



**Report on the**  
**Regional workshop for the review of phytosanitary surveillance in the**  
**context of the IPPC Standard (ISPM 6)**  
**Identification of challenges and best practice**  
17-20 January 2012, Yerevan, Armenia

**1. Opening of the session**

The Regional Workshop took place in the Best Western Hotel, Yerevan on 17-20 January 2012. The senior experts from the National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPO) from 12 countries, mainly representing plant quarantine services, participated in the workshop (List of participants is presented in Annex 1). The language of the workshop was Russian. Government officials from the Food Safety Department, Ministry of Agriculture, Republic of Armenia, colleagues from the Forestry Agency and Yerevan University also attended the workshop. The workshop was organized by the REU Plant Production and Protection Officer in close collaboration with IPPC Secretariat and FAOR in Republic of Armenia. Thus, FAO and IPPC in the workshop were represented by Mr. Avetik Nersisyan, REU, Mr. Hafiz Muminjanov, SEC, and Mr. Geza Gabriel JTO, REU. Ms. Gayane Nasoyan, AFAOR in Republic of Armenia also attended the workshop. EPPO in the meeting was represented by Mr. Andrei Orlinski, Scientific Officer. The seminar was opened by Mr Abram Bakhchagulyan (Head of the State Food Safety Service, Armenia). Opening remarks were also made by Mr Artur Nikoyan (Head of the State Plant Quarantine Inspection Service, Armenia), Ms Gayane Nasoyan (Assistant FAO Representative, Armenia) and Mr Avetik Nersisyan (FAO Regional Plant Production and Protection Officer) on behalf of IPPC and FAO.

**2. Purpose of the workshop**

IPPC/FAO explained the purpose of the workshop, which was:

- to provide reviewers of the IPPC standard setting team with feedback from contracting parties to the IPPC on ISPM 6, 4 and 8. These standards are currently up for review;
- to analyze responses from contracting parties on the level of implementation of ISPM 6 and identify main challenges for its implementation; This data will provide the IPPC

capacity building team with guidance on how best to approach country surveillance capacity building in this area. The data will be shared with RPPOs to assist them in the same regard.

It has been explained that the data from the workshop will be further analyzed by a global expert group on pest surveillance in a workshop to be hosted later in 2012 by the APPPC. The expert group will identify concrete actions to be followed up on through projects including development of additional guidance such as through manuals, training materials. It is expected that at least 1 training course will be developed in this follow up initiative.

Participants have been informed that discussions will take place in Jan-Feb in all regions and the outcomes of these sessions will be presented in the CPM7. In addition to the main purposes also other issues related to cooperation in phytosanitary were to be discussed in the workshop.

FAO/IPPC underscored that one of the main tasks is to define future actions. FAO is committed to provide support to the countries. EPPO is also ready to support, although not all countries in the region are EPPO members. Thus, EPPO representative Mr Andrei Orlinski was asked to make a short presentation on EPPO work.

In his presentations he emphasized the importance of the phytosanitary risk analysis and also the sharing of the results of these analyses.

### **3. IPPC overview**

#### **3.1 Progress with ISPM development**

Mr Nersisyan gave a presentation on the overview of International Plant Protection Convention including the standard setting mechanisms, implementation and exchange of information, IPPC Standards and the SPS Agreement, IPPC administrative framework and the role of the national/ regional plant protection organizations in this context.

### **4. Adoption of agenda**

After the election of the chair and the reporters of the workshop – Mr Meruzhyan Tarzyan (chief of department, State Plant Quarantine Inspection Service, Armenia) has been elected as chair and Mr Hafiz Muminjanov and Mr Geza Gabriel as reporters – the group reviewed and adopted the agenda (Annex 2). Meeting documents including

hardcopies of ISPM 6, 4 and 8 standards and the empty questionnaire forms on these 3 standards were also provided to every participant as workshop handouts.

## **5. ISPM 6**

### **5.1. Overview of ISPM 6**

#### **5.1.1 General surveillance**

#### **5.1.2 Specific surveillance**

Summary presentation was made by Mr Nersisyan on the overview of ISPM 6, including the introduction of the characteristics of general and specific surveillance, best surveillance practices and technical requirements for diagnostics of pests, before the general and group discussions took place. Further the participants gave presentations on the implementation of the ISPM6 in their home countries and discussed the problems.

