

**Report
on
The APPPC regional workshop for the review of draft
International Standards
for Phytosanitary Measures**



**Pyongchang
Republic of Korea
6-10 September, 2010**

**Report on the APPPC regional workshop for the review of draft International Standards
for Phytosanitary Measures
Pyongchang, Republic of Korea, 6-10 September, 2010**

1. Opening of the session

The meeting was opened by Mr Chong-Seo Park, Director General of the National Plant Quarantine Service, MIFAFF, Republic of Korea.

Mr Chong-Seo Park welcomed the Executive Director of the APPPC, Dr Piao Yongfan, and the participants to the meeting. He noted the importance the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) had placed on the development of standards within the Business plan for the CPM. The CPM also expressed the need for financial assistance in the development of ISPMs. The Korean Government is continuing to support the development of standards by providing financial support for this regional workshop on draft standards. Mr Park wished the participants success in their discussions on the draft standards and an enjoyable stay in Korea.

The meeting was attended by twenty-three experts from seventeen countries and was facilitated by Dr Piao Yongfan (FAO), Mr M. Sakamura and Dr J. Hedley. See Appendix 2. The meeting participants introduced themselves to each other.

2. Purpose of the workshop

Dr Piao (Senior Plant Protection Officer, FAO) outlined that the main purpose of this workshop which was to provide participants from countries in each FAO region with a regional forum to discuss the draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs). These discussions would help participants gain a better understanding of the national and regional impact of these proposed standards and provide a basis for the development and submission of national comments. This workshop covered the following draft ISPMs:

- *Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies*
- *Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM No.15*
- *Integrated measures approach for managing pest risks associated with international trade of plants for planting*
- *Irradiation treatment for *Ceratitidis capitata* (Annex to ISPM 28)*
- *Diagnostic protocol for Plum pox virus*

Seven members have submitted draft comments to facilitate the discussions on the standards. The meeting will also discuss the draft ISPMs 7 and 12 which are important standards for all members. The participants should take this opportunity to express their opinions on these drafts.

The meeting also provides an opportunity to network with colleagues in the region. Dr Piao expressed his hope that all members would provide substantial input to the discussions on the draft.

Mr Young-Chul Jeong, Deputy Director, International Quarantine Cooperation Division, NPQS gave an introductory address concerning the work of the NPQS

3. Introductory papers

Overview of the IPPC

Dr Hedley gave an overview of the IPPC, ISPMs and the standard setting process using the Power Point display provided by the IPPC Secretariat. It was noted that this meeting is held to assist countries in the preparation of their comments on draft ISPMs. Official comments should be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat by the national IPPC contact point before the deadline of 30 September 2010.

NPQS airport activities

A short address on the functions of the airport quarantine staff was provided by Dr. Kim, NPQS staff. These included quarantine inspection, the enforcement of acts and regulations, the identification of exotic pests, and the monitoring and controlling of exotic pests.

NPQS has some 432 employees, with 22 branch offices. The administrative structures with associated functions were shown in the Power point presentation. There are 67 airlines and 578 flights per day at Incheon. There are 6 sites and 31 inspectors working around the clock. There were 19, 349 export inspections in 2009.

Research and development work is also carried out. Work on *Phoma spp* was described. Monitoring of citrus greening disease (Huanglongbing) is undertaken.

4. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was discussed and adopted (Appendix 1). Mr Young-Chul Jeong, Rep. of Korea was elected as chair of the meeting with Dr J. Hedley acting as rapporteur.

5. Review of documents and discussion on draft ISPMs

The following five draft standards were reviewed and comments were recorded. The drafts were introduced and the subsequent discussions chaired by the only Standards Committee Asian member present, Mr M Sakamura and Dr J. Hedley.

Participants were reminded to follow the *Instructions for the Use of the Template*.

The following sections capture most of the discussion points for each of the draft ISPMs reviewed.

