



联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

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

Продовольственная и
сельскохозяйственная организация
Объединенных Наций

Organización de las
Naciones Unidas para la
Alimentación y la Agricultura

منظمة
الأغذية والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Ninth Session

Rome, 31 March - 4 April 2014

Summary Report of the Twenty-five Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

Agenda item 14.1

Prepared by COSAVE

1. The 25th Technical Consultation among regional plant protection organizations (TC-RPPOs) was hosted by the Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) in collaboration with the Dirección General de Servicios Agrícolas, Uruguay NPPO, in Colonia del Sacramento, Uruguay, from 26 to 30 August 2013. Present at the Consultation were representatives of the IPPC Secretariat, the CPM Bureau and seven RPPOs: Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC), Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE), European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO), North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO), Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO), Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA), and Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO).
2. The Andean Community (CA), Caribbean Plant Protection Organization (CPPC) and Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) were not represented at the meeting.
3. The full report of the meeting is available at: <https://www.ippc.int/publications/tc-rppo-25th-final-report>

I. Matters arising from the 24th Technical Consultation (including post meeting networking and cooperation)

Follow up on impacts of the decisions of the 24th TC RPPOs

4. Issues arising from the 24th TC were considered under other agenda points. One item arising from the 24th TC was discussed: Feasibility to draw up list of priority pests (National, Regional, Global and under which modalities). This year, some RPPOs expressed their opinion on the impossibility to build up these lists. Other RPPOs supported the idea, and finally some asked for more time to consider the issue.
5. Key recommendations agreed included:

This document is printed in limited numbers to minimize the environmental impact of FAO's processes and contribute to climate neutrality. Delegates and observers are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and to avoid asking for additional copies. Most FAO meeting documents are available on the Internet at www.fao.org

- To think more strategically about these lists
- To study the high priority regulated pests considering cultivated area, volume, and value for the host commodity
- To think about global/regional protection when establishing these lists.

Follow up on impacts of the 24th Technical Consultation

6. As established in the Agenda, the TC analyzed the impacts of discussions and agreements during the previous TC. In the future, this is going to be a standing issue in the agenda and a table on impacts is going to be compiled from this year on.

Meeting or activity	Identified impact
Bureau	Strategic decisions on diagnostic protocols, RPPO recognition, how to deal with NROs, studying the feasibility to draw up lists of priority pests Issues to be addressed in the scientific session of CPM
CPM 8	Identification of the Scientific session on Probit 9 treatments Decisions on ePhyto activities
SC	Usefulness of Diagnostic protocols
CDC	Review of manuals
IPPC Workshops	Coordination and cooperation

II. Review of RPPO's Activities

7. Each participating RPPO presented their activities over the past year within their region related to the following:

- the development of work plans, regional standards and guidelines for phytosanitary measures
- involvement in the organization of the regional workshops (draft ISPM, pest eradication, etc.)
- information exchange including pest reporting
- improvement of phytosanitary capacity through capacity building projects
- development of contingency plans and eradication programmes
- major pest issues.

8. The TC suggested that during the next meeting, each RPPO should be granted additional time to demonstrate their Websites. During the presentations the Secretariat requested all RPPOs to contribute the technical resources they had presented, to the phytosanitary resources page. RPPOs kindly accepted the proposal.

III. Results on consultations on a Caribbean RPPO

9. The TC was informed that Plant Health Directors in CAHFSA will have a meeting and a decision will be communicated on using or not CAHFSA as an RPPO. As a first step the existing RPPO (CPPC) should be deactivated.

10. In relation to the withdrawal of an existing RPPO and the two criteria identified by the Bureau and the FAO legal office have identified two criteria: (i) RPPO does not exist anymore (ii) RPPO has been inactive in all IPPC activities for a period of time, the TC was agree and advised that a period of 3 years of inactivity would be an appropriate length of time to warrant removal of

recognition as an RPPO. The activities of the RPPO should be linked to the roles and functions, as adopted by ICPM 2005.

11. About this issue the TC agreed:

- To review the Roles and Functions of the RPPOs, to take into account changes in the IPPC strategies and work plans and to define clearly when an RPPO is active in the IPPC framework
- To include this issue in the agenda for next TC for further consideration
- To propose the withdrawal of recognition of the CPPC
- To support the creation/recognition of a new Caribbean RPPO (e.g. CAHFSA), if necessary
- That RPPOs should work together collectively to raise the level of participation in IPPC activities

IV. IPPC Secretariat Updates

12. The IPPC Secretariat provided updates for each of its core activities including standard setting, information exchange, reporting to the IPPC through RPPOs, Implementation Review and Support System (IRRS), capacity building, and dispute settlement.

