



*REPORT*

Island of Åland,  
Finland  
27-31 May 2013

# **Expert Working Group on International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment May 2013**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

**CONTENTS**

1. Opening of the Meeting .....3  
2. Administrative Matters .....3  
3. Review of Specification 48.....3  
4. Development of draft ISPM .....4  
5. Next Steps.....9  
6. Other business.....9  
7. Close of the meeting .....9

**APPENDIXES**

APPENDIX 1: Agenda.....11  
APPENDIX 2: Documents list .....13  
APPENDIX 3: Participants list .....14

## 1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] The meeting was called to order and it was noted that Mr Mlungisi Nyangane Edmund TSHABALALA and Mr Ilaisa Iranavuna DAKAICA were unable to attend due to visa issues.

### 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [2] The Secretariat opened the meeting, welcomed the experts and introduced the host, Mr Ralf LOPIAN.

### 1.2 Opening of meeting by host

- [3] Mr Ralf LOPIAN welcomed the participants of the Expert Working Group (EWG) to Finland and in particular to the unique region of Åland. Mr LOPIAN gave greetings from the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Department of Food and Health and noted that the Ministry would offer an excursion and meal on Wednesday.

### 1.3 Introductions

- [4] The participants introduced themselves and indicated the particular expertise that they brought to the EWG. Collectively they present a wide range of expertise related to the international movement of used equipment and machinery from practical oversight of inspections and conducting pest risk analysis through to policy making and setting regulations. Some participants had experience with used equipment for both plant and animal health. In addition, the participants had many years working in the area of plant health.

### 1.4 Roles of the Participants

- [5] The IPPC Secretariat reviewed the responsibilities of the various roles of the participants, reminding the experts that they were not representatives for their country or region but were selected in their individual capacity as experts and that the main purpose of the EWG was to develop a globally acceptable International Standard on Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) that was in line with the specification for the topic<sup>1</sup>.

### 1.5 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur

- [6] Mr Ralf LOPIAN was selected as the Chairperson and Ms Melanie NEWFIELD was selected as the Rapporteur.

### 1.6 Adoption of the Agenda

- [7] The Agenda was adopted as presented in Appendix 1.

## 2. Administrative Matters

- [8] The Secretariat reviewed the Documents List which is attached in Appendix 2. The Participants List was circulated and updated by participants; it is attached in Appendix 3. The host reviewed the Local Information document and further described some details of local arrangements.

## 3. Review of Specification 48

- [9] The Steward reviewed the Specification 48: *International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment* (2006-004)<sup>2</sup>, noting that the importance of topic had originally been identified at a regional

---

<sup>1</sup> Specification 48. 2009. *International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*. Rome, IPPC, FAO: <https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-48-international-movement-used-vehicles-machinery-and-equipment>

<sup>2</sup> Specification 48: <https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-48-international-movement-used-vehicles-machinery-and-equipment>

workshop in the Pacific. He briefly outlined each task and what he hoped would be the output. One expert asked if the EWG should develop also a guidance document, other than the standard. The Secretariat explained that according to the specification, the EWG should identify implementation issues and report on these to the Standards Committee (SC).

- [10] There was some discussion on whether or not the EWG should address issues of concern to the World Animal Health Organization (OIE), the World Health Organization (WHO) or the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) that were not directly covered by the specification, such as animal and human health. It was decided that these issues were not the main purpose of the standard. However, being of concern to contracting parties, the EWG concluded that if used vehicles, machinery and equipment (hereafter “used equipment”) is clean, these issues may be addressed indirectly by the standard and that this fact should be pointed out when the draft ISPM goes for member consultation. One expert felt that it would be important to discuss the specific challenges that small island nations were facing in regards to used equipment because of increased commerce (e.g. mining and tourism) and of used equipment arriving in ports, where there are limited facilities to handle this increased volume.

#### **4. Development of draft ISPM**

- [11] The EWG decided to review the discussion papers, note items for further discussion and make an outline of items that they agreed needed to be covered by the draft ISPM.

