

# **REPORT OF THE IPPC-APPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP**

**8 – 12 September 2025**

**Amid Hotel, Seoul, Republic of Korea**



## Contents

<b>SUMMARY OF MEETING .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>OPENING OF SESSION &amp; MEETING ARRANGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1. Opening of the workshop .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>1.1. Welcome remarks .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2. Meeting arrangements.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.1. Election of chair and rapporteur.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.2. Adoption of the agenda.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Administrative matters.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3.1. Participant list &amp; other administrative matters.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>IPPC UPDATES.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Updates on governance and strategic issues.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4.1. Governance and strategy (Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), CPM Bureau) .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4.2. Update from the IPPC Secretariat on Communications (IDPH &amp; Comms Networks).....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4.3. Update from the Standards Committee.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4.4. Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>4.5. Getting in touch about CPM FG on sea containers .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4.6. Getting In Touch About CPM FG on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (FGSA).....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>4.7. Getting In Touch About CPM FG on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (FG GPRC) .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>4.8. Getting In Touch About CPM FG on plant health in the context of One Health .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>SECTION 1: CONSULTATION ON ISPMs.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5. Consultation on ISPMs.....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.1 1st Consultation: Draft annex <i>International movement of fresh banana (Musa spp.) fruit</i> (2023-028) to ISPM 46 (<i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i>) .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>5.2 1st Consultation: Draft <i>International movement of fresh taro (Colocasia esculenta) for consumption</i> annex (2023-023) to ISPM 46 (<i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i>) .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>5.3 2nd Consultation: Draft revision of ISPM 26 (<i>Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>) (2021- 010).....</b>	<b>24</b>

5.4	2nd Consultation: draft annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection) .....	32
5.5	Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Revision of ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection) .....	36
5.6	Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Annex Remote audits to ISPM 47 (Audit in the phytosanitary context) .....	37
5.7	Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates) .....	39
5.8	Discussion on rethinking ISPMs .....	40
SECTION 2: FAO/RPPO FRAMEWORK .....		41
6.	Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/RPPOs .....	41
6.1	APPPC activities .....	41
6.2	IPPC Call for topics: lessons learned and future topic submissions .....	43
6.3	Identification of regional IPPC implementation issues to share with the IC .....	44
SECTION 3: MOVING TOGETHER FROM IDEAS TO ACTIONS .....		46
7.	Moving together from ideas to action .....	46
7.1	Regional issue on IPPC ePhyto solution .....	46
7.2	IPPC Plant Health Campus .....	46
7.3	E-commerce .....	47
7.4	IPPC Observatory: Overview of the IPPC 3rd general survey questionnaire. .....	48
7.5	IPPC workshop on Systems Approaches .....	49
CLOSING SESSION .....		50
8.	Conclusion of the workshop .....	50
9.	Online survey of the workshop .....	51
10.	Date and venue of the next regional workshop .....	51
11.	Evaluation of workshop and adoption of report .....	51
12.	Close of meeting .....	51
ATTACHMENT 1: Agenda .....		52
ATTACHMENT 2: List of Participants .....		55
ATTACHMENT 3: List of acronyms used in this report .....		60

## SUMMARY OF MEETING

The APPPC workshop was held from 8-12 September 2025 to review the draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) undergoing first and second consultation. The aim was to discuss and agree APPPC regional comments for 2025. In addition to this, the workshop provided updates on IPPC-related developments in standards and implementation, strengthening technical capacity across various aspects of plant protection, and fostering the exchange of experiences and insights among countries in the region.

The draft ISPMs for discussion were:

### First consultation

1. Draft annex International movement of fresh *Musa* spp. fruit (2023-028) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)
2. Draft annex International movement of fresh *Colocasia esculenta* fruit (2023-023) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)

### Second consultation

3. Draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010)
4. Draft annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines of inspection*)

The draft specifications for ISPMs briefly discussed were:

5. Annex: Remote audits (2023-031) to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*)
6. Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (2023-020)
7. Revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2023-014)

The agreed regional comments on the draft ISPMs were entered into the IPPC online commenting system (OCS) during the meeting at: <https://ippc.int/en/online-comment-system>. This report provides a description of the discussion to support the agreed regional comments.

