results".

6.6 New Section 4. Record Keeping

- First paragraph, "assessments" changed to "analyses"
- ..."scientific name of pest and Bayer code if available" used in first line of each indent
- In fifth indent of first series: added "only under glass"
- Third indent: added "scientific name and Bayer Code of host if available and plant part affected..."
- Deleted "other comments" in the "additional information indent"

6.7 New Section 5. Rewritten to read:

"The NPPO should produce and, on request, distribute reports of pest presence, distribution, prevalence or absence derived from general surveillance and specific surveys. This should include making the information accessible to the public after verification".

- Note: the Contents page to be rearranged to follow changes

Conclusion

The Committee recommended that the amended standard be sent to FAO Members for comment.

7. **Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free Areas (PFAs) standard**

The Committee considered the summary of general comments provided by the IPPC Secretariat collected from FAO Members (see Annex 3). Many of the comments had already been dealt with in the revised draft presented to the Committee. The standard was discussed generally at some length. It was decided to prepare a further draft to take into account the European requirements that the standard include the preparation of import requirements.

7.1 Regarding Scope - Added:

“...or to support the scientific justification for phytosanitary measures taken by an importing country for protection of an endangered PFA”.

7.2 Regarding Outline – Added to second paragraph:

“It also provides, as an element in pest risk assessment, the confirmation on a scientific basis of the absence of a stated pest from an area. The PFA is then an element in the justification of phytosanitary measures taken by an importing country to protect and endangered area”.

- First series of indents, changed all to “an”

7.3 General Requirements

- 1.1 Changed to “...physical features (eg rivers, seas, mountain ranges...roads) or property boundaries...”.

- The size and permanence of the PFA was discussed but not agreed to

- Changed the first sentence to read: “The delimitation of a PFA...”.

- Changed the last sentence to read “establish” instead of “define”

- 1.2 Re changes proposed:

- Changed second indent of 1.2 to “phytosanitary measures to maintain freedom”

- Second series of indents, added “its means of dispersal”

- Third series of indents, deleted “suitable” and last sentence “performed” by “conducted”, and added “ecological conditions”

- Changed title of 1.2.2 to “Phytosanitary measures to maintain freedom”

- 1.2.2: Changed fourth indent to include: “...countries including buffer zones”

- Definition added for “buffer zone”

- Original format used except for the deletion of indent re “prohibition” and “of imported consignments”

- “Where ecological conditions...” removed and following inserted:

“The application of phytosanitary measures to maintain pest freedom status is only justified in a PFA, or any portion of a PFA, in which ecological conditions are suitable for the pest to establish”.

- 1.2.3 Re changes proposed:

- First sentence added “continuing” in front of “pest free status”

- Second sentence second half after “required” removed

- Second line changed “safeguards” to “phytosanitary measures”

- Changed “justify” to “verify”

- First indent changed to “*ad hoc* inspection of exported consignment”

- Third indent all deleted

- Last sentence, moved to end of 1.2 with the reference to PRA and added “(In preparation)”.

- Deleted the second paragraph of 1.2.1

- 1.3 - first line replaced “has” by “should”

- Deleted from “to provide...” to end

- “...regulatory controls taken...” changed to “...phytosanitary regulations applied...”

- Third paragraph “Also,...”. deleted

- Fourth paragraph changed to "...so that the information can be communicated to interested NPPOs at their request".
- Last paragraph, first sentence interpolated after "operation plan" the phrase "based on a bilateral agreement"
- 2. Changed the three indents to beg with "an"
Second line "dividing" - "them" added
- 2.1.1 First two lines deleted
- 2.1.2 Changed "safeguards" to "Phytosanitary measures"
- 2.1.4 Shortened to finish at "1.3"
- 2.2.1 Deleted the text in brackets (In fact,...)
- First sentence changed to read: "Normally...from specific surveys" Deleted the pest freedom indicated. Re-spelled surveillance
- 2.2.2 Changed "host material" to "commodities"
- 2.3 Second line changed to read "...free from a specific pest"
- Second paragraph first sentence added "based on specific surveys" to replace "verified".
Second sentence deleted
- Changed for a third paragraph
"The PFA should be adequately isolated in relation to the biology of the pest".
- 2.3.2 "Safeguards" changed to "Phytosanitary measures"
- 2.3.4 Third line "the" and "involved" deleted

Conclusion

The Committee reached consensus on the amended draft of this standard. The standard will be distributed to FAO Members for their consideration before the October meetings of Council and Conference.

