



***REPORT***

Arusha, Tanzania  
16-20 June 2014

**Expert Working  
Group Meeting on the  
*International movement of  
cut flowers and branches*  
June 2014**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting .....	4
1.1	Selection of the Chair .....	4
1.2	Selection of the Rapporteur .....	4
1.3	Adoption of the Agenda .....	4
2.	Administrative Matters .....	4
3.	Review of Specification.....	5
4.	Development of draft ISPM .....	5
4.1	Discussion papers.....	5
4.2	Development of text for draft.....	5
5.	Next Steps.....	10
6.	Other business.....	10
7.	Close of the meeting.....	10
	APPENDIX 1: Agenda.....	11
	APPENDIX 2: Documents List.....	13
	APPENDIX 3: Participants List.....	14

## 1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter Secretariat) welcomed the participants of the Expert Working Group (EWG) on the topic *International movement of cut flowers and branches* (2008-005) to Arusha, United Republic of Tanzania, noting the absence of Ms Gisele IRVINE (New Zealand). The Secretariat thanked the participants for their preparatory work and wished them a productive meeting.
- [2] The meeting was hosted by the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) of Tanzania and organized by the Tanzania Horticultural Association (TAHA). Ms Asnath B. URONU, on behalf of Tanzania NPPO, welcomed the participants to Arusha and wished them a productive meeting, as did Mr Juma S. LOSSINI on behalf of TAHA.
- [3] The Secretariat noted that due to the last minute change of venue from Nairobi to Arusha because of security reasons, one representative from the NPPO of Kenya and one from CAB International (CABI) had been invited to participate in the meeting.
- [4] The participants introduced themselves and outlined their experience in dealing with cut flowers and branches and the expertise they would bring to the EWG. They collectively have expertise in one or more of the following key areas: plant pathology, entomology, taxonomy, plant inspection, pest risk analysis, quarantine pest management, and import operations of fresh fruits and vegetables.
- [5] The Secretariat reminded the participants that they would help produce a globally acceptable International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) in line with the Specification for the draft standard, and that they were selected in their individual capacity as experts, not as representatives of their region or country. The Secretariat reviewed the different roles and responsibilities of the participants and noted that the Secretariat's role is to facilitate the discussions. An overview of the standard setting process was presented.
- [6] One member noted that many countries are experiencing increased concerns from importing countries in regards to the increased pest risks related to the rapid growth of cut flowers production. He wished the standard would provide guidance to both importing and exporting countries in the trade of cut flowers and branches.

### 1.1 Selection of the Chair

- [7] Ms Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE LARA (Mexico) was selected as the Chairperson.

### 1.2 Selection of the Rapporteur

- [8] Ms Niranjani SAVERIMUTTU (Australia) was selected as the Rapporteur.

### 1.3 Adoption of the Agenda

- [9] The EWG approved the Agenda as attached in Appendix 1.

## 2. Administrative Matters

- [10] The Secretariat reviewed the Documents List (Appendix 2 of this report) and the Local Information document.
- [11] The Participants List was updated by participants (Appendix 3).
- [12] A field trip, organized by TAHA, was arranged for the afternoon of Wednesday 18 June to the Mount Meru Flowers farm, which produces several varieties of roses for export. Participants visited the growing houses (plastic) and packing facilities where post-harvest activities are carried out.

### 3. Review of Specification

- [13] The Steward presented the Specification 56<sup>1</sup> on the *International movement of cut flowers and branches* (2008-005).
- [14] One member queried the intended use of cut flowers and whether the draft standard would cover other uses such as edible cut flower for consumption. It was explained by the steward that the Standards Committee (SC) had requested the EWG to propose a definition for cut flowers and branches as covered by the standard and thus, the intended use would be captured in that definition.

### 4. Development of draft ISPM

#### 4.1 Discussion papers

- [15] The steward outlined the history of the development of Specification 56<sup>2</sup> and presented relevant discussions on the topic by the SC<sup>3</sup>. This topic was added in the *List of Topics for IPPC standards*<sup>4</sup> in March of 2008, during the Third Session of the Commission of Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-3)<sup>5</sup>.
- [16] The EWG reviewed the discussion papers and other reference material provided by some participants. These documents collectively aimed at addressing the tasks that are listed in Specification 56. Based on these papers, the group identified a number of issues, which were then discussed further.