Presenters provided updates on IPPC SC and IC activities, CPM Focus Group activities, the ePhyto solution, the Plant Health Campus, e-commerce, the Observatory and the IPPC Workshop on Systems Approaches planned for December 2025. There was also discussion on ‘*Rethinking ISPMs*’ as well as regional standards for phytosanitary measures including the draft RSPM *Safe movement of shipping containers* and two regional commodity standards.

The next regional workshop on draft ISPMs is tentatively planned for 7-11 September 2026 hosted by the Republic of Korea.

## SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS

1. Ms Sophie PETERSON to share the Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) process for the selection of regional nominees for various IPPC groups.
2. Ms Kyu-Ock YIM to discuss with Mr Glen PANGANIBAN and the IPPC Secretariat about the nomination and funding process for attendance at IPPC groups.

3. APPPC members and observers to share feedback with Ms Mutya FRIO, IPPC Communications Specialist ([mutya.frio@fao.org](mailto:mutya.frio@fao.org)) on:
  - Key information needs
  - Support from IPPC, NPPOs, and RPPOs
  - Role of regional/national media
4. APPPC members and observers to submit data to the IPPC Secretariat on the interception of pests and contamination on sea containers using the *Container Inspection Recording Template* in the IPPC guidelines for sea-container surveys for NPPOs (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/90644/>).
5. APPPC members and observers to submit to the IPPC Secretariat national examples of pest risks linked to humanitarian aid.
6. APPPC members and observers to review the draft report of the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (FG-GPRC) when available and provide feedback to the IPPC Secretariat by March 2026.
7. APPPC members and observers to send ideas to Ms Lihong ZHU ([Lihong.Zhu@mpi.govt.nz](mailto:Lihong.Zhu@mpi.govt.nz)) regarding topics to be covered during the planned regional workshop on commodity standards in the Philippines in 2026.
8. APPPC members and observers to send to the IPPC Secretariat by 15 October, technical information for apple fruit called for by the Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS).
9. APPPC members and observers to support the agreed regional comments in the IPPC OCS and add any country comments on the Draft annex *International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit* (2023-028) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) considering the discussions at the regional workshop.
10. APPPC members and observers to support the agreed regional comments in the IPPC OCS and add any country comments on the Draft annex *International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta fruit* (2023-023) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) considering the discussions at the regional workshop.
11. Ms Joanne WILSON to prepare a paper to the IPPC Standards Committee concerning:
  - The inclusion of pests in commodity standards
  - Enhancing transparency for the exclusion of pests in commodity standards

Ms WILSON to circulate the draft paper to the APPPC SC members for review before submitting to the IPPC Secretariat by mid-October.
12. APPPC members and observers to support the agreed regional comments in the IPPC OCS and add any country comments on the draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010) considering the discussions at the regional workshop.

13. APPPC members and observers to support the agreed regional comments in the IPPC OCS and add any country comments on the draft annex *Field inspection* (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines of inspection*).
14. APPPC members and observers to provide country comments in the IPPC OCS on the specification for the revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2023-014) considering regional discussions.
15. APPPC members and observers to consider nominating suitable candidates for the expert working group (EWG) for the revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2023-014) when an IPPC call for experts is made and submit discussion papers to support the work of the EWG.
16. APPPC members and observers to provide country comments in the IPPC OCS on the specification for the Annex *Remote audits* (2023-031) to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*).
17. APPPC members and observers to consider nominating suitable candidates for the expert working group (EWG) for the Annex *Remote audits* (2023-031) to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*) when an IPPC call for experts is made and submit discussion papers to support the work of the EWG.
18. APPPC members and observers to provide country comments in the IPPC OCS on the specification for the revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (2023-020).
19. APPPC members and observers to consider nominating suitable candidates for the expert working group (EWG) for the revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (2023-020) when an IPPC call for experts is made and submit discussion papers to support the work of the EWG.
20. APPPC members and observers to support the Asian region paper on ‘*Rethinking ISPMs*’ by agreeing/not agreeing by 26 September for the IPPC SPG meeting in late October 2025 and elect a champion to present it at SPG.
21. APPPC members and observers to consider preparing and submitting papers to the SPG about their country perspectives on ‘*Rethinking ISPMs*’.
22. APPPC members and observers to provide comments on the RSPM ‘*The safe movement of shipping containers*’ by 31 October using the IPPC OCS.
23. Ms Sophie PETERSON to circulate to APPPC members and observers a copy of the draft Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) sea container strategy.
24. APPPC members and observers to provide comments on the RSPM *Options for phytosanitary measures for the international movement of fresh durian (Durio zibethinus) fruit*, when it is released for consultation.