5.1 DRAFT ISPM: Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies

The Power point display of the draft ISPM was presented by M. Sakamura who also led the discussions.

Korea noted that they did not see any reason for this standard – ISPM 14 is sufficient. New Zealand supported this noting the relationship with ISPM 14. Japan said that this could be an annex to ISPM 14. Indonesia stated that this standard involved staff from other than the agriculture department. New Zealand noted the use of contracting parties versus countries and the lack of clarity about which country, importing or exporting, accomplishes certain functions.

It was considered that the scope be amended to includeestablishment, use and maintenance

It was suggested that this standard should not be a stand-alone standard but be an annex to ISPM 14 or ISPM 30.

Para 18 had the reference to the appropriate level removed and phytosanitary import requirements used. Para 20 supervision changed to verification ...and between the NPPOs of the importing and exporting ...

There was some discussion about the inclusion of Drosophyllids but this was not agreed to. “Hosts” in the first sentence of the background was changed to “fruit”.

It was suggested by Rep. of Korea that para 24 be introduced a different way as in ISPM 28: Article VII.2g of the IPPC 1997 states that contracting parties ...for consistency with other standards. It was also suggested that this paragraph be deleted as it has no specific meaning in this standard.

Para 26 - the last line – the “and” was changed to “or” for clarity. With para 30 dash-point 5 – changed to “increased cost-effectiveness in meeting phytosanitary import requirements.” This was because of the present day restricted use of ALOP.

Para 39 variety was added to cultivar. In para 40, host preference was suggested as a replacement for host sequence or an addition to host sequence.

It was suggested that section 1.1 be divided into two sections so paras 38-43 could be in section 1.2 called Basic information on the establishment of an FF-SA

China suggested that in Para 43 “fruit bagging” could be added to the list of measures. It was suggested that “cultural practices” could be added instead.

Para 45 – critical was added before control points to be consistent with ISPN 14. Para 46 corrective actions was changed to corrective action plans.

The title of para 47 and in para 49 using the term Supervision was changed to verification.

Para 54 ... a critical was added to control point and an NPPOs added before importing and exporting contracting parties in third line.

With para 55 host was changed to fruit. China wanted to add “bagging” to the list in the first sentence. China also suggested the deletion of “specified population levels” and a change to ‘establishment of an ALPP’. The harvesting time was changed to harvesting at a non-host status stage.

Second dash point of para 60 – Korea suggested to change to - collection and destruction of fallen fruit from the orchard field, remove mature fruits from the tree after harvest season. With the 4th dash point, other was added before fruit fly host plants.

It was suggested that the ALOP of paras 62 and 66 be replaced with “phytosanitary import requirements”. With para 70 wrapping of fruit was deleted and insect-proof boxes was added.

Para 71 – waxing and water dipping removed as China suggested these were not effective at reducing the risk of fruit flies.

The heading of para 73 was deleted.

Para 74 1st sentence – add at end – e.g. cold treatments, heat treatments, vapour heat treatments, fumigation and irradiation may be used in combination with other measures in an FF-SA...Indonesia and Japan.

There was considerable discussion on para 77 onwards. The need for “maintenance” and the “work plans” A redraft of paras 78 and 79 were redrafted.

Para 85 and para 95 ALOP removed and replaced with phytosanitary import requirements. Two members of the participants expressed their concern on the use of non-compliance in this section. The use of faults in application etc in ISPM 30 was noted.

5.2 DRAFT ISPM: Submission of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM No.15

Power point display of the draft ISPM was presented by Mr Sakamura who also led the discussions.

The usage of “resistance” was questioned. “Least susceptible” might be more appropriate as the present usage of resistance implies a response to an external stimulus.

There was discussion on the re-infestation of treated wood .and how this should be dealt with. It was finally decided that this annex would follow the direction of ISPM 15 and deal with raw wood only.

Para 6 The 4th dash point was amend to effect of environmental conditions.