#### 4.2 Development of text for draft

- [17] The main discussions points for the development of the draft ISPM on *International movement of cut flowers and branches* (2008-005) raised by the EWG were as follows:
- [18] *Definitions and scope* The Steward informed the EWG that one of the main issues raised by the SC was related to the definition of the term *cut flowers and branches*. Because the definition of the term impacts the scope of the ISPM, the EWG agreed the two issues should be considered jointly.
- [19] ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*) contains a definition for the term *cut flowers and branches* that the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) proposed a revision for in February 2013 as below. The SC in May 2013 reviewed the proposed revision by the TPG but suggested that instead of proposing a revision at this point, the EWG on *International movement of cut flowers and branches* (2008-005) should review, adjust and modify the proposition as needed.
- [20] Original definition in ISPM 5

<b>cut flowers and branches</b>	A <b>commodity class</b> for fresh parts of <b>plants</b> intended for decorative use and not for <b>planting</b>
---------------------------------	---

- [21] Proposed revision by the TPG

<b>cut flowers and branches</b> <u>other decorative plant parts</u>	A <b>commodity class</b> for <u>any</u> fresh parts of <b>plants</b> intended for decorative use and not for <b>planting</b> .
---	--

<sup>1</sup> Specification 56 - International movement of cut flowers and branches:

<https://www.ippc.int/publications/specification-56-international-movement-cut-flowers-and-branches>

<sup>2</sup> 15\_EWGCutFlowers\_2014\_June

<sup>3</sup> More information on the SC discussions are available in the SC reports page at <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/standards-committee>

<sup>4</sup> List of topics for IPPC standards: <https://www.ippc.int/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards>

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/documents/1249888979969\\_CPM3\\_English\\_Final\\_0.pdf](https://www.ippc.int/sites/default/files/documents/1249888979969_CPM3_English_Final_0.pdf)

- [22] The Steward explained that this definition aims to cover a large commodity class, defined by its intended use, and hence a wide variety of plant parts, such as cut flowers, branches, with or without propagules, with or without foliage, but also roots, leaves, etc. Due to the impossibility of listing exhaustively all concerned parts of plants in the definition, the addition of “any” had been proposed.
- [23] The Steward also explained other major SC discussions, including: the inclusion or exclusion of fresh material and dry material for cut flowers and branches; the pest risk by dry and preserved material and the difficulty in identifying them; the investigation on particular pest risk patterns for the different species of cut flowers and branches; and the possibility to identify different types of pests, considering the possibility to include the major pest groups and relevant phytosanitary measures for each pest group.
- [24] The EWG discussed the definition and the proposed revision. To begin with, the EWG found that it is important to stress that they were not in a position to revise the Glossary definition, and they would therefore propose a definition to be used for the purpose of the draft ISPM alone.
- [25] The EWG agreed that it was appropriate that the definition indicated that propagation was not an intended use. The group likewise agreed that the scope of the standard should not cover propagative materials such as cuttings, bulbs, seeds, nursery stock or tissue culture.
- [26] As to the attribute of “fresh”, members noted that some countries may import cut flowers that are fresh material mixed with dried, semi-dried or preserved material, while others may import semi-dried cut flowers that are not devitalized and may still be propagatable and hard to categorize. However, the EWG agreed that the scope should be narrowed down to fresh cut flowers for decorative purposes only (i.e. not dried, partially/semi dried, preserved or woody material), which include foliage and may include other fresh plant parts.
- [27] The EWG discussed whether edible plant material for consumption should be excluded from the current definition because some flowers are imported for consumption in salads and garnish (e.g. carnations, viola and pansies). The EWG found that fresh edible flowers for consumption may require phytosanitary measures and entry requirements different from those that would be elaborated in this standard.
- [28] Therefore, the EWG concluded that this use would be outside of the scope of the draft ISPM. Based on this, it was proposed to modify the definition to exclude edible cut flowers and cut flowers for planting.
- [29] Additionally, the EWG deemed that also “branches” should be excluded from the scope of the draft ISPM because it would not be covered by the range of plant parts (such as seed, fruit, nut and cones) discussed in this standard, as the presence of woody material on branches pose additional risks which should be covered elsewhere. Woody material, including conifer branches from Christmas trees, was understood to be excluded as should be covered by other standards involving bark material, timber and wooden articles, noting there is an EWG proposed for development of another ISPM standard for wooden articles in September 2014.
- [30] The EWG:
- (1) *decided* to narrow the scope of the draft ISPM on the *International movement of cut flowers and branches* (2008-005) to cover only fresh cut flowers (i.e. not partially dried, preserved, or stems with woody material), hence also excluding branches.
  - (2) *invited* the SC to consider change the title of this topic from *International movement of cut flowers and branches* (2008-005) to *International movement of cut flowers* (2008-005).
  - (3) *proposed* a definition for “cut flowers” to be applied locally to the draft ISPM, and *invited* the SC to consider whether this definition would be an appropriate revision to the current Glossary term and definition.