25. APPPC members and observers to provide comments on the RSPM *Options for phytosanitary measures for the international movement of green coffee (Coffea spp.) bean*, when it is released for consultation.
26. APPPC members and observers to consider submitting via the IPPC website, new topics for ISPMs, implementation materials and guidance.
27. APPPC members and observers to check IPPC contact point information on the IPP and update as needed with the IPPC Secretariat to ensure APPPC and IPPC notifications are received.
28. APPPC members and observers to respond to IPPC surveys when requested by the IPPC Secretariat.
29. APPPC members and observers to submit ‘success stories’ on systems approaches to the IPPC Secretariat when the call for participants for the IPPC *Workshop on Systems Approaches* in Chile in December 2025, is issued.

## OPENING OF SESSION & MEETING ARRANGEMENTS

### 1. Opening of the workshop

#### 1.1. Welcome remarks

Ms Kyu-Ock YIM welcomed participants to the meeting. She introduced the IPPC Secretariat representative, Ms Maki IIZUKA and the pre-recorded welcoming remarks by the Deputy Director General of FAO, Ms Beth BECHDOL. Ms BECHDOL’s presentation highlighted the Food and Agriculture Organization’s (FAO) strong commitment to advancing global plant health and supporting the implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). She emphasized the importance of regional collaboration in addressing emerging phytosanitary challenges, particularly in the context of climate change, trade dynamics, and food security. Her remarks commended the efforts of member countries in strengthening national plant protection systems and encouraged continued engagement in standard-setting, capacity development, and innovation. Ms BECHDOL also reaffirmed FAO’s support for the IPPC’s strategic goals and its role in promoting safe and sustainable agricultural practices worldwide. Ms YIM informed the workshop participants of the appointment of the new IPPC Secretary, Mr Enrico PEROTTI.

The APQA Director and Commissioner were unable to be present at the beginning of the meeting to welcome participants but would welcome everyone at the official dinner on Monday evening.

Ms Maki IIZUKA, also welcomed participants on behalf of the IPPC Secretariat.

Apologies were received from Mr Yubak DHOJ GC, APPPC Secretariat.

## **2. Meeting arrangements**

### **2.1. Election of chair and rapporteur**

Ms Kyu-Ock YIM, from the Republic of Korea, was elected as the chair.

Ms Joanne WILSON, New Zealand, was designated as the report writer for the workshop, and Ms Keira BEATTIE, and Ms Mi Chi YEA were nominated as rapporteurs. Comments on ISPMs were recorded in the OCS by Ms Jenny LAP and Ms Donam KIM.

### **2.2. Adoption of the agenda**

Ms YIM discussed the agenda (Attachment 1) and noted that Ms Joanne WILSON would record comments on the topic of '*Rethinking ISPMs*' and develop a paper for the region to be presented and discussed on Friday. The shipping container RSPM would be presented during the APPPC update.

## **3. Administrative matters**

### **3.1. Participant list & other administrative matters**

Ms Mi Chi YEA gave an overview of the meeting arrangements including the official welcome dinner (6.30pm), the field trip to NH NONGWOO BIO seed company on Thursday (8.30am start) and the lunch on the final day of the meeting hosted by the Director General of APQA. She briefly provided information about the city and local sites in Seoul.

The participant list is in Attachment 2 of this report. The meeting was attended by participants from 16 countries.

Attachment 3 contains a list of acronyms used in this report.

## **IPPC UPDATES**

## **4. Updates on governance and strategic issues**

### **4.1. Governance and strategy (Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), CPM Bureau)**

Ms Sophie PETERSON provided an overview of the IPPC (the vision, mission objectives, its history and core activities), the roles of its various governance and subsidiary bodies, meetings and decisions i.e. CPM-19, CPM Bureau, the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), Standards Committee (SC) and Standards Committee 7 (SC-7), Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), Focus Groups (FGs) and the Africa Phytosanitary Programme. FGs covered topics including strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems, climate change and phytosanitary issues, sea containers, safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid, global phytosanitary research coordination, plant health in the context of one health, and the diagnostic laboratory network intended to be formed.