##### **4.1 Discussion papers**

- [12] Discussion papers were presented.

##### **4.2 Outline of points for draft**

- [13] The EWG decided that the points noted during the presentations of the discussion papers should each form a section of the draft ISPM. Participants felt that some background information should also be provided. The following sections were identified to be covered under the heading *Requirements*: objective, phytosanitary risks, phytosanitary measures, non-compliance, and emergency actions (with appropriate subsections). In addition, it was decided to create an annex for an IPPC code of conduct for the military and an appendix on risk categorization and measures for used vehicles, machinery and equipment.

##### **4.3 Develop text for draft ISPM**

###### *Scope*

- [14] It was decided that information should be provided on pest risks and phytosanitary measures for categories that present a lower pest risk, such as deep-mining machinery, used cars, rimless tires and reconditioned parts, but that this should be outside the scope of the standard. The group debated whether to cover conveyances but felt this would widen the scope too much. In addition, because used vehicles that are not traded (e.g. driven vehicles) present a completely different type of pest risk it was decided to also exclude these from the scope and focus on used equipment that are traded as a commodity. Equipment used for contract harvesting was discussed and it was agreed that these articles pose a high pest risk and should be covered in the standard. The problems faced in gaining access to inspect military equipment were discussed and it was decided that while these articles also present a high pest risk and should be covered by the standard, they may need a different approach.

###### *General points of discussion*

- [15] After reviewing all the discussion papers, the EWG agreed that setting a standard for the international movement of used equipment was a complex issue but it should be tackled in as simple a manner as possible because many different stakeholders are involved and good compliance should be rewarded.
- [16] The EWG agreed to try to focus on used equipment that could be contaminated with soil.

- [17] To be able to explain the importance of this standard it was decided to make a list of examples of pests that had been moved by used equipment. New Zealand had done a complete study on the pest risks associated with used equipment, which identified several taxonomic groups. The group reviewed this study, which presented a summary of 10 to 15 years interception data. This gave a good understanding of the pest risks and which interceptions were consistent and which were rare, and the EWG made of list of examples of pests associated with the movement of used equipment to be inserted in the *Background* section.
- [18] It was agreed that the responsibility of compliance remained with the importer and this was emphasized through the draft ISPM.
- [19] The EWG discussed if a definition was needed for the word “clean” but decided common usage would suffice although a description of what was meant by “clean” in relation to used equipment was felt to be useful. The EWG also contemplated describing what “used” meant, but decided to provide some information in an appendix and to also include here some information on “reconditioned” or “field tested equipment”.
- [20] It was suggested to add a general statement explaining that national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) can accredit listed facilities and individuals, but it was noted that in some cases, this may be delegated by the NPPO to a third party so this statement was adjusted to use the word “entity” to make it more inclusive, allowing both NPPOs and companies to do this.
- [21] Some experts thought an additional declaration should be required on the phytosanitary certificate, so that NPPOs would be notified in order to do inspections upon arrival. This was not agreed to because some countries do not require a phytosanitary certificate (pest risk does not justify it) and others, under their national legislation, may not be able to issue a phytosanitary certificate for used equipment.
- [22] The EWG considered how to achieve a balance between an elaborate standard that covered everything and a simpler one that was more easily understood. The EWG decided that used equipment that present higher pest risks would be identified and included in the draft standard and that used equipment that present lower pest risk, which would not be covered in this standard, but be described in an appendix to be considered at a national level and regulated if justified by a pest risk analysis. It was decided that this appendix should comprise a list of all types of used equipment divided into groups of different pest risk categories (with only some being covered by the draft standard).

### **Records**

- [23] The EWG discussed whether maintenance of records needed specific mention. However, it was decided that a note on general record keeping would suffice.