8. *Inspection Methodology standard*

General comments were made that the draft standard language was not consistent with *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* and that the classification (positioning) of the standards seemed awkward. Regarding "Definitions and Abbreviations", some Committee members suggested that these be more comprehensive.

8.1 Regarding MAP: "Detection level" was proposed by one participant but not agreed to as the Committee did not fully understand the concept

8.2 Outline:

- Discussion on first paragraph and preference to remove the "management" and replace with "detection", and "requirements" to "regulations"
- Second paragraph, second line, changed "Plants, plants products and other regulated articles..." from "plants and plant products"
- Proposed the following rewrite:
"Inspection is a process that may be used for pest detection purposes and/or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations.

The standard deals with pest detection aspects of post-harvest compliance procedures by visual examination for import and export of plants, plant products and other regulated articles. It does not deal with closely related certification management systems including documentation control, testing production based surveys...

The major elements of inspection as described in this standard...".

- Removed "to" in third indent

8.4 General Requirements

- 1. Responsibility for Inspection
- Recommended rewrite to include:
“In accordance...Inspections can be performed by individuals, groups and agencies accredited by the NPPO to undertake this responsibility. These may include:

“officers of the contracting party, e.g.

employees of sub-national organizations...”
- 3. Re Inspection Parameters
- First line changed to “In...of a commodity...”.
- Third line, changed to “phytosanitary regulations (ideally derived...”.
- Fifth line, changed to “need for the detection of other unspecified pests”
- 3.1 Re Pest Detection
- Second sentence, changed to “...categorized according to the principle of *Emergency action*...”.
- Then third sentence deleted
- 3.2 Re Lot identification
- Third sentence, changed last words to “and homogeneous commodity”
- Last indent, changed to “- integrity of the lot(s)”
- 3.3 Re Sampling method
- Changed first indent to “...for a specific quarantine pest...”.
- Changed second indent to “...administratively decided”.
- 3.4 Re Inspection Outcome
- Changed second to last line: “- for import - treatment, reconfiguration if appropriate, re-export or destruction”
- Changed last line: “...treatment, reconfiguration if appropriate, rejection or diversion to another market or end-use”

8.5 Re Technical Requirements

- 1. Replaced text with the equivalent piece from the background paper
- 1.1 Second line, “arrived” replaced by “derived”
- Second paragraph delete the “correct” suggested: It was agreed that this recommendation would destroy meaning of the sentence and hence was not followed
- Questions arose concerning terminology “to be detected” in the first line, “operational purposes”, third paragraph
- 1.2 The term “sample unit” was questioned as the appropriate statistical term. Fourth line, the term “container” (is this a 40 ft container or a form of small box) should be checked
- Need to define or change the term “hitch-hiker”; term defined and added to Definitions
- 1.4 This Section needs to be redrafted to make comprehensible
- 2. This Section should be examined for too many words and simplified
- 3. Changed first line to “This standard is limited to visual inspection...”.
- Change the first paragraph by inserting: “The taking o samples for lab testing follows the same principles as for visual examination”
- Change to “pre-harvest survey”. Use:
“Inspections of growing plants or production sites may be necessary to fulfil importing country requirements”. Delete remainder
- Change re “laboratory testing” - delete the “to” at the end of the line

Conclusion

The Committee recommended that the standard be revised by the Secretariat and sent to CEPM for consideration. The standard could then be sent out for consultation later in the year.

9. PRA: *Pest Categorization* supplementary standard

In the discussions that followed, the Committee recommended the following amendments:

- 10.1 Definition of “Pest categorization” be corrected to read:
“Determination of whether a pest has the characteristics of a quarantine pest”.
- 10.2 Definition of “Pest risk assessment” corrected to read:
“Determination of whether a pest is a quarantine pest and evaluation of its introduction potential”
- 10.3 Definition of “Pest risk management” corrected to read:
“The decision-making process of reducing the risk of introduction of a quarantine pest”.
- 10.4 Discussion of the lack of the use of the term “endangered area”
- 10.5 Discussion of the need to have more explanatory information in the standard. The text should be self explanatory. Could be cross-referenced to other documents.
- 10.6 Last indent of third paragraph change to “economic impact potential...”.
- 10.7 Section 1, second indent suggested change “subspecies” to “strain or biotype”
- Accepted version:
“The taxonomic unit is generally a species but if a larger or a smaller unit is used it should have scientifically documented, stable characteristics (eg differences in virulence, potential distribution) related to quarantine status”.
- First indent - “the pest” changed to “it”
- 10.8 Section 2. Title change to “Delimitation of PRA area”. Note second indent of third paragraph to be changed also
- The PRA should be described precisely. Change Contents...
- Last suggestion - replace the second paragraph only...
“This is particularly important because it identifies the area for which information relevant to the PRA is collected”.
- 3. “Review...” deleted. Change list at beginning of General Requirements and in Table of Contents
- 3. New number 3
The Committee suggested that the notes from the Guidelines be added. Added to first sentence was: “(see geographical and regulatory criteria contained in the *Guidelines for Risk Analysis* standard)”.
- Second Indent changed to:
“...if the pest is not present or of limited distribution in the PRA area, its status can be verified by means of systems described in the standard *Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free Areas*”.
- New 4: Changed to:
“Evidence must be available to support the conclusion that the pest could become established and spread in the PRA area (see Establishment Potential and Spread Potential after Establishment in the *Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis*). Further factors to be considered include:...”.
- 6. New Section “Endangered areas”; note add to Contents and list:
“As a result of the consideration of potential for establishment and spread and of economic impact potential, all or part of the PRA area may be identified as one or more endangered areas”
- 5. Title should read “Economic Impact Potential”; see Contents and early list
- In Conclusion, change “all” to “any”

Conclusion

It was agreed that this supplementary standard could be sent out to FAO Members for consultation.

10. Other PRA supplementary standards (*Economic Impact Assessment, Assessment of Probability of Introduction and Pest Risk Management*)

Other *Pest Risk Analysis* supplementary standards were submitted to the Committee for consideration. These were: *Economic Impact Assessment, Assessment of Probability of Introduction and Pest Risk Management*. The Committee recommended them for postponement to the next CEPM for further consideration. The Committee members are to forward their comments to the IPPC Secretariat by the end of November 1995 for the Secretariat to collate for the next CEPM meeting in May 1996.

11. *Framework for an Export Certification System* standard

In the consideration of the draft of this standard, the Committee made the below recommendations:

- In "Scope" delete "the" before the "phytosanitary certificates"
- Add definitions of "NPPO" and "RPPO"
- Add footnote about definitions not yet included in the *Glossary*
- Under Outline:
- First paragraph last line delete "and be free from quarantine pests"
- Second paragraph delete "the" in the fourth line and use "verifying" and "issuing"
- For "General Requirements": delete "General" from before Requirements
- 1. Change "must" to "should"
- 2. Delete indent 5
- 3.1 Indent 1, add "other regulated articles"
- Add indent "proficiency in the identification of plants and plant products"
- Indent 3: delete "routine"
- Indent 4: change to "...related to phytosanitary certification"
- Last sentence change to "To be accredited, personnel need to be qualified and skilled..."
- Discussion of the point in brackets second to last sentence; left as is
- 3.2: Move 4.6 to become 3.2 and present 3.2 to be 3.3 etc
- Title should be "Information on importing country requirements"
- Last sentence changed to have "may" replaced by "should"
- Second sentence, change to:
"It may be useful for the exporter to obtain information on the current import requirements for the country of destination and supply it to the NPPO".
- New 3.3: Change to "The NPPO should provide the personnel involved..."
- 3.4: Change to "The NPPO should..."
- 4.1: Change "Certificate" to plural in both indents 1 and 2 and "shall" to "should" in third indent. Should use upper case in the second, indent
- Third indent change to "to the extent the NPPOs deem appropriate, ..." .
- 4.2: First line changed to:
"... a Phytosanitary Certificate for Re-Export...". and second sentence "country of origin should (not shall)..."
- 4.3: Change to "the NPPO should..."
- Three lines from end change to "consignment identification..."
- 4.4: Last indent change to "the disposal of non..."
- Second line, change "must" to "should"
- Third indent, change to "the date on which the activity..."
- Last line change to "records." (ie add "s")
- 4.5 "An NPPO..." change to "The NPPO..."
- Next to last line: "countries" change to singular "country's"
- Change to "the importing country's NPPO should be so advised" instead of "consideration..."
- First line: Change "products" to "Commodities..."
- 4.6 remove to become 3.2