Para 8 it was suggested that termites and boring beetles be removed from the table. But some participants said that these organisms are found in forests. This resulted in a long discussion with no conclusions being reached.

Para 10 1st sentence groups of organisms and 2nd sentence – all organisms - replaced with pest groups

Para 28 4th sentence Japan suggested this should be 3 replicates. Para 29 change all organisms to pest groups.

There was a long discussion on the heading of Step 3 – some countries preferred to delete the heading as it gave too much emphasis to the procedure.

5.3 DRAFT ISPM: Integrated measures approach for managing pest risks associated with international trade of plants for planting

The Power point display of the draft ISPM was presented by Dr Hedley who also led the discussions.

Some participants expressed concern over the use of the term Integrated Measures Approach. Some suggested that this needed a definition to distinguish it from Systems approach.

There were still a number of importing and exporting NPPOs which have to be changed to NPPO of the importing/exporting country.

In para 34 it was suggested that tubers, corms and rhizomes be added to the plant parts.

One participant suggested adding to para 64 a new dash point – selection of a suitable method and frequency for irrigation to control pests. Another participant proposed the addition of a further dash point to para 90 – assisting the NPPO of the importing countries to carry out on-site inspections in the place of production. There was some disagreement from other members with this approach. Further to this point, it was also suggested by some members that para 102 have added a new section 4.6 Where agreed the NPPO of the exporting country should assist the NPPO of the importing country to undertake on-site inspection of the plant of production as part of risk analysis, audit or non-compliance inspection.

Para 106 – one country suggested adding two indents – establish traceability procedures and – conduct audits. It was agreed by the meeting that “review authorization programme” was unclear and it was suggested that this be replaced by – review the authorization of the place of production presented by the NPPO of the exporting country.

It was suggested by one country that the title of Appendix 1 be modified with the addition of –in the place of production – at the end.

In Table 2, the errors in the numbering of the references to the groups in table 1 were noted.

5.4 DRAFT ISPM: Irradiation treatment for *Ceratitis Capitata* (Annex to ISPM 28)

The Power point display of the draft ISPM was presented by Dr Hedley who also led the discussions.

There were no comments recorded on this draft standard.

5.5 DRAFT ISPM: Diagnostic protocol for Plum pox virus

The Power point display of the draft ISPM was presented by Dr Hedley who also led the discussions.

Para 2 – regarding the quote of the costs associated with Shark, it was suggested that the reference be added to the text.

Para 8 – one country proposed that the “identification” part of the title be deleted as the text did not discuss identification.

Para 9 – the host *Prunus mume* (Japanese apricot) was added to the list.

Para 12 – 2nd line, “minimum requirements” was replaced with “recommended methods” Line 5 “additional confidence” was replaced with “further verification”.

With Figure 1, it was suggested that the title be changed to read “Recommended methods for the detection....”

Para 53 last 4 lines – one member suggested that the temperature range should be replaced with a single figure as for para 84.

5.6 DRAFT ISPM 7: Phytosanitary certification system

This was introduced by Mr Sakamura with Power points supplied by Dr Hedley. The display included the major points of the revision of the standard. Mr Sakamura then went through the new draft in detail noting specific points.

The short period of retention of documents is only 12 months in para 45. Re App 1, China suggested that the NPPO be provided with guidelines, not the individual inspector. Others felt that the Guidelines for inspectors should be available. Some felt that the present standard was sufficient as a guideline.

5.7 DRAFT ISPM 12: Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates

This was introduced by Mr Sakamura with Power points supplied by Dr Hedley. The display included the major points of the revision of the standard. Mr Sakamura then went through the new draft in detail noting specific points.

The case where PCs are issued by territories was brought up. This point will be brought to the attention of the SC.

Re consignee and “to order” – re Myanmar – the consignee is eight small importers and won't issue to Order

Re section 2.3 China asked for examples of replacement or alteration of certification – are these editorial alternations

Re alterations should be on the original ...they are printed, should the alterations be in pen ..might not be accepted. Now they have to reprint.