### **Pest risks**

- [24] Pest risk from the introduction of opportunistic pests was discussed and the group decided that instead of using the term “opportunistic pest” it would be better to describe the risks associated with used equipment as contaminants.
- [25] It was noted that pest risks are also related to where used equipment is stored before shipment as well as the traits associated with the life stages of the organisms, and the EWG found that resistant or dormant life stages could allow pests to be more easily transported.
- [26] The issue of using the terms “moving used equipment internationally” or “temporarily relocated” was discussed. It was decided that it could be misleading to use the word “temporarily” because it could be a regular movement, such as the short-term movement of equipment (e.g. custom harvesters). The EWG decided to add some text to the *Background* on operational relocation and provide some examples.
- [27] Experts felt that weeds presented a significant pest risk in this standard but agreed to refer to them as invasive alien species to help emphasize that biodiversity concerns were also being addressed.

- [28] It was also agreed to refer to “endangered areas” when talking about plants and use “new areas” when talking about animal (OIE) or human (WHO) health issues.
- [29] Agricultural machinery was identified as one of the hardest types of used equipment to manage because it consistently turns up contaminated and because both exporters and importers lack awareness of phytosanitary import requirements because they infrequently ship this kind of equipment. Agricultural, silvicultural and horticultural consignments were identified to present the highest pest risks.
- [30] It was noted that there were many places on used equipment where pests could be found. Grills, under windscreen wipers, empty water reservoirs, debris traps, weld plates and hoppers all provide habitats for pests.
- [31] In regards to earth moving equipment, the EWG debated if they presented high or medium pest risk. It was agreed that the pest risk level was more variable and that, on average, it would be of lower pest risk than for agricultural equipment although there was a wider range of pest risks associated with this type of equipment. Prior use and intended use play a larger factor when determining the level of pest risk. For example, if the equipment is used to dig ditches on farms and is then moved to dig ditches on another farm it presents a high pest risk and much higher than the one equipment used to build city streets being moved to dig ditches on a farm does. It was decided that this issue is more related to industrial use and should be separated based on whether the use was inside (such as forklifts and warehouse equipment) or outside (digging ditches) rather than rural versus urban use. It was decided this draft standard would exclude all equipment that was used entirely indoors because pest risk would be rare.
- [32] It was decided to have a separate category for waste management equipment as there are specific pest risks associated with waste.
- [33] Deep-mining equipment generally presented a lower pest risk, but sometimes, if the equipment was stored before being shipped, it could be exposed to contamination that was not related to its use. Also it would be difficult to determine what the prior use had been.
- [34] Some specific examples of pests and how they were associated with used equipment were discussed in detail. It was noted that much is known about the specific pest risks of many species associated with used equipment. However, in this standard, which needs to apply more generically, general guidance on points to consider when determining pest risk should be given (e.g. considering life stages that could be transported (egg masses, cocoons and other dormant stages); where pests may be found (soil, water, in plant debris); other factors such as food scraps in used cars that may attract pests).
- [35] The pest risks of military equipment were discussed and it was agreed that the fact the equipment was military had no impact on the pest risk it presented, so the determination of pest risk would follow the normal process for used equipment.

### ***Pest risk management***

- [36] Pest risk management options that could be applied to mitigate the different levels of pest risk associated with used equipment were discussed.
- [37] It was agreed that it is easier to manage pest risks before import. The EWG discussed if pest risk management options before export should be the only ones considered but decided to describe options before import to consider treatments done in transit. It was also noted that some countries may have cleaning done at offshore facilities. It was agreed that the draft ISPM should strongly encourage that phytosanitary treatments, if required and justified, take place before import, where pest risks are easier to mitigate. It was also noted that in cases where the pest risk is managed before export, the NPPO of the importing country does not have jurisdiction over the exporter and this could create some challenges require good cooperation between the NPPOs of the importing and exporting countries.