- 5.1 First line “must” change to “should”
- Third paragraph change to “...non-conforming consignments the NPPO should have in place...”.
- 5.2: First indent change to “...nominated representatives of other NPPOs to discuss phytosanitary requirements”. Delete remainder
- Second indent change to “...NPPOs should make available to exporting country’s NPPOs their...”.
- Third indent change to “The NPPO should liaise with the RPPOs...in order to facilitate the harmonization of phytosanitary measures and the dissemination...”.
- Fourth indent change to “...for importing country NPPOs to report cases of non-...”.
- 6.1: Second line delete third word “to”
- 6.2: First indent change “shall” to “should” and add “a” before “system failure”
- Delete from “received from an...”. to end of sentence
- second indent change to “...and not just rectifying the situation...”.

Conclusion

The Committee recommended that the amended draft of this standard be distributed to FAO Members and RPPOs for comment.

III. OTHER MATTERS

12. Review the International Plant Protection Convention

Letters to FAO requesting consideration of the International Plant Protection Convention were noted. The IPPC Secretariat pointed out some areas of the Convention where a review was needed. It was reported that the COAG meeting in March had requested a review and asked for the costs of the exercise to be presented at the next Conference. The primary reason for the review was stated as the need to harmonize certain sections with the World Trade Organization (WTO)/GATT *Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures* (SPS) endorsed in 1994.

It was noted that Australia had identified a number of issues, but believed that a major review would not be necessary.

NAPPO agreed to distribute a document to CEPM Members which included comments on the IPPC.

The FAO Legal Council noted that the interim machinery for the IPPC Secretariat needs to be supported by the Convention. A proposal for this would have to come from an FAO Member. If important technical changes were suggested, then these would be screened by an IPPC Advisory Committee. It was indicated that there is a moral obligation on Governments to ensure that they are able to ratify the amendments. This could begin with a resolution agreed upon at Conference.

The Committee noted the following concerns with the present Convention:

- problems with current phytosanitary certificates not fulfilling their purpose. The need to bring IPPC into synchrony with the WTO/GATT SPS Agreement.
- definitions of words, concepts from SPS transparency, non-discrimination etc., may need to be modified.
- use of CEPM as the interim arrangement for the production of standards needs to be recognized.
- coordinating function of the FAO and the RPPOs is missing and would need to be addressed.
- emphasis on use of RPPOs for all tasks of the IPPC.
- dispute settlement needs to be better addressed.

The Committee also noted that the mechanism of an amended IPPC might be the same or different, although a more dynamic document is needed for norm-setting. There was need for an indication of the length of process to review the Convention: it could perhaps need an expert committee, Government consultation, and two rounds of country consultation.

It was agreed that FAO would contact Members to ask for comments and RPPOs would be asked to bring their comments to the Technical Consultation in September 1995 in Noumea, New Caledonia. If possible, the IPPC Secretariat will collate comments sent to FAO by Members for presentation at the Noumea meeting.

13. Priority of future work

It was noted that the *Inspection Methodology* standard should go out for consultation in spite of some difficulties with terms and the sampling methodology. The IPPC Secretariat would revise the document and send it out to the CEPM and then on to Consultation by FAO Members.

Suggestions for a further Glossary Working Group meeting and the construction of operational specific standards were discussed and supported by the Committee. Other suggested topics for standards and support material to be produced included:

- Growing season inspection (ie premise inspection)
- Eradication
- Notification of interception (ie non-compliance reporting) and measures on interception
- Listing of quarantine pests
- Document checks
- Post-entry quarantine
- Inspector accreditation
- A specific PFA: eg fruit fly, citrus canker, and potato cyst nematode
- Pre-clearance procedures
- extra sampling standard
- PRA information material
- PRA manual.

It was suggested that the Committee look at what standards were needed in a broader sense, and identify those activities that are really required rather than prepare an *ad hoc* list.