Ms PETERSON highlighted that the main topic for the SPG meeting this year would focus on making the ISPMs more accessible and highlighted that a later agenda item would discuss regional comments on '*Rethinking ISPMs*'. It was hoped that an APPPC paper could be presented following the regional workshop. She noted that there was funding available for a member from the Asian region to attend the SPG meeting and that the IPPC Secretariat was seeking expressions of interest. She encouraged those that were interested to apply.



Ms PETERSON also highlighted that a call for experts for the EWG for the safe provision of food and humanitarian aid would be announced shortly and APPPC countries were encouraged to nominate experts.

Ms PETERSON described the key highlights from CPM-19 which included the adoption of the first annex, the *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit* to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*), the adoption of the annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risk associated with the movement of wood* to ISPM 39 (*International movement of wood*) and approval of the draft specification for an ISPM on the safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid. Also, at CPM-19 was the launch of the Plant Health Campus, a science session on the importance of plant health in One Health and the \$US1.8m contributions from countries to support global plant health efforts. She noted that in-kind contributions were also valuable and gave the example of Tanzania providing in-kind support for Swahili translations.

Ms PETERSON discussed communication, advocacy and knowledge management projects which included:

*Communications and Advocacy*

- 9 publications including the annual report
- The successful delivery and uptake of social media, videos and media stories from countries celebrating the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH)

*Knowledge Management*

- The IPPC released 12 newsletters, published 67 news headlines, and 132 announcements covering the breadth of the IPPC Secretariats work.
- There is ongoing maintenance work being undertaken on the IPPC website redesign, the IPPC brand and design for CPM-19.

Notable international cooperation achievements included seven successful regional workshops in 2024, a Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPO) held in Panama in October 2024 and another planned for late September 2025 in Thailand. These meetings promote the development and use of the international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) and encourage inter-regional cooperation in plant health.

**Discussion:**

Ms Lihong ZHU encouraged Asian countries that are eligible to apply for funding to attend the SPG meeting. She suggested that it was important that they highlight the role that they could have in the meeting such as presenting a paper. Ms Maki IIZUKI said that she would share the application form with participants later in the meeting.

The Chair noted that Asian participation is low and encouraged NPPOs to nominate the right experts to participate in the various IPPC groups.

Ms ZHU highlighted that there were often extensions for calls indicating when there were not enough people being nominated for Focus Groups, Technical Panels, EWGs etc. She was uncertain if countries were aware of funding or whether there were other barriers preventing representation. She suggested that there was further discussion on this at the APPPC Advisory Group meeting to ensure that the right expertise was nominated.

Mr Xiaoliang WANG said that not all calls were getting through as he had not received the latest ones.

Ms PETERSON described that the PPPO had a process for how nominees are selected from the region to be put forward to the IPPC. She offered to share the process with the APPPC Advisory Group. There was often a tight turnaround for nominations and selections.

The CHAIR noted that there was a lack of a coordination role to nominate Focus Group and other experts and thought it would be a good topic for the biennial session discussion in 2026. She committed to talking to Mr Glen PANGANIBAN, the Bureau member of how to nominate Asian members for various groups.

Mr Prateep ARAYAKITTIPONG from Thailand discussed whether experts could be funded by the APPPC as, if not, it could be a limiting factor for some nominations. Mr Xiaoliang WANG also said that funding was a limiting factor for nominating Chinese experts.

The CHAIR said that it was often difficult to provide funding for ineligible countries. She would talk to the IPPC Secretariat about whether exceptions could be made to ensure that Asia was represented.

Ms Laila HUDDIN also supported this as Malaysia had similar difficulties and suggested that there could be a half and half funding or alternative options. Also, it was often difficult to convince NPPOs of the importance of attending meetings and EWGs and many experts were limited to two trips per year by their governments. It would be valuable if discussions on funding could be held with IPPC and APPPC Secretariats to ensure Asian attendance and contribution at IPPC meetings.

The CHAIR noted the IPPC statement of commitment for attending meeting made it difficult. She said that Korea had difficulties initially but are now supported by their government to attend.