- [38] It was stressed that it would be the importer's responsibility to provide prior notification and make a declaration to the NPPO of the importing country. This notification is often supported by documents supplied by the exporter, and was deemed to be very important.
- [39] In the discussions on the requirements for facilities involved in preparing consignments for export, it was agreed that the surfaces where the used equipment was stored or handled should help reduce the risk of contamination and it was decided that the surface should be sealed.
- [40] It was agreed that equipment used for contract harvesting posed unique considerations because it was normally moved between countries without a change in ownership. It was agreed that this type of equipment posed a high pest risk and should be categorized together with agricultural equipment.
- [41] The need to use import permits was discussed. It was noted that Australia uses a three-year import permit that is obtained from the NPPO by importers. This import permit gives guidance to importers and outlines what their responsibilities are when importing high pest risk consignments. EWG members discussed the use of import permits and whether it should be included in this standard. Some thought import permits would be useful to help notify importers and exporters of requirements but the EWG decided not to include this because another standard on this topic was under already under development and the use of import permits would be generally addressed in that standard.
- [42] Tyres, especially oversized tyres, also present a higher pest risk, specifically because of mosquitoes that carry human diseases. For this group, the phytosanitary measures would have to be stronger to manage the risks.
- [43] There was a discussion on the accreditation of cleaning facilities. This would mainly apply to NPPOs of exporting countries but in some cases NPPOs of importing countries may want to only allow import from accredited cleaning facilities in the exporting country. In the latter case, it was felt that NPPOs of the exporting countries should accredit the cleaning facilities and the importing country could verify compliance through import inspections at a reduced frequency. It was agreed to add text in the draft ISPM to reflect this.
- [44] Much of the success in obtaining a high level of implementation from this standard depends on the knowledge of importers and exporters, and the EWG highlighted the need for NPPOs to be involved with awareness raising. It was discussed if this needed to be added to the draft ISPM but it was felt that this was applicable to the implementation of many standards and did not specifically apply to this standard, so no additional text was inserted.
- [45] It was agreed that used cars and trucks did not present a high pest risk and also that the pest risk that different cars present when shipped from a country in one continent to a country in another continent vary greatly compared to cars shipped between neighboring countries. It was also noted that deep-mining equipment posed a lower pest risk.
- [46] It was acknowledged that the pest risk management options for military equipment were often limited. In some countries, NPPO inspectors do not have rights to enter military bases. The military often move large volumes of containers and the costs for checking and cleaning them could be huge. Dialogue between the NPPO and the military is very important and most of the time it follows a very hierarchical approach with the main focal point for communication being the officer-in-charge.
- [47] The EWG developed a code of conduct for military operations when deploying and retracting equipment which provides guidance and offers assistance to NPPOs if pests are intercepted. There was discussion on how detailed this code should be, e.g. if military equipment should also include helicopters transported on trucks, tactical equipment, boots, tools and packs, but it was decided to leave out any specific reference and let the NPPO decide.
- [48] The EWG proposed that NPPOs encourage their military to follow this code of conduct for the international movement of used military vehicles, machinery and equipment as presented in Annex 1 to the draft standard. This code of conduct should help make the military aware of possible risks and

encourage them to take responsibility for ensuring all of their used equipment is cleaned and checked before it is moved.

### ***Pest risk categorization***

- [49] Two main groups of used equipment were identified: (i) a higher pest risk category, which is covered in this standard (Appendix 1, Table 1), and (ii) a lower pest risk category, which is not directly covered by the standard (Appendix 1, Table B).
- [50] Specific guidance is given in Appendix 1 which further categorizes used vehicles, machinery and equipment into High, Medium to high, Medium, Low and Insignificant categories.
- [51] A specific reference to bulldozers was considered but not retained because it was considered too specific, as bulldozers are covered under earth moving equipment.

### ***Phytosanitary measures***

- [52] The phytosanitary measures described in this draft standard should be consistent with other standards. Some possible measures will be excluded since the EWG decided to focus only on addressing used equipment that presented a higher pest risk. Some text was added to the draft ISPM to explain how other types of used equipment, that present lower pest risk, may also have variable risk and that these may still be managed by the NPPO, although this would be subject to further technical justification.