Alterations must be done in the period of validity

There was some criticism of para 82. Could have a prior clause – where agreed by countries

Paragraphs 79 and 80 were stressed as new developments with the standard and it was suggested that participants ensure that their colleagues are aware of these matters.

Technical and editorial comments were made on the draft ISPMs and these comments are attached to the report (see Appendix 3). Participants were invited to take note of the comments collected at this workshop and utilize these comments as they felt appropriate in their preparation of national comments.

5.8 Guide to the implementation of phytosanitary standards in forestry

The Power point display was introduced by Dr Hedley. Some six countries have separate Forestry departments – some with regular liaison with the NPPO, some with none. It was noted that the term “phytosanitary standard” is not found in the book of ISPMs.

5.9 Review of progress with the Online comment system

The Power point display was briefly discussed by Dr Hedley. The problems of the previous system were noted with very few countries managing to have the system work properly.

5.10 Notes on the June Bureau meeting

Dr Hedley presented some notes on various matters of importance that were discussed at the June Bureau meeting.

6. Organization of future regional workshops on draft ISPMs (2011 session)

6.1 Identification of sponsors for future workshops

It is hoped that the Government of Korea will fund the meeting next year.

7. Any other business

7.1 Progress reports by participants on the implementation of adopted ISPMs

Some of the points mentioned are included below:

Vietnam – An outline of the structure of the plant protection department was provided. Vietnam has completed 10 Vietnamese standards and 4 specialised standards relating to ISPMs. The participant noted the lack of law and legal documents, a lack of professional skills, of equipment and difficulty with language problems. There are problems with ISPM 31 with all the formulas for the different sampling procedures.

Thailand – work to follow the standards and with stakeholders in their implementation. There have been problems with the implementation of ISPM 15 regarding the collaboration with other departments. There have been difficulties with the identification of some pathogens and EPPO protocols have been used. The sampling systems of Australia have been used as examples.

Sri Lanka – The administrative and legal, laws and regulations, structure was discussed. The powers provided by the Plant Protection Act were noted. The plant quarantine safeguard measures were listed. The APPPC table of acceptance of standards was displayed. The major constraints included the legislation which is being re-written. This is in the final stage.

Philippines – an example of implementation was discussed re methyl bromide fumigation and accredited fumigators as undertaken by AQIS and AFAS.

Pakistan – The extent and range of plant exports was described (200,000 PCs issued and not non-compliances noted). Trade arrangements with the US were noted. The forest departments are under provincial control not under the central plant protection administration. The treatment of seed is being carried out upon entry of seed (to deal with the emergency situation) instead of requiring treatment before entry.

Nepal – The country has one international airport and only land ports. There are 31 inspectors at the airport. The problem of a “porous” border was described. Exports include tea, coffee, peppers and some wooden materials. ISPM 15 has been a major concern.

Myanmar – 1940 legislation was used. 1993 law is an updated law. The certification system was amended in 1989. Currently the law is being reviewed. Trade is with 122 countries. A number of non-compliances have been notified. ISTA rules are used instead of ISPM 31. Registration of producers of ISPM 15 treated WP has been undertaken.

Malaysia – ISPM 15 is in full implementation as with ISPM 23. Malaysia had a fumigation accreditation scheme (MAFAS). Heat treatment providers are also accredited. The certification system was described (MPCA). The PEQ and biological systems were shown. The issue of the import of the double coconut was noted.

Laos – Progress is being made with ISPMs 6,7,12, 15 and others. A plant quarantine law was instituted in 2008. This outlines what can be imported, specifies the regulated pests and describes the function of the administrative body. Training requirements were described. A PRA committee is being set up. There is progress in the implementation of the certification system. Some parts of ISPM 15 are implemented – only for export.

Japan – The new potato microtuber system is being modified to meet the new ISPM. Sakamura mentioned the Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade. Japan has already started inspection related to AGM.