It was proposed that the IPPC Secretariat devise a project plan or hierarchy for the development of standards or that a Working Group do this. The Secretariat offered to draft a framework for standards and to note the positioning of present and priority standards and to send this to RPPOs for consultation at the next Technical Consultation. RPPOs were asked to present any standards available at the next Technical Consultation that could be considered for modification into ISPMs.

Priority work areas were suggested as being:

- *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*
- Clarification of Outline of Standards
- Growing season inspection
- Eradication.

It was recommended by the Committee that the revised *Glossary* to be published include terms in present standards and not include terms from the Code and the PRA standards presently being considered by the FAO Governing Bodies.

14. Close of the meeting

The meeting was closed by Dr Zehni thanking all participants for their contributions.

GUIDELINES FOR PEST RISK ANALYSIS

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Section	Comment/Proposal	Proposed by:
General	The procedure for the determination of a quarantine organism. This should only take place after the analysis and formulation of possible management options.	Netherlands
	The national delegation of COAG should be instructed by their authorities to defend the regional phytosanitary interests.	COSAVE
	The above national delegations, if appropriate, to participate in the next FAO programme and budget exercise, insisting on the necessity to fill the vacancy post of the Regional Plant Protection Officer in Santiago, Chile.	COSAVE
Figures	The figures are not in accordance with the text. This problem can be solved by deleting them.	Netherlands
	A revised and simplified figure proposed.	Germany

Section	Comment/Proposal	Proposed by:
<p data-bbox="259 269 555 336">STAGE3: PEST RISK MANAGEMENT</p> <p data-bbox="259 379 383 408">Section 3</p>	<p data-bbox="618 379 1570 560">The definitions of “introduction” and “introduction potential” should both be deleted. These are out of line with normal usage of the terms and may lead to confusion. Recommended that the terms “Entry”, “Establishment”, “Entry potential” are used instead throughout the document wherever appropriate.</p> <p data-bbox="618 603 1585 855">In spite of various concepts/terminology used, the document presented to COAG is still ambiguous. The concept “protected zone” is not included in the document. “Major or important pests” are not considered and “potential economic importance” is not defined clearly. Therefore, the approval of the standards in the present form would cause serious inconveniences and disputes (N.B.: COSAVE as well as MERCOSUR have included the above concepts in their regional standards)</p>	<p data-bbox="1626 379 1839 408">United kingdom</p> <p data-bbox="1626 603 1980 703">COSAVE (9th meeting held in Montevideo, Uruguay in March 1995</p>

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE IMPORT AND RELEASE OF EXOTIC BIOLOGICAL CONTROL AGENTS

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

Section	Comment / Proposal	Proposed by:
General Comments	<p>Code needs considerable revision</p> <p>COAG should recommend further review of the Code by the CEPM and by the RPPOs</p> <p>Refer the draft Code to the 1995 FAO Conference for endorsement as originally scheduled</p> <p>Resubmit the Code to COAG in 1997</p> <p>The word “Acceptance” of the Code by FAO Members be changed to “endorsement by member countries”</p>	<p>USA - Australia</p> <p>USA - Australia</p> <p>Australia</p> <p>USA</p> <p>Thailand</p>
Definitions and abbreviations	<p>The definition of “inundative release” should be amended as “The release of overwhelming <u>numbers of</u> mass-produced biological control agents”</p> <p>The term “predator” must be defined to preclude use for phytophagous agents (i.e., herbivores). Thus, the word <u>carnivorous</u> could be inserted in front of “natural enemy” or the word <u>animal</u> could be inserted in front of “organisms”.</p>	<p>USA</p> <p>USA</p>