### **5.2 Summary of results of the questionnaire**

#### **5.2.1 In the region**

All the countries participating in the workshop have filled in the relevant questionnaire on the implementation of ISPM 6. Those countries, which previously had difficulties with the online questionnaire, had the possibility on the spot to discuss, fill in and give the survey forms in hardcopies to the representatives of IPPC/FAO.

## **6. Review of best practices for phytosanitary pest surveillance**

### **6.1 Country reports on best practices**

Countries presented their best practices and filled in and provided the representatives with the relevant forms on the identification of best practice case in the context of ISPM 6.

## **7. The use of ISPM 6 in the region**

### **7.1 Discussions on advantages in the use of the standard**

### **7.2 Discussions on the difficulties in implementation of ISPM 6**

According to the outcome of the general and the group discussions the following most participants mentioned that the national plant protection legislations in general are in line with the standard, but they face difficulties in the implementation of the standard due to the lack of regulations, especially the ones related to the international trade.

Moreover it was mentioned that due to the lack of technical capacities of experts of NPPOs it is difficult to carry out the activities according to the standard. There is lack of information on pests and diseases and information exchange between the countries in different regions. For instance, while marketing cherries from Uzbekistan to Korea, the importer requested detailed information on pests and diseases of cherry, but the NPPO could not provide and could not get any help from the plant protection institute. The participants requested FAO to assist in conducting both in country and international trainings, supporting the strengthening of institutional capacities, developing methodologies, supply of collections of pest samples, development of investment projects for refurbishment of plant quarantine facilities, etc. Thus, there is a need to continuous capacity development and technical support that should be jointly support by FAO, IPPC and EPPO.

Lack of cooperation in the national and regional level as well as between public and private sector was noted as a problem too. In most of the countries there are separate institutions on plant protection and plant quarantine functioning and carrying out monitoring, assessment and forecasting independently. Capacity of the national research institutes on plant protection not in all countries is sufficient to provide scientific support. In some of the countries the training centers responsible also for development of methodologies are available, but they do not function in full capacity due to lack of financing and lack of well trained trainers. Private sector is not involved in assessments due to low potential on plant protection and plant quarantine.

The major problems indicated by the participants include the lack of methodologies on identification of quarantine pests, the lack of experts on bacteriology, mycology, virology, mycology and nemathodology in the Central Office of NPPO and introduction quarantine nurseries, lack of modern equipment, lack of methodology and collections of existing and new quarantine pests, expansion the list of quarantine pests, e.g. ambrosia, melon fly (*Myiopardalis pardalina*), american white fly (*Hyphantria cunea* Drury), etc.

In most of the countries a plant quarantine laboratory does not exist or unequipped. There are no labs for entomological, phytopathological, virological, nemathodological and herbological studies.

In general, it was noted that the main problem limiting conducting specific survey is lack of conditions, e.g. transportation means, tools for inspectors, lab equipment, well trained experts, methodology/guidelines, proper office premises/facilities, etc.

The colleagues from Armenia shared their experience in development of the Register of producers, importer and exporters of plant and plant products that significantly assists implementation of the standards.

## **8. Requirements for improving national pest surveillance**

### **8.1 Suggested tools and technical resources needed to implement ISPM 6**

### **8.2 Recommendations for improving ISPM 6**

During the workshop a discussion on translation and usage of terminology in Russian and English took place. The participants were concerned on correct translation and use of terminology, e.g. “phytosanitary”, “plant quarantine”, “plant health”, etc. They appreciated providing the Russian translation of the standards, but expressed their concern on quality and correctness of translation. In most documents in Russian the terminology used does not meet the phytosanitary terminology. Thus, they proposed the terminology included in the glossary to be used for all documents in all languages.

In general it was noted by the participants that the ISPM6 is well formulated, but there are problems with its implementation related to the national policies/legislation. The ISPM6 allows coordinate activities of different public institution on surveillance as well as cooperation between inspection and users of information. Thus, strengthened cooperation between NPPO, FAO and EPPO provides possibilities for improving activities on defining pests in early stages and to control them.

While discussing the text of ISPM6 the participants proposed to remove the Bayer Codes from the ISPM6 as they do not exist anymore and to replace by EPPO Codes. They also proposed to include use of pheromone traps for specific surveys. Another proposal was to update the terms and acronyms according to the last version of Glossary (ISPM5) and to add the 4th type of survey – “complex survey” (to check all pests present in an area) under “specific surveys”. This type of survey was very usual in USSR and is still used in many countries.