Indonesia – The process of implementation includes: a protocol is issued before the regulation is drafted. The draft is reviewed with other agencies. A list of the state of implementation is available.

India – Most ISPMs are implemented, ISPM 5 is not. A list of import schedules was presented making up the Import order. PRA is fully implemented in India. ISPM 15 is fully implemented in India. 121 companies are accredited for the use of MBr re this standard.

China – All 34 standards are being implemented in China. ISPM 15 is widely used and implemented. PRA, surveillance and certification national standards are developed. There is a team to review all the translations of the international standards. Re ISPM 32, the commodity list waiting for PRA – so ISPM 32 is being used to review the risk of commodities –so some commodities will not require PCs. China's regulation of 1997 states all products require a PC. This will require amendment. From 18 March this year the EC will test for residue of MBr, entry will be refused and the user fined if residue is detected. Heat treatment is also used in China but facilities are not available. With AGM – this is a challenge.

Cambodia – There is a new draft PQ law is undergoing ministerial discussion. This is long way from being endorsed by the National Assembly. With 6, 16 and 19, some work is being undertaken. Re 7, 12, 23 and 31 there is a constraint with human resource and treatment facilities.

Bangladesh – The country is mainly an importing country with few exports. The plant quarantine section has 1 director and four sub-directors with a total staff of approximately 400.

Korea – The country makes efforts to implement ISPMs. With 2 and 4 – has more than 150 cases of PRA to deal with. ISPM 13 is difficult to apply with so many imports into Korea – there are too many cases of non-compliance. With ISPM 15, private heat treatment companies – 200 companies are supervised. Frequently receive non-compliances from other countries. The sampling systems have yet to be revised. Re AGM, Korea is now monitoring ships. The law is being revised to allow private companies to inspect ships.

7.2 Presentation of online comment system for draft ISPMs

The Power point was shown by Dr Hedley. There was no discussion.

7.3 Participant survey

The on-line survey was exercised by participants, all participants were asked to submit their on-line survey form on line after back to home.

8. Date and location of the next meeting (between July – September 15, 2011)

The participants agreed that next year's meeting should be held in Korea from at dates to be arranged. The NPQS and APPPC would be requested to organize the meeting.

9. Close

Closing remarks were given by Dr Piao, FAO. Participants were thanked for their valuable contributions and encouraged to coordinate the submission of national country comments to the Secretariat. Dr Piao noted the establishment of an APPPC website separate from the IPP. Dr Piao also made a request to countries for further financial support for the APPPC. There would be funds required for the next session in the Philippines. Mr Jeong, Mr Sakamura and Mr Glen and Dr Hedley were also thanked for their special contribution. The Government of Korea was thanked for the financial support that made the workshop possible. Mr Jeong noted that the workshop had helped participants to understand the draft standards and to make comments on them. He thanked the facilitators and Dr Yim for their efforts in making the meeting a success.

Wednesday

8.30 – 10.30 am [Review on Draft 4- Irradiation treatment for Ceratitis Capitata \(Annex to ISPM 28\)](#)

10.30 – 11.00 am **Coffee break**

11.00 – 12.30 pm [Review on Draft 5- Diagnostic protocol for Plum pox virus](#)

12.30 – 2.00 pm **Lunch break**

2.00 – 3.30 pm Introduction and pre-review on draft revision of ISPM7

3.30 – 4.00 pm **Coffee break**

4.00 – 5.30 pm Introduction and pre-review on draft revision of ISPM12

Thursday

9.30 am – 4.00 pm Visit highland agriculture research institute and pest free area of seed potato production

Friday

8.30 – 10.30 am [Any other business](#)

1) Presentation on the Guidelines of the implementation of ISPMs in forestry (John/Sakamura)

2) Presentation of online comment system for draft ISPMs (John/Sakamura)