13. Detailed information on **standard setting activities** was provided in the updated document presented by the Secretariat.

14. The TC expressed concern on the non acceptance by the TPPT of experience based phytosanitary treatments and asked the Secretariat to inform on the position of the SC at this respect, considering the text under the first paragraph of item 3.2.2 of ISPM 28.

15. About engaging experts in standard setting activities, the comments by TC were the following:

- The main general reason to don't get proposals of experts is that the NPPOs and RPPOs have an evident shortage of human resources for their own activities
- RPPOs and IPPC are competing for the same human resources
- A realistic approach could involve the reformulation of the standard setting work plan, the consideration of withdrawal of some less relevant EWGs and Panels, or the elimination of activities duplicated with the ones performed by RPPOs.

16. The Secretariat presented a detailed paper entitled: Update on the **National Reporting Obligations** (NRO) Programme. The Secretariat encouraged the RPPOs to be active in improving the ability of CPs to meet their NROs. It was noted that some RPPOs are proactive in promoting the fulfillment of NROs .

17. The IRSS officer provided the TC with an **update on the IRSS** project highlighting the latest initiatives which include the questionnaire on ISPM17/19 released to NPPOs, brainstorming on indicators and a possible monitoring framework for IPPC and ISPMs, discussion on SPG on implementation and role of IRSS and the ongoing development of the Implementation Review Report.

18. The TC was informed on the developments and recent activities in the area of **capacity development** and on the works of the Capacity Development Committee. The Secretariat highlighted the possible cooperative actions with the RPPOs attending the 25th TC and encouraged all RPPOs to participate in the process of development, review and testing of the new technical resources produced. Some RPPOs congratulated the Secretariat for the new developments and all of them committed to provide resources to the phytosanitary resources page.

19. On the formal request for assistance in resolving a **phytosanitary trade dispute**, no new development had happened since both parties agreed to wait for a new PRA for CBS prepared by EFSA. The PRA is currently under public consultation.

20. About **liaison, cooperation & partnership policy**, the Secretariat informed on the development of this policy and remarked that RPPOs were considered privileged partners in the document prepared for presentation to the Bureau and the next CPM.

V. CPM-8 Follow-Up

21. The Secretariat updated the TC on the developments related to e-Phyto, the constitution of a new Steering group and the face to face meeting to be held in Auckland, NZ, in September 2013.

VI. Topics for future: CPM Scientific Sessions

22. The TC decided to put forward the following proposals, which are not in any particular order of priority.

- ◀ New technologies for diagnostics (Web based technologies, DNA barcoding, etc), describing necessary equipment each technology requires
- ◀ Lessons learned from jurisprudence: revisiting the role of science in phytosanitary disputes at the WTO
- ◀ Aquatic plants: challenges for regulation.

23. On side sessions for the CPM, the TC suggested:

- ◀ ISPM 15 implementation
- ◀ Emerging pests
- ◀ ISPM vs. other referential documents (e.g. Global GAP and others)
- ◀ ISPM 13 implementation
- ◀ Use of terms: invasive alien plants, invasive alien species, pests, etc.

VII. TC Work Plan

24. The Secretariat was requested to prepare a draft of a standing work plan that could be submitted to annual reviews. The draft was discussed and the 2014 work plan appears in Appendix I.

VIII. TC amongst RPPOs technical discussion

25. The TC had a very interesting discussion about the following issues: current and emerging major pest issues, developments on invasive alien species that are plant pests, electronic certification, contingency planning for Huanglongbing (HLB), pests of national concern and deviation of intended use.

IX. Other Business

a) Mechanism for inter-session communication

The TC agreed that teleconference or videoconference could be a mechanism for periodic communication. As usual, the TC should meet during CPM and E-mails should be used as a main channel for requesting decisions.

b) Mechanism for requesting the addition of items to the CPM agenda.