### ***Facilities and waste disposal***

- [53] There was a lengthy discussion on the type of equipment and nature of the facilities that were needed for cleaning and waste disposal. It was agreed that the requirements would vary depending on the pest risk (e.g. where cleaning was done before export, in transit or upon arrival). Reference was made to the ISO 17020 (Inspection Management) standard and it was agreed that it would be a useful reference for NPPOs. The EWG decided to list some requirements for facilities in regards to checking and treating consignments and to provide more elaborate details for facilities at import, where the pest risks are higher, including a sealed wash pad and closed drainage system. It was also agreed to provide a few sentences to remind facilities to dispose of waste (e.g. waste water) in accordance with national or local regulations to help reduce environmental impacts.
- [54] Heat treatment facilities are often used to decontaminate consignments and it was noted that, in some cases, mostly in cold countries, a cold treatment might be sufficient so no special facilities may be needed.

### ***Verification***

- [55] The exporting NPPO is only involved in ensuring that used equipment is clean when a phytosanitary certificate is requested by the NPPO of the importing country. The EWG decided that since the standard did not promote the use of phytosanitary certificates the verification process related to phytosanitary certificates could be omitted.
- [56] It was agreed that when the NPPO of the exporting country did not issue a phytosanitary certificate, it would have no role in the verification that the used equipment was clean. It was also agreed that the NPPO of the exporting country would only be involved when there is a higher pest risk (that is technically justified) and when a phytosanitary certificate is required by the NPPO of the importing country. It was also felt that it was rare that the NPPO would do the cleaning itself but that it rather would order it be done and verify that cleaning was done appropriately, however, it was noted that this varied and in some countries NPPOs are very hands-on and would do the cleaning themselves.
- [57] The NPPO of the exporting country may also be involved in the verification process when the NPPO of the importing country requests the facilities be accredited, and this would be done through the cooperation of both the importing and exporting NPPOs.



- [58] It was decided that ultimately the importer was responsible and would have a contractual arrangement with the exporter to ensure that the used equipment was clean.

### ***Implementation issues***

- [59] The EWG considered the future implementation of the standard by contracting parties and identified potential operational and technical implementation issues. The following issues and possible recommendations are presented to the SC for their consideration.

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
Military not aware of the risks of moving used vehicles, machinery and equipment.	ISPM must be promoted actively to the military. Recommend the SC ask the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) to promote active consultations with international military organizations and encourage contracting parties to contact national military forces to apply the code of conduct.
Industry is not aware of the risks of moving used vehicles, machinery and equipment.	Request the SC consider how awareness raising material can be developed and distributed.
Lack of appropriate cleaning facilities in importing countries; no soil traps or waste water management to prevent the escape of pests while cleaning.	Encourage cleaning in exporting countries, where such facilities are not necessary.
Lack of trained staff to do inspections and consequent lack of awareness of what to look for.	Training materials need to be developed.
A lack of licensed fumigators.	No recommendation presented.
NPPOs often have little or no experience in setting up accreditation systems and auditing.	No recommendation presented.

## **4.4 Agreement on draft**

- [60] The EWG reviewed and revised the complete draft ISPM and agreed that the text developed was complete and asked the Secretariat to process the draft ISPM and submit it to the SC.

## **5. Next Steps**

- [61] The Secretariat informed the group that the text would firstly be edited by the Secretariat and secondly by a scientific editor. The Secretariat or Steward would try to resolve any issues that were identified, however, in some cases more important issues might be identified that warrant discussions between the EWG members via electronic means.

## **6. Other business**

- [62] No other business was identified.

## **7. Close of the meeting**

- [63] The Chairperson thanked the participants for their preparation, for the informed discussions and for the congenial atmosphere that was created. He felt that everyone contributed and he appreciated the extra work done during the evenings where participants had drafted assigned text. He also thanked the Rapporteur for her efforts and the Secretariat for their work in preparing for the meeting and providing guidance on the standard setting process. As he was also the host, he hoped everyone had enjoyed their stay.