### ***Background section***

- [31] This section was drafted based on wording from Specification 56. The EWG also included mention of the devitalization process which is currently in use by some countries as a phytosanitary measure, as this was a point raised in several discussion papers.

### ***Environmental and biodiversity issues***

- [32] The EWG discussed the impact of pest management on the environment and biodiversity. A general wording was added on reducing the pest risk and thereby reducing the negative environmental impact.
- [33] It was noted that exploring disposal options at the end of vase life may be a method for controlling pest establishment in the importing country and may have an impact on biodiversity. However, the EWG decided not to include this in the draft ISPM because it would imply including requirements of safe disposal and this is not something that the NPPO could implement..
- [34] The EWG noted that the implementation of this standard should reduce the likelihood of introduction and spread of pests.

### ***Responsibilities***

- [35] The EWG noted that the NPPO of the importing country is responsible for conducting the PRA and for determining the phytosanitary measures to apply. However, the EWG also found that NPPOs of importing and exporting countries should discuss the PRA findings and collaborate for the establishment of mutually acceptable phytosanitary measures.
- [36] Some members queried the need to address the fact that pests can be introduced in non-commercial cargo, in particular in passengers' luggage and in international mail, because the material may not need to be declared to the authorities in some countries. Others explained that NPPOs of importing and exporting countries should have effective screening/ inspection mechanisms in place to prevent this kind of introduction. The EWG acknowledged that it is sometimes difficult to manage non-commercial cargo and agreed to not mention them in the draft ISPM.

### ***Pest risk analysis and pest risk associated with cut flowers***

- [37] It was stressed that any phytosanitary import requirements applied for cut flowers should be based on a Pest Risk Analysis (PRA). It was noted that guidance on pest risk management options for cut flowers should also be provided. As described in some discussions papers, cut flowers genera are intrinsically related to the pest risk, i.e. some pests groups are highly associated with certain cut flowers genera. It was highlighted that pest risk varies from country to country and plant genus to plant genus, and examples of some groups associated with key genera of cut flowers were included in the draft ISPM.
- [38] Information on pest risk associated with cut flowers that may be relevant to a PRA was extensively discussed. It was noted that there are two types of pest risk management associated with cut flowers: (i) general pest risk management options to reduce pest levels in production areas and (ii) management of pest risks associated with specific trade in meeting the importing country requirements, which are managed through phytosanitary measures. The phytosanitary measures and generic pest risk management measures may not necessarily be the same. It was pointed out that this standard should describe the risks associated with trade of cut flowers and available phytosanitary measures, including the ones that may need to be captured in the phytosanitary certificates.
- [39] It was agreed to include factors that should be considered when conducting a PRA for the international movement of cut flowers. Some of these factors were: presence or absence of propagules; geographical location (e.g. climate conditions); storage, segregation, and mode and conditions of transport ; cut flower crop genus; production system, such as growing conditions (e.g. water source, soil/medium for growing plants), exposure to the environment (grown in greenhouse, open field or wild grown) and level of crop management (managed vs wild); pest control, in which Integrated Pest



Management (IPM) was included; pest prevalence; post-harvest practices; packaging and storage, segregation and transport.

