



Paris, 13 August 2014

## TECHNICAL REPORT ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE REGIONAL IPPC WORKSHOP 2014

### **Date and place of the Workshop**

---

The Workshop was held from Monday 28 to Thursday 31 July 2014 in Bykovo, Moscow region, Russia

### **FAO-supported speaker**

---

1. Mr Avetik Nersisyan (FAO Office for Europe and Central Asia)

### **IPPC-supported speaker**

---

1. Mr Craig Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)

### **EPPO-supported speaker**

---

1. Mr Martin Ward (EPPO Secretariat)
2. Mr Andrei Orlinski (EPPO Secretariat)

### **PowerPoint presentations, submitted by the FAO-supported speaker (in Russian)**

---

1. Draft amendments to ISPM 5 “Glossary of phytosanitary terms” (1994-001) – A. Orlinski (EPPO Secretariat)
2. Draft ISPM on “International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment” (2006-004) - M. Ward (EPPO Secretariat)
3. Draft ISPM on “International movement of seeds” (2009-003) - M. Ward (EPPO Secretariat)
4. Agreement on Trade Facilitation – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)
5. National Report Obligations – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)
6. PRA advocacy material – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)
7. STDF350 products – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)
8. E-phyto – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)
9. Standard Setting Process – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)
10. Phytosanitary resources page – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)

## **Information about the Workshop**

---

The Workshop lasted 4 days, according to the programme. Ten presentations (see above) were made, followed by questions and discussions.

The Workshop was attended by 45 participants coming from 18 countries, IPPC, FAO, EPPO and Eurasian Economic Commission including speakers and observers. Participants' background included management, inspection, research and regulation in the field of plant quarantine. The comments received regarding the organization and content of the Workshop have been largely positive.

The material distributed to the participants of the Workshop included dissemination material in English and Russian provided by EPPO, IPPC and FAO.

M. Ward (EPPO Secretariat) was elected Chairman, and A. Orlinski (EPPO Secretariat) was elected rapporteur.

## **Publication of presentations**

---

There are no plans to publish proceedings of the Workshop as a separate publication. All presentations were made available to participants, speakers and observers.

## **Summary overview of draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and summary of discussions**

---

The agenda for the Workshop prepared by the IPPC Secretariat was focused on engaging Russian-speaking experts and experts from countries of former Yugoslavia in generating comments on the IPPC draft standards (and amendments to standards) currently open for review and comment under IPPC country consultation procedure. The Workshop also aimed to discuss a number of other IPPC-related issues including: the new WTO agreement on trade facilitation, national reporting obligations, PRA advocacy material, STDF350 products, electronic phytosanitary certificates, the standard setting process and the phytosanitary resources page. These discussions were intended to ensure that Russian-speaking experts and experts of former Yugoslavia countries were fully informed of the details of these issues. The meeting was conducted mostly in Russian with interpretation between Russian and English.

Three draft ISPMs (and amendments to ISPMs) were discussed at the Workshop, all comments were made in Word format with explanation. A demonstration of the on-line comment system (OCS) was given to participants on how to include their own country comments into the IPPC's on-line comment system (OCS).

1. Draft amendments to ISPM 5 "Glossary of phytosanitary terms" (1994-001) (given by A. Orlinski) generated much discussion as well as some technical and editorial comments, especially with regard to new definitions of the terms "additional declaration" and "visual examination". The Workshop considered that any attempt to explain what kind of information may be included in an "additional declaration" leads to confusion. The Workshop proposed a simplification for the definition of "visual examination".

2. Draft ISPM on "International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment" (2006-004) (given by M. Ward) generated several comments including several on some inconsistencies of the draft text with the Glossary (ISPM 5) and a lot of technical and editorial comments. For example, the Workshop judged that the use of terms "export" and "import" is not appropriate for international movement of used vehicles, the term "plants for planting" is used in the sense not consistent with the Glossary (ISPM 5), the term "horticulture" is covered by the term "agriculture", ISPM 13 does not describe phytosanitary actions but only notifications, and sentences on military operations are not appropriate in an ISPM.

3. Draft ISPM on "International movement of seeds" (2009-003) (given by M. Ward) also generated several discussions including comments on some inconsistencies of the draft text with the Glossary (ISPM 5) and a lot of technical and editorial comments. For example, the Workshop judged that the

difference between terms “seeds” (in plural) and “seed” (in singular) existing in English does not exist in Russian (in Russian “seed” in singular may also mean “sperm”) and is not appropriate to be used in the ISPM, the term “quarantine pests” should be replaced by “regulated pests” because the ISPM should cover regulated non-quarantine pests as well, the terms “fungicides” and “nematicides” are covered by the term “pesticides”, the procedure of “labelling” should be mentioned together with “packing”, several paragraphs are repetitions of what was already written and could be deleted as well as the article on equivalency which is not appropriate for this ISPM.

All of the Workshop comments on the documents discussed were formulated in Russian and translated into English during the meeting. The Workshop also discussed issues of Russian translations and made some appropriate corrections in them.

Presentations on the WTO agreement on trade facilitation, national reporting obligations, PRA advocacy material, STDF350 products, the use of electronic phytosanitary certificates, standard setting process and phytosanitary resources page (given by C. Fedchock) were of high interest for participants and were catalytic for discussions about these phytosanitary issues, especially concerning the use of electronic phytosanitary certificates and PRA advocacy material. The practical exercises on PRA, conducted by two groups, demonstrated a divergence in approaches by the number of countries in the ways in which they seek support for phytosanitary programs. The participants generally agreed that they would encourage exercises of this type in the future.

M. Ward and A. Orlinski organized a presentation on how the OSC should be used to enter comments to draft ISPMs and to send them to IPPC from the official contact point of countries. Participants were questioned on who are official contact points of their countries in IPPC. It was found that persons that had been nominated as official contact points in 4 of participating countries are no longer in the NPPO staffs, which cause problems in communicating countries comments to IPPC. Those participants from countries which no longer had a functioning IPPC contact point agreed to return home and attempt establish a working contact point.

Participants all had the opportunity towards the end of the Workshop to express their views and their experience with the IPPC online commenting system. Some issues raised separately with the rapporteur included:

- it may be not enough to have a 4 day workshop to fully complete discussions on such a large range of issues in the agenda and to carefully discuss all draft ISPMs: therefore, it would be preferable to envisage full 5 days workshops in the next year,
- the IPPC procedure is too complicated to nominate new official contact points and to get them new user names and passwords to access the OCS,
- a number of participants were disappointed that only 3 of more than 10 draft ISPMs were included in the Workshop agenda which gives no possibilities to their countries to comment draft ISPMs for substantial concern and phytosanitary treatments (commenting the draft ISPMs on diagnostic protocols is slightly easier because most of diagnostic people are able to understand them in English).

The organization and support provided to participants from Russian NPPO was excellent. The meeting ran consistently within the intended timeframes, and the level of participation from all participants was very high. The comments were well thought out and indicative that the participants had a good familiarity with the material being discussed.

As a final discussion point, participants expressed a strong wish to continue with 2 regional Russian-English workshops per year: one on different issues of implementation of adopted ISPMs in practice, and another one on draft ISPMs (to be continued with support from VNIIKR in Russia).