**ACTION 1:** Ms Sophie PETERSON to share the Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) process for the selection of regional nominees for various IPPC groups.

**ACTION 2:** Ms Kyu-Ock YIM to discuss with Mr Glen PANGANIBAN and the IPPC Secretariat about the nomination and funding process for attendance at IPPC groups.

#### **4.2. Update from the IPPC Secretariat on Communications (IDPH & Comms Networks)**

The update was presented by Ms Maki IIZUKA from the IPPC Secretariat. Ms IIZUKA provided an update on the IPPC Secretariat's comprehensive set of communication activities and products in 2025 which is guided by the IPPC Secretariat Annual Communications Plan. The Plan aligns with the milestones of the Global Communications Strategy. Internal IPPC tools have been developed to monitor and track outputs and events.

To enhance visibility of the IPPC during CPM-19, the IPPC Secretariat executed a multi-channel branding campaign which included stage design in the FAO Plenary Room, internal promotions within FAO offices, social media outreach, news articles on the IPP, the promotion of side sessions and public access to CPM-19 photos via the FAO Digital Media Hub. The efforts aimed to raise awareness among contracting parties and FAO stakeholders.

### *International Day of Plant Health*

This year the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) was hosted in El Salvador by OIRSA. This marked the first time the event was held outside the FAO headquarters. Highlights included:

- Opening remarks by FAO Director-General Qu Dongyu (by video)
- Moderation by NSP Director Yurdi YASMI
- High-level speakers: Ministers of Agriculture (El Salvador, Honduras), OIRSA Executive Director, and Nobel Laureate Rigoberta Menchú TUM
- Inclusive technical session with geographic and gender representation
- Showcase of OIRSA's 3D virtual reality pest surveillance training tool

The IDPH outcomes and media reach had significant global engagement with 1,300 livestream participants, more than 1,000 views of the promotional video. In addition, 45 media outlets covered the event, more than 60 countries organized IDPH events and over 187 million unique users were reached. These metrics for IDPH surpassed engagement levels of other international observances such as World Potato Day and World Bee Day.

To generate local interest in IDPH, IPPC representatives gave interviews on TCS' Frente a Frente, one of El Salvador's most-watched programmes, and appeared on Channel 12 and Channel 21. These efforts increased regional visibility and public awareness.

### *Communication Networks*

The CPM Bureau approved a proposal by the IPPC Secretariat to survey NPPOs and RPPOs on their information needs. The survey results will help to identify and bridge communication gaps before scaling up to more complex communications networks. Further development was paused pending the appointment of the new IPPC Secretary.

The IPPC Secretariat is adopting a more targeted strategy that will create greater impact, achieve greater visibility and build brand recall and association. The key strategies the Secretariat are taking include doing less with more impact, prioritizing short-, medium-, and long-term priorities, segmenting audiences, communicating results and measuring outreach both quantitatively and qualitatively

Stakeholders were invited to share feedback by email with Ms Mutya FRIO ([mutya.frio@fao.org](mailto:mutya.frio@fao.org)). Ms FRIO is an IPPC Communications Specialist. Feedback is sought on:

- Key information needs
- Support from IPPC, NPPOs, and RPPOs
- Role of regional/national media

### **Discussion:**

Ms Lihong ZHU asked for clarification when the survey would come out. Ms Maki IIZUKI said the survey questions were still under-development. Ms ZHU encouraged NPPOs to respond to the survey when it was available. Ms ZHU was formerly the Chair of the FG on the Communications Strategy and wanted to see improvement on communication within the IPPC community. The survey was one key action from the work plan. Ms ZHU also noted that improving regional networking would be coming and responding to the survey about needs and expectations was important so communications could be tailored to the region.

Another participant asked for clarification on what ‘brand recall’ was. Ms IIZUKI responded that it was about how easily people could recall, for instance, the IPPC functions.

Mr Sonam DORJIN noted that Bhutan are still an observer of the APPPC and that they had a milestone in the past year regarding the eradication of the giant African snail. He would put this up to the IPPC as a success story.