Section	Comment / Proposal	Proposed by:
<p>The authority of an importing country</p> <p>Section 3.1.5 and 6.1.1.</p>	<p>It is unclear whether an importing country could judge itself whether it is necessary to involve quarantine facilities. In any case, a systematic requirement for plant protection products containing micro-organisms to pass through a quarantine facility when imported would not be appropriate. Once a plant protection product has been authorized – which implies that a judgement has been made on its acceptability – it should not subject any more to a systematic quarantine inspection unless there are serious grounds for such a procedure.</p>	<p>European Union</p>
<p>The authority of an exporting country</p> <p>Section 3.2</p>	<p>Deletion of section 3.2. The contents of the section are largely unrealistic and impractical. It might impose considerable monetary burden on the exporting country.</p>	<p>USA - Canada</p>
<p>Responsibilities of importer prior to import</p> <p>Section 4.1.1 to 4.1.3</p> <p>Section 4.5</p>	<p>The information on the pest to be controlled is very extensive and is not required in the case of application for an authorization of <u>chemical</u> plant protection products. It is not evident why biological control agents should be dealt with stricter. If this information is necessary it should be required only at the first importation.</p> <p>The meaning of the last sentence is unclear and the necessity to maintain it is questionable. At least in the E.U. legislation separate testing is required on the organism and on the preparation containing the organism; there is not necessarily separate testing for any additive used in the formulation.</p>	<p>European Union</p> <p>European Union</p>
<p>Responsibilities of authorities upon import</p> <p>Section 6.1.1</p>	<p>Better wording is needed. The term “formalities” implies political aspect or Government bureaucracy. A more reasonable word is “requirements”</p>	<p>USA</p>

Section	Comment / Proposal	Proposed by:
<p>Responsibilities of importer after import and release</p> <p>Section 8.1.1</p> <p>Section 8.1.5</p>	<p>It is acceptable that persons involved in distribution of biological control agents are trained adequately; this requirement should however not lead to a situation where biological control agents are submitted to stricter rules than <u>chemical</u> plant protection products.</p> <p>Add the following point to the section 8.1.5. Importers of biopesticides would need to seek authorization of their biological control agents as pesticides as well as providing the required data to the relevant authority before they could be used. If any biological control agent was genetically modified there would also be further assessments required, before its release, to those mentioned in the Code.</p>	<p>European Union</p> <p>United Kingdom</p>

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF PEST-FREE AREAS

SUMMARY OF GENERAL COMMENTS

N°	COMMENT- PROPOSAL	PROPOSED BY:	IPPC SECRETARIAT'S REMARKS
1.	The proposed standard is structured in a way that does not reflect the priority consideration for establishment of a PFA. Reasons: Strength of measures taken in relation to a PFA should depend on pest risk assessment. The current document makes practically no mention of criteria for the strength of these measures.	EPPO	No comment
2.	Proposed standard is relatively inflexible in its assignment of PFAs to types and in the specification of the requirements for these types. Reason: Requirements for PFAs can be considered generally. Specific requirements for each type can be derived from the General ones.	EPPO, Netherlands	No comment
3.	Requirements should be classified by their purpose, not their nature. Reason: More meaningful.	EPPO	No comment
4.	Proposed standard should address import, as well as export. Reason: Establishment of PFAs in exporting country can be based on identical considerations to their establishment in an importing country to justify import phytosanitary regulations.	EPPO, Netherlands	Disagrees. Requires further consideration to use PFA to justify import requirements
5.	It should be mandatory to inform about pest outbreaks of the concerned pest(s) in the PFA area. IPPC may revoke the PFA status on non-compliance	Grenada	Disagrees: The IPPC Secretariat can not impose penalties as suggested. This may be handled by the GATT, under their SPS Agreement.
6.	Considerable concern was expressed with perceived difficulties of implementation in developing countries.	South Africa, Zaire and Korea, Rep. of	No comment

**SECOND MEETING OF THE
COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

Rome, Italy : 15-19 May 1995

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Opening of Session
2. Welcome Address: Dr. A. Sawadogo, Assistant Director-General, AG
Dr. NA Van der Graaff, Chief, AGPP
3. Election of Chairman
4. Adoption of the Agenda
5. Review of draft standard: Guidelines for Pest Risk Analysis, as requested by
COAG *COAG document provided*
6. Review of draft standard: Code of Conduct for the Import and Release of
Exotic Biological Control Agents : Technical Guidelines, as requested by
COAG *COAG document provided*
7. Consideration of draft standard: Guidelines for Survey and Monitoring
Systems
8. Review of draft standard: Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free
Areas, as requested by COAG
9. Consideration of draft standard: Inspection Methodology
10. Consideration of draft standard: PRA, Pest Categorization.
11. Consideration of draft standard: PRA, Economic Impact Assessment
12. Consideration of draft standard: PRA Probability of Pest Introduction
13. Consideration of draft standard: PRA Pest Management
14. Consideration of draft standard: Framework for an Export Certification
System
15. Revision of the International Plant Protection Convention
16. Priorities for the development of standards
17. Other business
18. Closure