## **9. Future work**

### **9.1 Contributions to this project (symposium, preparation of training material)**

It was proposed to conduct next regional training workshop on Phytosanitary Risk Assessment and Pest Lists by October 2012. Proposed countries to be the host of the next workshop were Belarus and Moldova.

The following topics were proposed for further training:

- Conducting phytosanitary risk assessment (PRA)
- Specific surveys
- Use of pheromone traps in phytosanitary surveys

### **9.2 Work in the region**

During the workshop Mr Nersisyan gave an overview on the types of technical assistance provided by FAO in the field. From his presentation the participants could get familiar with the nature and purpose of FAO's Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) which is a modality by which FAO funds are used for technical assistance projects in eligible FAO member countries. According to this the countries have been encouraged to examine the possibility of using this tool to improve their technical capacities in the context of the implementation of ISPM6 standard.

## **10. Any other business**

### **10.1. Recommendations on what needs to be revised in ISPM 4**

### **10.2. Recommendations on what needs to be revised in ISPM 8**

The ISPM4 and ISPM8 were also reviewed by the participants. They have noted that the ISPM4 is very important and useful; reflected in the national legislation, but it is difficult to establish and maintain the pest free areas (PFA) due to existing problems. Also was suggested to use the terminology according to the Glossary (ISPM5). However, the ISPM8 is not clearly formulated, thus, the text should be simplified. Also there is a need for clarifications on different pest status. In the Russian version of the standard, in paragraph 3.1.3 there is a need to indicate the exact timing, e.g. one growing season, instead of nearest future. The part concerning practices on pest reporting would be more appropriate to locate in ISPM17. In regard of implementation of the standard the participants proposed to provide a technical assistance in the

installation of software in promotion of the system on determination of pest location in GPS.

### **11. Adoption of report**

The seminar report has been drafted at the meeting and has been introduced to the participants. Participants have agreed with the content of it and they considered, that their remarks, suggestions are well reflected in the document.

### **12. Close**

Closing remarks were given by Participants were thanked for their valuable contributions and encouraged to coordinate the submission of national country comments to the Secretariat. The IPPC/FAO and EPPO were also thanked for their special contribution. Finally, it was noted that experience and continuity were achieved by having the same person participate each year and the group benefited from the expertise of many different disciplines and experiences.

### **Appendices:**

Annex 1- List of the Participants

Annex 2- Agenda



**International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)**  
**Regional workshop for the Global review of phytosanitary surveillance in the context of the IPPC Standard (ISPM6) – identification of challenges and best practice**  
 17-20 January 2012, Yerevan, Armenia  
**List of Participants**

	Country	Name	Title	Organization	Contacts
1	Albania	Mr Josef TEDESCHINI	Specialist	Department of Plant Protection, University of Agriculture Tirana	Tel: +355682210292 Tirana <a href="mailto:ipmcresp@icc-al.org">ipmcresp@icc-al.org</a>
2	Armenia	Mr Abram BAKHCHAGULYAN	Head	State Food Safety Service	0041 Yerevan 12 Erebuni str. Tel: (+37410) 45 09 60; (+37410) 49 91 82; Fax: (+37410) 45 09 60 <a href="mailto:sfssarmenia@gmail.com">sfssarmenia@gmail.com</a>
		Ms Lusine DAVTYAN	Deputy chief	State Food Safety Service	0041 Yerevan 12 Erebuni str. Tel: (+37410) 45 09 60; (+37410) 49 91 82; Fax: (+37410) 45 09 60
		Mr Artur NIKOYAN	Head	State Plant Quarantine Inspection Service	0051 Yerevan, 39/a Mamikonyants str. Tel: (+ 374 10) 29-72-13; Fax: (+ 374 10) 29 74 30 <a href="mailto:nikoyanartur@rambler.ru">nikoyanartur@rambler.ru</a>