10.30 – 11.00 am **Coffee break**

11.00 – 12.30 pm 3) Progress of implementation of adopted ISPMs in countries
4) On-line feedback/survey

12.30 – 2.00 pm **Lunch break**

2.00 – 3.30 pm [Report and close of the meeting](#)

**Eleventh Regional Workshop for the Review of Draft International Standard
for Phytosanitary Measures
6-10 September 2010, Pyongchang, Republic of Korea**

List of Participants

Bangladesh

Mr. Nazmul Ahsan
Pesticide Regulation Officer
Plant Protection Wing
Room no. 301, 2nd floor, Rear Building
Dept. Agricultural Extension
Khamarbari, Farmgate, Dhaka-1215, Bangladesh
Fax: 88-02-8130338
Mobile: 88-0-1715040041, 15524756400
Email: cg_bp22@yahoo.com

Cambodia

Mr. Hean Vanhan
Deputy Director General
General Directorate of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture, Forest and Fisheries (MAFF)
#S6B, St.365, Sangkat Teuk Laak III, Khan Toul Kork, Phnom Penh
Cambodia
Tel: 855-12 818 216
Email: heanvanhan@gmail.com

China

1) Mr. Jingquan Zhu
Division of Plant Quarantine, National Agro-Tech Extension and Service Center (NATESC)
Ministry of Agriculture
No.20, Mai Zi Dian Street
Beijing 100125
China
Tel: (8610) 59194524
Fax: (8610) 59194726
Email: timzjq@agri.gov.cn

2) Ms. Xingxia Wu
Research Center for International Standard and Technical Regulations,
General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine
9 floor, Sanyuan Building, No.18 Xiba He Dong Li, Chaoyang District
Beijing 100028
China
Tel: (8610) 84603962
Fax: (8610) 84603817
Email: cqwuxx@sina.com.cn; wuxx@aqsiq.gov.cn

India

Mr. P. Manickam
Deputy Director (Plant Pathology)
Plant Quarantine Station, Bangalore, Karnataka state
India
Tel: 080-25225003 +91-9945038765 (M)
Fax: 080-25225003
Email: manickambl@gmail.com

Indonesia

Mr. Hermawan
Head of Sub Division
Technique and Method Development for Plant Quarantine
Tel/Fax: +62 21 781 6482
Email: hermawan@deptan.go.id

Japan

1) Mr. Motoi Sakamura
Director of Plant Protection Office
Plant Protection Division
MAFF
Address; 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,
Tokyo, Japan
Email : motoi_sakamura@nm.maff.go.jp

2) Mr. Yuji Kitahara
Section Chief,
Plant Protection Division,
MAFF
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku,
Tokyo, Japan
Email : yuji_kitahara@nm.maff.go.jp

3) Ms. Michiko Tabata
Officer
Yokohama Plant Protection, MAFF
5-57, Kitanaka-dori, Naka-ku,
Yokohama, Japan
Email : tabatam@pps.maff.go.jp

Lao People's Democratic Republic

Mr. Souliya Souvandouane
PRA team leader
Plant Quarantine Division
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Department of Agriculture
Lane Xang Avenue
Patuxay Square, P.O. Box 811
Vientiane, Lao PDR
Email: souliya_ss@yahoo.com

Malaysia

Mr. Mokhtarud-din Husain
Principal Assistant Director
Head of Domestic Quarantine, Enforcement Section
Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Division,
Department of Agriculture
Wisna Tani, Jalan Sultan Salahuddin 50632 Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia
Tel: +603-2030 1403;
Fax: +603-2691 3530;
Email: mokhtarud@doa.gov.my, mokh_zai@yahoo.com

Myanmar

Mr. Myo Nyunt
Manager, Plant Quarantine, Plant Protection Division
Myanma Agriculture Service
Bayintnaung Road, Gyogon, Insein
P.O 11011, Yangon
Myanmar
Tel: 95-1-644214
Fax: 95-1-644019
Email: mnyunt73@yahoo.com; naynyunt940@gmail.com