**ACTION 3:** APPPC members and observers to share feedback with Ms Mutya FRIO, IPPC Communications Specialist ([mutya.frio@fao.org](mailto:mutya.frio@fao.org)) on:

- a. Key information needs
- b. Support from IPPC, NPPOs, and RPPOs
- c. Role of regional/national media

### 4.3. Update from the Standards Committee

The update from the Standards Committee (SC) was presented by the SC Chair, Ms Sophie PETERSON. Ms PETERSON provided background on the role of the Standard Setting Unit of the IPPC Secretariat, introduced staff and outlined the work of the SC in 2024. The SC is composed of 25 members from 7 FAO regions who meet in May and November each year. There are four technical panels overseen by the SC.

Except for the Technical Panel on the Glossary (TPG), all technical panels have held in-person meetings in 2025. The Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) met in Auckland, New Zealand, in June, the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) met in Yokohama, Japan, in June and the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) met in Angers, France, in July.

#### *Consultation*

This year the SC approved two annexes to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) for first consultation, three ISPMs for second consultation (including one phytosanitary treatment), and three specifications. The draft ISPMs and draft specifications will be discussed during the workshop. However, the draft phytosanitary treatment will not be discussed. Two diagnostic protocols were approved by the SC for a 45-day notification period prior to their adoption. Also, not for discussion during the workshop, was the annex on systems approach for seed as the SC have put this on hold. Ms PETERSON thanked the APPPC for the comments on the seed standard and hoped that it would resume progressing soon.

#### *Call for topics*

This year the SC endorsed a year-round submission process for submitting new topics for development. The SC encouraged early submissions to enable the SC to review them during their November meeting each year.

#### *The future of ISPMs*

A small working group of the SC was formed to explore issues raised in a paper prepared by New Zealand for the SPG in 2024 and presented to the CPM-19. The paper prepared by New Zealand on behalf of the PPPO discussed the low readability, low translatability and complexity of the current ISPMs. The paper proposed options to improve accessibility of

the ISPMs. The SC small group is preparing a discussion paper for the SPG in October 2025 to form an SC position on the future of the ISPMs. The topic will be discussed in agenda item 5.7.

#### *SC replacement members*

Ms PETERSON asked for the APPPC to be aware of the need for suitable replacements for the Asian region in the IPPC SC as these needed to be approved by the CPM. It is important that the Asian region have all four seats filled.

#### **Discussion:**

The CHAIR emphasized the point that Asia needed to be represented in the SC as it is a very important committee and a good learning experience.

#### **4.4. Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)**

The update from the IC was presented by Mr Xiaoliang WANG. Mr WANG gave a brief introduction on the role of the IC to support the implementation of the IPPC, strengthen the phytosanitary capacity of contracting parties and oversee the IPPC Strategic Framework Development Agenda Items. There are 14 members of the IC including 7 regional representatives, 5 experts, 1 RPPO and 1 SC representative. The IC meets face-to-face twice per year and has a demanding work programme.

In the past year, the IC has focused on advancing strategic development agenda items including electronic data exchange, e-commerce pathways, pest outbreak alert systems, and third-party authorization.

The IC held two key meetings in November 2024 and May 2025, where they reviewed progress, addressed resource challenges, and coordinated with the IPPC Secretariat and observer organizations. The IC previewed the IPPC Plant Health Campus platform, developed training materials and coordinated global efforts on Fusarium TR4 management and shared preliminary findings from studies on e-commerce and antimicrobial resistance.

The IC has enhanced collaboration with the SC by strengthening IC representation in SC meetings, is working towards improving communication channels between committees including by having regular reciprocal participation of chairpersons in each other's meetings. The IC is also encouraging SC involvement in the certification of Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) facilitators.

The IC encourages contracting parties to actively participate by submitting implementation and IPPC observatory topics, responding to surveys, mobilizing resources for implementation activities, supporting translation efforts, and joining working groups and participating in webinars.

#### **Discussion:**

Ms Natsumi YAMADA asked when the survey would be announced. It was confirmed that an update will be provided later in the agenda.

Ms ZHU noted that funding was talked about a lot in the presentation and that funding needed to be prioritized to have impact to the broader IPPC community. She suggested that before the CPM there could be a list of projects that need funding, and these could be itemized by how much each one needed. This would allow the CPM to make informed



decisions on how to distribute funding. It was proposed that the IC team members could also advocate for projects that require funding or more funding.