		Mr Gurgen KHACHATRYAN	Expert	State Plant Quarantine Inspection Service	Kotayk region <a href="mailto:phytosanitary@rambler.ru">phytosanitary@rambler.ru</a>
		Mr Meruzhyan TARZIAN	Chief of Department	State Plant Quarantine Inspection Service	0051 Yerevan, 39/a Mamikonyants str. Tel/Fax: (+ 374 10) 29-74-30 <a href="mailto:mm.tarzyan@gmail.com">mm.tarzyan@gmail.com</a>
		Ms Meri SHISHMANYAN	Expert	State Plant Quarantine Inspection Service	-
		Mr Taron MANIKYAN	Phytosanitary expert	Armenian Forestry Agency	-
		Mr Armenak TER-GRIGORYAN	Phytosanitary expert	Agriculture University Yerevan	-
		Mr Hasmik HAKOBOCHYAN	Expert	Armenian Forestry Agency	-
<b>3</b>	<b>Belarus</b>	Ms Hanna MIALESHKA	Deputy Director of Department of Veterinary and Food Surveillance	Ministry of Agriculture and Food	Starovilenski tract 91, Minsk, 220053 Tel. +375-17-233-25-12; Fax +375-17-288-24-57 <a href="mailto:ofsn3@tut.by">ofsn3@tut.by</a> ; <a href="mailto:bshn@tut.by">bshn@tut.by</a>
		Mr Leanid PLIASHKO	Director	Main State Inspectorate for Seed Breeding, Quarantine and Plant Protection	Krasnozvezdnaya str.8, Minsk, 220034 Tel. + 375-17-284-40-61 (+375 – 17 – 288 – 11 - 67 engl.); fax +375 – 17-288 – 24 - 57 <a href="mailto:labqbel@tut.by">labqbel@tut.by</a>
<b>4</b>	<b>Georgia</b>	Mr Otar SKHVITARIDZE	Head of Plant Quarantine Division	National Food Agency, Ministry of Agriculture of Georgia	6 Marshal Gelovani Ave., 0159 Tbilisi Mob: (+995 95) 22 65 65 Tel: (+995 32) 91 91 67 (ext.143)

					<a href="mailto:skhvitaridzeo@yahoo.com">skhvitaridzeo@yahoo.com</a>
5	Kazakhstan	Mr Symbat KALIASKAROV	Expert on Phytosanitary Security	Committee of State Inspection in Agriculture;  Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Kazakhstan	010000 Astana; 36. Kenesary str, Kazakhstan Tel: +7 7172 555-772, +7 7172 555-944 <a href="mailto:symbat_k@minagri.kz">symbat_k@minagri.kz</a> <a href="mailto:kaliaskarov.s@minagri.gov.kz">kaliaskarov.s@minagri.gov.kz</a>
6	Kyrgyzstan	Mr Adyl NURBAEV	Main specialist	Plant Quarantine Service Ministry of Agriculture;	60 str. Mayakovsky, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan Tel:+996(312)379718; Mob: +996(555)906898 <a href="mailto:nurbaevkg@gmail.com">nurbaevkg@gmail.com</a>
7	Lithuania	Mr Gintaras LAPINSKAS	Head of Phytosanitary division	State Plant Service under the Ministry of Agriculture	Kalvariju str. 62, Vilnius Lithuania, LT-09304 Tel.: +370 5 273 13 11 Fax: +370 5 275 2128 <a href="mailto:gintaras.lapinskas@vatzum.lt">gintaras.lapinskas@vatzum.lt</a>
8	Moldova	Mr Lilian ISTRATI	Deputy Director	General Inspectorate for Phytosanitary Surveillance and Seed Control	Chisinau Tel: +373 22 210 009 ; +373 22 210 236 <a href="mailto:l.istrati@mail.ru">l.istrati@mail.ru</a>
9	Tajikistan	Mr Nusratullo BEGOV	Deputy Head	State Inspectorate Service for Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary; Ministry of Agriculture	Shark street, 2nd Intersection 10 734002 Dushanbe Tel: (+992 37) 228-90-45 <a href="mailto:tojikquarantine@gmail.com">tojikquarantine@gmail.com</a>
10	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Mr Aleksandar DILJE	Expert	Phytosanitary Directorate Ministry of Agriculture	Skopje Tel: +389 70 403926 <a href="mailto:aleksandar.dilje@mzsv.gov.mk">aleksandar.dilje@mzsv.gov.mk</a>