### **7.1 Adoption of the report**

- [64] The Secretariat noted that several meetings were running over the next month and the report would therefore not be finalized immediately. Once the report is drafted, it will be submitted to the Rapporteur for clearance and, following, circulated to the EWG for comments. Once finalized, it will be posted on the IPP and presented to the SC along with the draft ISPM.

## 7.2 Close

- [65] The Steward thanked the Chairperson for his excellent job in guiding the EWG in their discussions, which enabled them to agree on the text for the draft ISPM.
- [66] The Secretariat thanked the host for the wonderful location and the smooth logistical arrangements and expressed, on behalf of all the participants, high appreciation for the hospitality of the people of Åland and the Finish cultural experiences, including the midnight sun. He thanked the Government of Finland, in particular the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland, for the excursion and meal they hosted.

**APPENDIX 1: Agenda**

**EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING**  
**International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment**

**AGENDA**

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	--	LARSON
1.2 Opening of meeting by host	--	LOPIAN
1.3 Introductions	--	LARSON
1.4 Roles of the Participants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IPPC Secretariat</li> <li>• Steward</li> <li>• Host Country/Organization</li> <li>• Rapporteur</li> <li>• Chair</li> <li>• Experts</li> </ul>		LARSON
1.5 Selection of the Chair and Rapporteur	--	
1.6 Adoption of the Agenda	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_01	CHAIR
<b>2. Administrative Matters</b>		
2.1 Documents List	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_02	CHAIR
2.2 Participants List	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_03	CHAIR
2.3 Local Information	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_04	CHAIR
<b>3. Review of Specification</b>	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_05	CHAIR
<b>4. Development of draft ISPM</b>		
4.1 Discussion papers	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_06	BROADLEY
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_07	NEWFIELD
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_08	MOREIRA PALMA
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_09	STEVENS
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_10	STEVENS
	WGUsedEquip_2013_May_11	TSHABALALA
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_12	LOPIAN
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_13	LEE
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_14	LEE
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_15	LEE
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_16	LEE
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_17	LEE
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_18	LARSON

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
	EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_19	DAKAICA
4.2 Outline of points for draft		
4.3 Develop text for draft		
4.4 Agreement on draft		
<b>5. Next Steps</b>		
• Work plan if needed		
<b>6. Other business</b>		
<b>7. Close of the meeting</b>		
7.1 Adoption of the report		CHAIR
7.2 Close		CHAIR

**APPENDIX 2: Documents list**

**EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING**  
**International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment**

**Documents List**

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED</b>
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_01	1.6	Draft Agenda	2013-04-03
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_02	2.1	Documents List	2013-04-03
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_03	2.2	Participants List	2013-04-03
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_04	2.3	Local Information	2013-04-03
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_05	3	Specification 48 - International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment	2013-04-03
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_06	4.1	Discussion Paper (Adam BROADLEY)	2013-04-30
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_07	4.1	Discussion Paper (Melanie NEWFIELD)	2013-04-30
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_08	4.1	Brazilian comments on Specification 48	2013-05-07
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_09	4.1	Discussion Paper (Tim STEVENS) - <i>Military Vehicles and Equipment</i>	2013-05-23
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_10	4.1	Discussion Paper (Tim STEVENS) - <i>Transport Modes</i>	2013-05-23
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_11	4.1	Discussion Paper (Mlungisi TSHABALALA)	2013-05-23
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_12	4.1	Discussion Paper (Ralf LOPIAN)	2013-05-23
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_13	4.1	Discussion Paper (Jae-Seung LEE)	2013-05-27
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_14	4.1	Report of the Workshop on the Review of Draft Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures	2013-05-27
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_15	4.1	Regional Standards on Minimizing pest movement by machinery	2013-05-27
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_16	4.1	Draft Standard on Minimizing pest movement by sea containers (draft 4)	2013-05-27
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_17	4.1	CPM-8_2013_CRP_28_SeaContainers	2013-05-27
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_18	4.1	CPM-8_2013_CRP_06_EveningSession_SeaContainers	2013-05-27
EWGUsedEquip_2013_May_19	4.1	Points to consider for tasks on specification 48 ( <i>International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment</i> (2006-004)), (Ilaisa DAKAICA)	2013-05-27