- [40] Pest groups associated with cut flowers and relevant phytosanitary measures were extensively discussed because a large number of species/types of cut flowers are traded and their pest profile varies depending on the genus and species and the geographic origin or destination. Thus, the EWG did not deem it appropriate to generalize the pest risk and pest risk ranking (i.e. high, moderate, and low) in the text of the standard and some guidance may be more appropriate in an appendix. The group agreed not to use the wording “frequently” as in the Specification 56 because there was no consensus on which pest groups are more frequently associated with different cut flowers. Some members stated that certain pest groups are either more or less likely to be associated with cut flowers and therefore influence the potential to establish via this pathway, cut flowers for decorative purposes. It was pointed out by some members that some NPPOs collect pest interception or pest establishment information for their own records. It was noted that PRA usually applies to pest species and not to pest groups. The group felt that it would be useful for NPPOs who were conducting a PRA if examples of pest groups that may be associated with some cut flower genera were included in the draft standard.
- [41] Regarding ranking of the pest risks, while noting that pest risk varies from country to country (and plant genus to plant genus) and ranking was thought to be determined by PRA, the EWG agreed to include a relative risk ranking of major pest groups associated with cut flowers and a brief explanation of this relative ranking. The EWG felt this information may be a useful guide for importing or exporting countries during the PRA process. This information was added as an appendix and is not a prescriptive part of the draft standard.
- [42] Some members raised the point that some pests, such as snails, slugs and their eggs, can be found in association with cut flowers as contaminating pests. Also there may be pest infestation of the packaging or transport containers (i.e. air cans, trucks etc). While this association is occasional, the EWG felt it was nevertheless important to include some examples of *contaminating pests* in cut flowers.

### ***Phytosanitary Measures***

- [43] The EWG noted that phytosanitary measures for cut flowers are described in other ISPMs. The participants felt that some particular factors should be taken into account in the identification and selection of appropriate pest risk management options for cut flowers. These options could be applied to mitigate the different types of pest risks associated with cut flowers. Options for pre-harvest, harvest and post-harvest were thoroughly discussed and included under the section Phytosanitary measures.
- [44] It was agreed that it is easier to manage pest risks prior to export. The EWG discussed if pest risk management options before export should be the only ones considered but decided to describe instead options before import (pre-harvest, harvest, post-harvest and in transit) and options upon arrival. The latter options include safeguarding or segregation (considering industry practices in place in importing countries), documentation verification (to verify compliance with phytosanitary import requirements) and phytosanitary treatments that may be applied upon arrival as a result of detection.
- [45] IPM was included as an example of systems approach in pre-harvest option, as to manage pests in field. The EWG felt that it may be used as a first step in keeping pest levels in the field at a minimum which may help reduce the pest risk of consignments. Other options include examples of systems approach in the growing areas, chemical and physical control, substrate treatments, cultural practices, sanitation, packing facility processing (such as quality check, trimming cleaning, grading), packaging, and phytosanitary treatments. These were all included in the draft ISPM.
- [46] It was suggested and agreed that post-harvest practices in packing facilities be grouped in separate categories such as physical control and chemical control, hence more appropriate categorization. Physical methods included cleaning, washing, tapping (to dislodge insect pests hiding in the flowers) and verification/inspection. The EWG also discussed including chemical dipping of either the flower



heads or the whole stems, as one of the standard practices and agreed to have this practice as an example in the draft standard.