26. The TC could do this through:

- Proposals of member countries
- Sending suggestions to the Bureau before its June meeting. Proposals could be performed as individual RPPOs or as the TC. Memoranda should be sent to the Secretariat at least one month before the end of December.

c) Mentoring and cooperation amongst RPPOs

27. Other business:

- EPPO/NAPPO annual bilateral meeting
- NAPPO/OIRSA letter of understanding with annual exchange of work plans and joint projects, as for instance: Tuta absoluta surveillance protocol
- GICSV,: NAPPO/OIRSA/COSAVE annual work plan and shared projects: e-phyto workshop
- APPPC/NAPPO planning for ISPM 15 implementation workshop
- APPPC/Brazil on SALB
- Cooperation in the identification of experts for regional projects
- EPPO/NEPPO cooperation for the establishment of the RPPO
- EPPO/NEPPO workshop on ISPM 7 and 12 and surveillance
- EPPO/COSAVE annual meeting before CPM
- EPPO/OIRSA: sharing information on PRA.
- PPPO/APPPC on pest surveillance
- APPPC workshop on surveillance information exchange with participation of NPPOs from member countries
- NAPPO workshop on Citrus diseases with participation of other RPPOs
- NEPPO workshop on HLB with COSAVE, NAPPO and OIRSA
- Exchange of more than 14 technical resource documents: protocols, regional standards, PRAs
- OIRSA shared with RPPOs the document in Spanish “Plan de contingencia ante un brote de la raza 4 tropical de Fusarium oxysporum f. sp. cubense en un país de la región del OIRSA”.

d) TC report to CPM 9

The TC suggested to COSAVE that for the report to CPM, two items should be covered: the history and 25th anniversary of the TC, and the accomplishments and cooperation over the years.

e) Requests from the Bureau

The TC addressed all request from the Bureau, as follows:

- 1) Opinion of the TC RPPOs on the possibilities of IPPC contracting parties to put together and make available their list of regulated pests.
 - It is a common problem to many IPPC contracting parties, independently of being developing/developed countries .
 - Many countries have the lists available on their Websites, but in their own languages .
 - The publication of the list of regulated pests should not be interpreted as a possible technical barrier to trade .
 - Many contracting parties are concerned on the quality of the information contained in their list of regulated pests .
 - The capacity to improve and update the lists of regulated pests is variable and needs to be reinforced .
 - The list of regulated pests has a key value in giving transparency to trade .
 - Many RPPOs are currently developing regional models for PRA that contribute to the regulation and improvement of lists of regulated pests at the national level.
- 2) Is it enough to have an annual TC meeting to ensure the due coordination and action between RPPOs and the IPPC? The TC decided on other mechanisms for coordination that are not face to face meetings and are complementary to the TC.
- 3) Which is the TC feedback on the periodical news report coming from the Bureau.

28. The TC suggested that it should be useful to send a notification about the publication (e-mail with the link) and not only the publication in the IPP.

f) New items for future scientific sessions.

29. This information is included in a specific item in the agenda

g) Communications

30. The TC requested to consider the involvement of RPPOs in the development and delivery of the IPPC Communication work plan.

31. The aim will be to ensure consistency of messages and raise the profile of Plant Protection in the regions.

X. Date and location of the twenty-six TC-RPPOs

32. The TC-RPPOs agreed that the next TC-RPPOs would be held during the period of 10-14 November 2014 in Antigua, Guatemala. The TC thanked OIRSA for offering to host the meeting. COSAVE and NAPPO shall assist OIRSA with the organization of the meeting.

33. The CPM is invited to:

- 1) *note* the report.

APPENDIX 1

Activity / Topic	Responsible body	
1	Investigate an operative mechanism for pest reporting through RPPOs	Secretariat All RPPOs
2	a) Should CAHFSA enter into force, then they should be made aware of the requirements for recognition as RPPOs or CPPC arrangements be clarified and b) Cooperate in the technical aspects of the establishment.	Secretariat All RPPOs
3	RPPOs support to Regional IPPC workshops	PPPO APPPC EPPO COSAVE OIRSA NEPPO
4	Contingency planning for emerging pests – exchange of information	All RPPOs
5	Electronic certification: encourage all NPPOs to participate in developments and exchange of information in the TC.	All RPPOs Secretariat
6	RPPOs input into the IRSS (Implementation review and support system)	All RPPOs Secretariat
7	Periodic review and update of the Roles and Functions of RPPOs in the framework of the IPPC.	All RPPOs
8	Management of preparations for further TC meetings – periodic communication to provide updates and reminders	All RPPOs Secretariat
9	Support activities intended to encourage NPPOs to implement the Convention and the standards. a) Possible increased involvement by RPPOs in capacity development	All RPPOs

	activities b) Cooperate with the Secretariat in the fulfillment of NROs c) Support the implementation of the IPPC communications work plan	
10	Discussion on new concepts of strategic value for the Convention	All RPPOs
11	Consideration of specific requests coming from the Bureau and CPM bodies	All RPPOs