COMMITTEE OF EXPERTS ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

List of Participants

Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)

Songlin LIU

Director-General
General Station of Plant Protection
Ministry Of Agriculture
No 11 Nong Than Guan Nan Li
Chao Yang District 100026
Beijing China

Telephone 86 10 500 3366 Ext. 4040
Fax: 86 105002448, 5025146

Richard J. IVESS

Chief Plants Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
P. O. Box 2526
Wellington New Zealand

Telephone: 64 4 474 4100
Fax: 64 4 474 4240
E-mail:

IVESSR@POLRA.MQM.GOV.NZ

Comité Regional de Sanidad Vegetal para el Cono Sur (COSAVE)

Felipe CANALE

Plant Health Director
Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca
Servicio de Protección Agrícola
Avenida Millán 4703
Montevideo

Uruguay

Telephone: 598-2-398.720
Fax: 598-2-396.508

Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)**L.W. SMALL**

Deputy Chief Agricultural Officer
 (Crops, Research & Development)
 Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
 Graeme Hall
 Christ Church

Barbados

Telephone

809 428 4150

Fax:

8W42Q 8444

E-mail:

SMALL.W@COL.BARBET.NET

European and Medit Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)**I.M. SMITH**

Director General
 European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization
 1, rue Le Notre
 75016 Paris

France

Telephone

33 1 45 20 77 94

Fax:

33 1 42 24 89 43

J. RAUTAPÄÄ

Head of Plant Protection Service
 Plant Production Inspection Centre
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 Vilhonvuorenkatu 11 C
 Box 42
 SF-00501 Helsinki

Finland

Telephone:

358 0 134 21 402

Fax:

3580 134 21 499

Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)

Gias M. LALLMAHOMED
 Principal Agricultural Officer
 Agricultural Services (Plant Protection)
 Ministry of Agriculture & Natural Resources
 Réduit

Mauritius

Telephone:

230 464 5365

Fax:

2304647330

Junta del Acuerdo de Cartagena (JUNAC)

César A. WANDEMBERG
 Funcionario Internacional
 Sistema Andino de Sanidad Agropecuario
 Junta del Acuerdo de Cartagena
 Paseo de la República 3895
 Lima 27

Perú

Tel

0051 41 414 212

Fax:

0051 41 420 911

E-Mail:

SANIDAD@JUNDA.ORG.PE.LIMA

North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)

Bruce E. HOPPER
 Executive Secretary
 North American Plant Protection Organization
 C/o Plant Protection Division
 59 Camelot Drive
 Nepean Ontario K1A 0Y9

Canada

Telephone:

613 952 8000 Ext. 4321

Fax:

613 990.5136

E-Mail:

BHOPPER@EM.AGR.CA

Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)**George H. BERG**

Technical Adviser in Plant Quarantine/Plant Protection
 Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria
 Aptdo. Postal (01)61
 San Salvador

El Salvador

Telephone:

503 223-239 or 223 8934

Fax:

503 298 2119

Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO)**Semisi PONE**

Plant Protection Advisor
 South Pacific Commission
 Private Mail Bag
 Suva

Fiji

Telephone:

679 370 733

Fax:

679 370 021

European Community (EC)**Marc VEREECKE**

Principal Administrator
 European Commission
 Rue de La Loi 200
 B-1049 Bruxelles

Belgium

Telephone:

322 296 32 60

Fax:

32 2 296 93 99

Japan**Hiroshi AKIYAMA**

Deputy Director
 Plant Protection Division
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
 1 Kasumigaseki Chiyoda-ku
 Tokyo

Japan

Telephone:

81 3 3501 3964

Fax:

81 3 3591 6640

Morocco**Ahmed DLIOU**

Chef de service de la Protection des végétaux

Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Mise en

Valeur Agricole

Service de la Protection des végétaux

Marrakech Ménara

Morocco

Telephone:

212 4 44 78 21

Fax:

212 4 44 78 20

IPPC Secretariat**N.A. VAN DER GRAAFF**

Secretary IPPC Secretariat

Chief, Plant Protection Service

Plant Production & Protection Division

John HEDLEY

Coordinator

Plant Protection Service

Plant Production & Protection Division

Ms I. de BORHEGYI

Information Officer (Plant Protection)

Plant Protection Service

Plant Production & Protection Division