**APPENDIX 3: Participants list**

**Meeting of the expert working group  
International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment**

**Participants List**

*A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting. Members unable to attend are listed at the end.*

	<b>Participant role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>
✓	Steward	<b>Mr Ngatoko NGATOKO</b> Director Biosecurity Service, Ministry of Agriculture P.O.Box 96, Rarotonga <b>COOK ISLANDS</b> Phone: +682 28 711	<a href="mailto:nngatoko@agriculture.gov.ck">nngatoko@agriculture.gov.ck</a> ;
✓	Member	<b>Mr Adam BROADLEY</b> Assistant Director, Operational Science Program, Department of Agriculture PO Box 1006, Tullamarine, Victoria, 3043, <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Phone: +61 3 8318 6994 Mobile: +61 408 016 556	<a href="mailto:adam.broadley@daff.gov.au">adam.broadley@daff.gov.au</a> ;
✓	Member	<b>Mr Jae-Seung LEE</b> Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency (QIA), Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (MAFRA), Assistant Director, Gwangyang Office, 812 Doi-dong, Gwangyang-si, Jeollanam-do, <b>KOREA, REPUBLIC OF</b> Mobile: +82-10 7200 0555	<a href="mailto:yjaes3@korea.kr">yjaes3@korea.kr</a> ;
✓	Member and Host	<b>Mr Ralf Lothar LOPIAN</b> Senior Advisor, International Affairs Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry of Finland, Food Department/Animal and Plant Health Unit, Mariankatu 23, Helsinki <b>FINLAND</b> Telephone:+358 40 5965698 Fax:+358 9 16052443	<a href="mailto:ralf.lopian@mmm.fi">ralf.lopian@mmm.fi</a> ;
✓	Member	<b>Ms Melanie Jane NEWFIELD</b> Manager Plants and Pathways Risk Assessment, Ministry for Primary Industries, Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace Wellington 6011, <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Phone: +64 4894 0495	<a href="mailto:melanie.newfield@mpi.govt.nz">melanie.newfield@mpi.govt.nz</a> ;

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Member	<b>Mr Tim N. STEVENS</b> USDA, APHIS, PPQ, PPQ Officer, 1815 Gardner Drive, Wilmington, North Carolina, 28405 <b>USA</b> Phone: +1 910-815-4678 EXT 1	<a href="mailto:Tim.N.Stevens@aphis.usda.gov">Tim.N.Stevens@aphis.usda.gov</a> ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat <b>Secretariat lead</b>	<b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> <b>INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (IPPC) SECRETARIAT</b> Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, ITALY Phone: +39 0657054915	<a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a> ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Celine GERMAIN</b> <b>IPPC</b> FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, ITALY Phone: +39 0657054468	<a href="mailto:Celine.Germain@fao.org">Celine.Germain@fao.org</a> ;
Unable to attend			
	Member	<b>Mr Mlungisi Nyangane Edmund TSHABALALA</b> 23/25 Victoria Embakment <b>SOUTH AFRICA</b> Phone: 031 368 8501	<a href="mailto:OupaT@nda.agric.za">OupaT@nda.agric.za</a> ;
	Member	<b>Mr Ilaisa Iranavuna DAKAICA</b> Biosecurity Services Division, P.O. Box 13360, Suva, <b>FIJI ISLANDS</b> Phone: 3812 512	<a href="mailto:idakaica@gmail.com">idakaica@gmail.com</a> ;