Mr Prateep ARAYAKITTIPONG asked for clarification on PCE including where to find information on how to evaluate it for your country. Mr WANG described the options for self-assessment, IPPC assessment, or facilitated assessment. Ms PETERSON described that PCE could be costly, and countries needed to write to the IPPC Secretary and ask for access via their minister. The cheapest way to do it is self-assessment and countries needed to work out which component/modules they required. Many countries might have similar assessments from WOA and WOA pays for the assessment if countries subscribe to WOA.

The CHAIR suggested that members contact Ms Sarah BRUNEL for more information about PCE to work out the best way to proceed.

#### **4.5. Getting in touch about CPM FG on sea containers**

Ms Joanne WILSON presented an update on the activities of the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers (FGSC) and related industry-led initiatives. The FGSC, whose mandate was extended by CPM-18 through 2027, is tasked with evaluating the effectiveness of CPM Recommendation 06 on sea containers, exploring regulatory and non-regulatory options, and advising on the potential development of an ISPM.

A key milestone was the International Symposium on Optimizing Container Design, held in Rotterdam in November 2024. The event brought together over 70 stakeholders from industry and plant health sectors to explore practical container modifications aimed at reducing pest contamination. Data showed that modified containers significantly reduce contamination rates, by more than five-fold, compared to standard containers.

The FGSC continues to assess regulatory and non-regulatory measures using a structured evaluation template. It also supports the revision of the Cargo Transport Units (CTU) Code (led by the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), the International Labour Organization (ILO), and the International Maritime Organization (IMO)), which now includes a dedicated chapter on pest contamination aligned with CPM Recommendation 06.

A notable initiative is the “*Custodial Responsibility*” concept, which outlines non-regulatory commitments for each party handling containers to prevent pest contamination. This is further supported by the Joint Industry Guidelines for the Cleaning of Containers.

The FGSC continues to emphasize the importance of consistent, measurable data collection on container cleanliness and pest interceptions. It encourages NPPOs and stakeholders to contribute data using the IPPC’s standardized survey template to support global risk assessments and inform future recommendations.

The CPM Recommendation 06 remains central to the FGSC’s work. It promotes awareness, encourages best practice, and supports the development of regulatory tools to manage pest risks associated with sea containers. The revised version of the recommendation was adopted by CPM-18 in 2024 following consultation.

Looking ahead, the FGSC is preparing for a side session at CPM-20 in 2026 and a potential International Workshop in 2026, which will assess the uptake and impact of



Recommendation 06. These efforts will inform the final recommendations to be presented to CPM-21 in 2027.

**Discussion:**

The CHAIR initiated discussion on the questions in the presentation related to the uptake of the CPM Recommendation 06. The CHAIR noted that many countries are silent on sea container contamination and that the APPPC decided to develop an RSPM on this topic. The FGSC have published a lot of information on the types of contamination on containers.

**ACTION 4:** APPPC members and observers to submit data to the IPPC Secretariat on the interception of pests and contamination on sea containers using the Container Inspection Recording Template in the IPPC guidelines for sea-container surveys for NPPOs (<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/90644/>).

**4.6. Getting In Touch About CPM FG on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (FGSA)**

Ms Sophie PETERSON outlined the progress and strategic direction of the CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (FGSA) which was established in 2022 to address the phytosanitary risks associated with emergency aid consignments. Consignments, often including food, seed, planting material, and wood packaging, frequently enter countries affected by disasters or conflict through expedited channels with limited phytosanitary oversight, posing significant risks of pest introduction.

The FGSA developed Specification 77 on this topic, which was approved by CPM-19 in 2025 as priority 1. This specification defines the scope for a future ISPM that will guide safe delivery of humanitarian aid during emergencies, especially when the receiving country's phytosanitary systems are compromised.

The FGSA has convened in-person meetings in Fiji (2023), Barbados (2024), and Kenya (2025), to discuss and develop the specification, gather case studies, and initiate awareness materials including webinars and videos. The FGSA has also strengthened collaboration with key international agencies such as FAO, WFP, CODEX, and WOA, laying the groundwork for coordinated responses and inter-agency cooperation. (It was noted that CODEX has a different code for food aid).