11	Ukraine	Ms Olena SHAKINA	Main Specialist	Ministry of Agricultural Policy;  Main State Plant Quarantine Inspection	7 Koloskova str. Kyiv 03138 Tel: (38044) 524 77 07 <a href="mailto:post@golovderzhkarantyn.gov.ua">post@golovderzhkarantyn.gov.ua</a> <a href="mailto:a-shybanova@rambler.ru">a-shybanova@rambler.ru</a>
12	Uzbekistan	Mr Victor PODAROV	Leading Specialist	Main State Inspection on Plant Quarantine	17h 1 <sup>st</sup> bling alley, Bobur str., Tashkent 100100 Tel: +998-712- 556239  <a href="mailto:glavkaruz@mail.ru">glavkaruz@mail.ru</a>
13	EPPO	Mr Andrei D. ORLINSKI	Scientific Officer	European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)	21 Boulevard Richard Lenoir, Paris 75011 France Tel: +33 1 45 20 78 09; Fax: +33 1 70 76 65 47 <a href="mailto:Orlinski@epo.fr">Orlinski@epo.fr</a>
14	FAO	Mr Avetik NERSISYAN	Plant Production and Protection Officer	FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia	1068 Budapest, Benczur utca 34 Hungary Tel: +36 1 814 1240 Fax: +36 1 351 7029 <a href="mailto:Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org">Avetik.Nersisyan@fao.org</a>
		Mr Hafiz MUMINJANOV	Plant Production and Protection Officer	FAO Subregional Office for Central Asia	Ivedik Caddesi No.55 Yenimahalle – 06170 Ankara Turkey Tel: +90-312-3079526 Fax: +90-312-3271705 <a href="mailto:Hafiz.Muminjanov@fao.org">Hafiz.Muminjanov@fao.org</a>
		Mr Geza GABRIEL	Junior Technical Officer for Plant Production and Protection	FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia	1068 Budapest, Benczur utca 34 Hungary Tel: +36 1 814 1240 Fax: +36 1 351 7029 <a href="mailto:Geza.Gabriel@fao.org">Geza.Gabriel@fao.org</a>
		Ms Gayane NASOYAN	Assistant FAO Representative in	FAO Representation in	Governmental building No 3 1st. Floor, Room 124

			Armenia	Armenia	0010, Yerevan, Armenia Telephone: +374-10-525453 Fax: +374-10-565871 E-mail: <a href="mailto:FAO-AM@fao.org">FAO-AM@fao.org</a>
15	<b>EUNDP</b>	Ms Lidija NECAJEVA	EU advisor on phytosanitary issues	EUNDP	Tel: +370 687 20236 <a href="mailto:lidijanecajeva@yahoo.com">lidijanecajeva@yahoo.com</a>



International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)  
Regional workshop for the Global review of phytosanitary surveillance in the context of the IPPC  
Standard (ISPM6) – identification of challenges and best practice  
17-20 January 2012, Yerevan, Armenia

**Agenda**

<b>17 January (Tuesday)</b>	
09.30 – 10.00	Registration of participants
10.00 – 10.30	Opening of the Workshop - Welcoming speeches from Armenian Government, FAO/IPPC - Local and logistical information - Introductions - Overview of IPPC/FAO activities
10.30 - 10.45	<i>Coffee break</i>
10.45 - 13.00	Overview of ISPM6
13.00-14.00	<i>Lunch break</i>
14.00 - 15.30	Challenges for Implementation of ISPM6 (open or breakout group discussions)
15.30 - 15.45	<i>Coffee break</i>
15.45 - 17.00	Continue Challenges for Implementation of ISPM6 (open or breakout group discussions)
<b>18 January (Wednesday)</b>	
9. 00 - 10.30	Review of Best Practices for phytosanitary surveillance (Country presentations)
10.30-10.45	<i>Coffee break</i>
10.45- 13.00	Review of Best Practices for phytosanitary surveillance (Country presentations)
13.00-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00 - 17.00	Discussion
<b>19 January (Thursday)</b>	
9. 00 - 10.30	Needs assessment for identifying tools and technical resources to facilitate the implantation of ISPM6
10.30-10.45	<i>Coffee break</i>
10.45- 13.00	Recommendations for improving ISPM6 and action plan
13.00 - 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
14.00 - 15.00	Next steps
15.00 - 15.30	Any other business - Challenges for ISPM4
15.30-15.45	<i>Coffee break</i>
15.45-16.15	Continue: Any other business - Challenges for ISPM8
16.15-17.00	Discussion
<b>20 January (Friday)</b>	
9. 00 - 10.30	Adoption of the report
10.30-10.45	<i>Coffee break</i>
10.45- 13.00	Close
13.00 - 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>