Nepal

Mr. Yubak Dhoj G.C.
Programme Director & National IPM Co-ordinator
Plant Protection Directorate
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives
Hariharbhawan
Kathmandu, Nepal
Tel: +977-1-5521597
Mobile: 9841097986
Fax: +977-5010112
Email: yubakgc@yahoo.com

New Zealand

Mr. John Hedley
Principal International Advisor
International Coordination
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Pastoral Horse, 25 The Terrace
P.O. Box 2526, Wellington
New Zealand
Tel: 644 894 0428
Mobile: 64298940428
Fax: 644 894 0733
Email: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz

Pakistan

Mr. Muhammad Ishfaque
Entomologist DPP
Karachi
10, A-Plant Protection, Infantry Road Dharam Pura
Lahore, Pakistan
Tel: +92 333 4372636
Fax: +92-42-36818403
Email: ishfaque20@yahoo.com

Philippines

Mr. Gerald Glenn F. Panganiban
Plant Quarantine Officer
Bureau of Plant Industry
692 San Andres Street
Malate, Manila
Philippines
Tel: (+63 2) 404-0409/524-2812
Email: Gerald_glenn97@hotmail.com; gfpanganiban@gmail.com

Rep. of Korea

Mr. Young-Chul Jeong
Deputy Director
International Quarantine Cooperation Division
National Plant Quarantine Service
Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MIFAFF)
433-1, Anyang 6-dong, Manan-Gu
Anyang-Si, Gyeonggi-Do
Rep. of Korea 430-016
Tel: 82-31-420-7664
Fax: 82-31-320-7605
Email: ycjeong9@korea.kr

Ms. Kyu-Ock Yim
Assistant Director
International Quarantine Cooperation Division
National Plant Quarantine Service
Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MIFAFF)
433-1, Anyang 6-dong, Manan-Gu
Anyang-Si, Gyeonggi-Do
Rep. of Korea 430-016
Tel: 82-31-420-7665
Fax: 82-31-320-7605
Email: koyim@korea.kr

Mr. Min-Goo Park
Central Post Entry Quarantine Station
National Plant Quarantine Service
Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MIFAFF)
234-1 Mangpo-dong Youngtong-Gu
Suwonsi Gyeonggi-Do
Rep. of Korea

Tel: 82-31-202-6988
Email: pmg@korea.kr

Sri Lanka

Mr. L.C. Wijetilaka
Research Officer / Deputy Director
National Plant Quarantine
Seria, Canada Friendship Road, Katunayaka, Sri Lanka
Tel: +94-01-2252028 / 29
Fax: +94-01-2253709
Email: npqs@sltnet.lk; lcwijetilaka@yahoo.com

Thailand

Mr. Surapol Yinasawapun
Chief, Plant Quarantine Research Group
Plant Protection Research and Development Office
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900
Thailand
Tel: + 662 579 8516
Fax: + 662 561 0744
Email: syinasawapun@yahoo.com

Mr. Prateep Arayakittipong
Standards Officer
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900
Tel: + 662 561 3388
Fax: + 662 561 3357
Email : prateep@acfs.go.th

Ms. Sangrawee Kausakul
Standard Officer
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900
Tel: + 662 561 3388
Fax: + 662 561 3357
Email : Sangrawee@acfs.go.th

Viet Nam

Ms. Ha Thanh Huong
Principal Plant Quarantine Officer, Plant Quarantine Division
Plant Protection Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Vietnam
Tel: 844 38518192
Fax: 844 35330043
Email: ppdhuong@yahoo.com, ppdhuong@gmail.com

FAO

Mr. Piao Yongfan
Senior Plant Protection Officer
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP)
39 Maliwan Mansion
Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: 662 697 4268
Fax: 662 697 4445
Email: yongfan.piao@fao.org

Completed templates with workshop comments on each ISPM
(see zip files)