- [47] Comments on how to maintain pest free growing medium/substratum were made. It was mentioned that the growing medium for cut flowers is usually soil, and soil treatments, such as fumigation, are important in managing pests and nematodes. However, other soil factors such as pH, water source and irrigation methods along with humidity and temperature of the growing environment may impact on pest and disease development. Type of the growing environment (open/closed production systems or wild) may also have an impact on the pest status of cut flowers. It was agreed that the growing medium itself was not to be included in this draft standard since another draft ISPM, for growing media, is under development. However, the group agreed to include other factors of the growing environment.
- [48] The group discussed how labeling could be used to mitigate the pest risk because, although not a phytosanitary measure, it can enable countries to trace back the history of the cut flowers, e.g. in regards to the application of phytosanitary measures at the point of origin, such as treatments. The group agreed to include this as an option for pest risk management of cut flowers during and after harvest.
- [49] Pest risk management options to be applied during transportation (including transit) and upon arrival were also discussed, because of the risks of re-infestation and contamination of the commodity.
- [50] It was mentioned that in some cases, cut flower consignments may be transported long distances and it may be necessary to maintain the cut flowers in ideal conditions during transit. So it was agreed that controlled atmospheric conditions during transport should be included as an option to prevent disease development and contaminating pests during transportation (including transit). This may be applied as a phytosanitary measure by the importing country at times.
- [51] The EWG also discussed options for pest risk management by pest groups as it was pointed out that some pests groups are more difficult to control than others. Once again, it was highlighted that pest risk varies from country to country and plant genus to plant genus, thus cut flowers genera are more often associated with particular pest groups (e.g. leaf miners are likely to be associated with certain genera of cut flowers, for example, *Chrysanthemum* spp. (mum) and *Gypsophila* spp. (common gypsophila/Baby's breath)). As the EWG had previously agreed to include examples of pest groups that may be associated with cut flowers, it was agreed to include a section on pest risk management options for these groups of pests.
- [52] The EWG agreed that any aspects of pest risk management outside of, or deviations from the guidelines provided by this draft standard should be through bilateral agreements.

### ***Inspection and certification***

- [53] The EWG discussed whether maintenance of inspection and any non-compliance records needed specific mention in the PRA. It was decided that record keeping would fit under “*inspection and certification*” section and that a note to state the type of documentation needed would suffice (e.g. surveillance, monitoring and phytosanitary treatments). It was noted that guidelines for inspection and certification are described in other ISPMs.

### ***Auditing***

- [54] When discussing auditing and verification, some participants recalled that these take place on a routine basis. In cases of repeated non-compliances, especially after trade commences and prior to export corrective action should be part of the audit process. For this, the EWG agreed that the NPPOs of both importing and exporting countries may conduct audits before or after the trade commences as a matter of practice. And the audit may cover part of or the entire process of the international movement, from growing, field measures, packing, application of phytosanitary measures, inspection, export certification, packaging and labelling, transport security and movement.

### ***Non-compliance***

- [55] The EWG felt that mention to ISPM 13:2001 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*) would suffice. Thus, this reference was included in the draft ISPM and no extra text was provided on actions of non-compliance, reporting and communication.

### **5. Next Steps**

- [56] The EWG reviewed and revised the draft ISPM and agreed that the text developed was complete. The EWG asked the Secretariat to process the draft ISPM and submit it to the SC.
- [57] The Secretariat informed the group that draft ISPM would be edited and that the steward would clear the edits. After this, the draft ISPM would be presented to the SC. The Secretariat also mentioned that the draft report of this meeting would be submitted to the Rapporteur for clearance and, following this, circulated to the EWG for comments. Once finalized, it would be posted on the IPP and presented to the SC along with the draft ISPM.
- [58] It was mentioned that, once this draft is approved by the SC, it will go for member consultation, at the earliest from 1 July to 30 November 2015.

### **6. Other business**

- [59] No other business was identified.

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

- [60] The EWG thanked the IPPC Secretariat for having been selected to participate in the EWG and for providing assistance during the meeting. The members also thanked the organizer, TAHA, and host, Tanzania NPPO, for providing support before and during the meeting. Lastly, the EWG thanked the Chairperson and the Rapporteur for their work.
- [61] The Secretariat thanked all those who helped to make logistical arrangements for the meeting along with all the experts for their participation. Once again, the Secretariat expressed gratitude to the host and organizer.
- [62] The Chairperson thanked all the participants for all their good and hard work to develop this draft ISPM, and closed the meeting.

**APPENDIX 1: Agenda**

**EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING**  
**International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005)**

**16-20 June 2014**

**Arusha, Tanzania**

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat</li> <li>• Welcome by the meeting host</li> <li>• Welcome by the meeting organizer</li> </ul>	--	MOREIRA Tanzania NPPO Tanzania Horticultural Association
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions</li> </ul>	--	MOREIRA
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presentation on the standard setting process</li> <li>• Roles of the Participants</li> </ul>	--	MONTUORI  MOREIRA
1.1 Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur	--	MOREIRA
1.2 Selection of the Rapporteur	--	CHAIRPERSON
1.3 Adoption of the Agenda	01_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	CHAIRPERSON
<b>2. Administrative Matters</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents List</li> <li>• Participants List</li> <li>• Local Information</li> </ul>	02_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 03_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 04_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	MOREIRA
<b>3. Review of Specification</b>	<a href="#">Spec 56: International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005)</a>	CHAIRPERSON
<b>4. Development of draft ISPM</b>		
4.1 Discussion papers History of the topic and draft specification	15_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 05_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 06_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 07_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 08_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 09_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 10_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 11_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 12_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 13_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 14_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June 16_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	MONTEALEGRE LARA OTIENO OTIENO OTIENO OTIENO OTIENO SAVERIMUTTU SAVERIMUTTU SAVERIMUTTU SAVERIMUTTU SAVERIMUTTU SAVERIMUTTU MIRANYI

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
	17_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	SAVERIMUTTU
	18_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	MHLANGA
4.2 Development of text for draft	--	CHAIRPERSON
<b>5. Next Steps</b>		CHAIRPERSON
<b>6. Other business</b>		CHAIRPERSON
<b>7. Close of the meeting</b>		IPPC SECRETARIAT / CHAIRPERSON

**APPENDIX 2: Documents List**

<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)</b>	<b>DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED</b>
01_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	1.3	Agenda	2014-02-24
02_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	02	Documents list	2014-02-24
03_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	02	Participants list	2014-02-24
04_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June_Rev1	02	Local information	2014-06-02
Specification 56: International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005)	03	<a href="#">Spec 56: International movement of cut flowers and branches (2008-005)</a>	2014-01-28
05_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Integrating drivers influencing the detection of plant pests carried in the international cut flower trade	2014-02-11
06_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Invasive Insect Pests and Plant Quarantine in Japan	2014-02-11
07_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Live plant imports: the major pathway for forest insect and pathogen invasions of the US	2014-02-11
08_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	The Economic Impact Of Invasive Species In The Ornamental Commodity In Puerto Rico: Towards Establishing A Multidimensional Framework For Data Collection And Analysis	2014-02-11
09_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Weed Risk Analysis of a Proposed Importation of Bulk Maize ( <i>Zea mays</i> ) from the USA	2014-02-11
10_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Postharvest treatment with Glyphosate to devitalize rose and carnation cut flowers	2014-02-21
11_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Vase life and root propagation of Geraldton Wax Cut Flowers treated with Glyphosate	2014-02-21
12_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Integrated pest management in cut flower crops grown in plastic houses at the Bogota Plateau	2014-02-21
13_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Review of post-harvest disinfestation of cut flowers and foliage with special reference to tropical	2014-02-21
14_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Final policy review: Alternative risk management measures to import <i>Lilium</i> spp. cut flowers from Taiwan	2014-02-28
15_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	History of the topic and draft specification	2014-05-14
16_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Devitalisation of Cut Roses	2014-05-20
17_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Specification 56 – Australia's response	2014-05-20
18_EWGCutFlowers_2014_June	4.1	Specification 56 – South Africa's response	2014-05-20

**APPENDIX 3: Participants List**

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.

	<b>Participant role / Country</b>	<b>Name, mailing address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>
✓	Steward / SC member	<b>Ms Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE LARA</b> Jefe de Organismos Internacionales de Protección Fitosanitaria Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal SENASICA / SAGARPA Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127, Col. Del Carmen Coyoacán C.P. 04100 <b>MEXICO</b> Phone: +11 52-55-5090-3000 ext. 51341	<a href="mailto:ana.montealegre@senasica.gob.mx">ana.montealegre@senasica.gob.mx</a>
✓	Member / Australia	<b>Ms Niranjani SAVERIMUTTU</b> Assistant Director, Plant Biosecurity Department of Agriculture, GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Phone: +612 6272 5798 / 04 11 034873 Fax: +612 6272 3745	<a href="mailto:Niranjani.Saverimuttu@agriculture.gov.au">Niranjani.Saverimuttu@agriculture.gov.au</a>
✓	Member / Iran	<b>Ms Maryam JALILI MOGHADAM</b> Manager of phytosanitary standards development and pest control programme 110 Fakoori Ave., Fatemi St., Tehran <b>IRAN</b> Phone: +00982188006639 / +00989126049255 Fax: + 00982188006639	<a href="mailto:marypaya@yahoo.com">marypaya@yahoo.com</a>
✓	Member / Jamaica	<b>Ms Juliet GOLDSMITH</b> Manager, Pest Risk Analysis Unit Ministry of Agriculture & Fisheries Address: 193 Old Hope Road, Kingston 6 <b>JAMAICA</b> Phone: 1876-9777160 Fax: 1876-9776992	<a href="mailto:jvgoldsmith@moa.gov.jm">jvgoldsmith@moa.gov.jm</a>
✓	Member / USA	<b>Mr Barney P. CATON</b> USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine Assistant Laboratory Director Address: 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 300, Raleigh NC 27606 <b>USA</b> Phone: + 1-919-855-7504 Fax: + 1-919-855	<a href="mailto:barney.p.caton@aphis.usda.gov">barney.p.caton@aphis.usda.gov</a>
✓	Member / United Kingdom	<b>Mr Guy NETTLETON</b> Principal Plant Health and Seeds Inspector Address: FERA, Apollo Court, 2 Bishop Square Business Park, Hatfield, AL10 9EX <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> Phone: + 01707 274598	<a href="mailto:guy.nettleton@fera.gsi.gov.uk">guy.nettleton@fera.gsi.gov.uk</a>
✓	Member / South Africa	<b>Mr Abel Jabulani MHLANGA</b> Chief Agricultural Food and Quarantine Technician Address: Private Bag X 04 OR TAMBO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT 1627 <b>SOUTH AFRICA</b> Phone: 011 390 7500/17 Fax: 011 390 2584 or 086 293 1002	<a href="mailto:JabulaniM@daff.gov.za">JabulaniM@daff.gov.za</a>

OTHER PARTICIPANTS			
✓	Tanzania NPPO (Host)	<b>Ms Asnath B. URONU</b> Head of Post Entry Plant Quarantine Station Plant Quarantine Inspection P. O. Box 3024 - Arusha <b>TANZANIA</b>	-
✓	Tanzania Organizer - TAHA	<b>Mr Juma S. LOSSINI</b> Board Director Tanzania Horticultural Association Kanisa Road, House No 49 P. O. Box 16520 - Arusha <b>TANZANIA</b> Tel/ Fax +255-27-2544568 Web: <a href="http://www.tanzaniahorticulture.com">www.tanzaniahorticulture.com</a>	<a href="mailto:jalossini@yahoo.com">jalossini@yahoo.com</a> ; <a href="mailto:taha@habari.co.tz">taha@habari.co.tz</a>
✓	Kenya NPPO (Host)	<b>Ms Hilda MIRANYI</b> General Manager, Phytosanitary Services Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service P.O. Box 49592 -00100 - Nairobi <b>KENYA</b> Phone: +254-020-356171/2 Fax: +254-020-356175	<a href="mailto:hmiranyi@kephis.org">hmiranyi@kephis.org</a>
✓	Kenya - CABI (Organizer)	<b>Mr Washington OTIENO</b> Regional Coordinator, Plantwise Programme CABI Africa United Nations Avenue P.O.Box 633-00621 - Nairobi <b>KENYA</b> Phone: +254 20 7224450 Mobile: +254 722 427097 Fax: +254 20 7122150	<a href="mailto:W.Otieno@cabi.org">W.Otieno@cabi.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Adriana G. MOREIRA</b> IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 - Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 55809	<a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Mirko MONTUORI</b> IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 - Rome ITALY Phone: +39 06 570 53803	<a href="mailto:Mirko.Montuori@fao.org">Mirko.Montuori@fao.org</a>
NOT ATTENDING			
	Member / New Zealand	<b>Ms Gisele IRVINE</b>	<a href="mailto:gisele.irvine@mpi.govt.nz">gisele.irvine@mpi.govt.nz</a>