The proposed ISPM will provide operational guidance for managing pest risks when standard import procedures cannot be followed. It will clarify the application of existing ISPMs in emergency contexts, support the issuance of phytosanitary certificates under uncertain conditions, and promote coordinated action among aid agencies, donors, and the private sector. An Expert Working Group (EWG) is tentatively planned for early 2026 to begin drafting the standard.

Moving forward, IPPC contracting parties and RPPOs are encouraged to share national examples of pest risks linked to humanitarian aid and support the implementation of CPM Recommendation R-09. Partner organizations are invited to contribute to outreach efforts and inter-agency messaging. The final report of the FGSA will be presented to CPM-20 in 2026, informing the next phase of standard development.

**ACTION 5:** APPPC members and observers to submit to the IPPC Secretariat national examples of pest risks linked to humanitarian aid.

#### **4.7. Getting In Touch About CPM FG on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (FG GPRC)**

Ms Lihong ZHU provided an overview of the work undertaken by the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (FG-GPRC), established following CPM-17 (2023) to explore mechanisms for enhancing international collaboration in phytosanitary research. The initiative aims to identify common research priorities, reduce duplication, and promote efficient use of resources across countries and institutions.

Recognizing the importance of both strategic and applied research, the FG-GPRC launched a global scoping study to assess existing research networks. A questionnaire was distributed to networks across regions, resulting in an inventory of over 120 entities. These were evaluated based on four criteria: scope of interest, geographical coverage, phytosanitary relevance, and policy engagement. A shortlist of networks was selected for interviews to understand current research focus, identify gaps, and assess the need for a new coordination mechanism.

Bi-weekly meetings have supported the progress of the study, with findings to be compiled into a final report for CPM-20 in 2026. Member countries are encouraged to support the initiative by ensuring participation from regional research organizations, especially from underrepresented regions such as Latin America and the Caribbean and Africa, to avoid regional bias in the study outcomes.

The FG-GPRC invites feedback on its draft report and emphasizes the importance of inclusive global participation to inform future recommendations on strengthening phytosanitary research coordination.

#### **Discussion:**

The study is still open and APPPC members can contact Mr Glen PANGANIBAN if they want to contribute. Information is needed from across the globe to avoid regional bias and to observe synergies.

**ACTION 6:** APPPC members and observers to review the draft report of the CPM Focus Group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (FG-GPRC) when available and provide feedback to the IPPC Secretariat by March 2026.

#### **4.8. Getting In Touch About CPM FG on plant health in the context of One Health**

Ms Maki IIZUKA outlined the establishment, mandate, and progress of the CPM Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health (FG-PHOH) which was created by CPM-18 (2024) to elevate the role of plant health within the broader One Health framework. One Health is defined as an integrated approach that recognizes the interdependence of human, animal, plant, and ecosystem health. Plant health which has historically been underrepresented, is now being positioned as a core pillar of this global health initiative.

The FG-PHOH comprises experts from all IPPC regions and relevant international organizations, including FAO, USDA, ANSES, and IITA. Its Terms of Reference (ToR) include conducting a preliminary study to map interconnections between plant health and other One Health pillars, gathering national and regional experiences, and coordinating with other IPPC and FAO bodies. The group is also tasked with developing a communications and advocacy strategy, advising on a potential CPM Recommendation, and enhancing IPPC engagement in FAO's One Health Committee.

A major milestone was the CPM-19 Science Session (March 2025), which showcased case-studies from IPPC contracting parties and featured participation from the Quadripartite organizations (FAO, WHO, WOA, UNEP). The session highlighted the scientific and policy relevance of plant health and marked the first formal engagement between IPPC and the Quadripartite.

Following CPM-19, the FG was requested to prioritize the development of a formal CPM Recommendation on Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) and present its findings to the 2025 Strategic Planning Group (SPG). Ongoing activities include desk research, coordination with other focus groups, and participation in peer review of the FAO Framework on One Health in Agrifood Systems.

The next steps involve drafting the preliminary study report, consulting with relevant stakeholders, and developing a plan to strengthen IPPC's role in One Health governance and advocacy.

#### **Discussion:**

The CHAIR asked participants if One Health was a priority for their NPPOs but it did not appear so.

## **SECTION 1: CONSULTATION ON ISPMS**

The IPPC Secretariat presented a video on IPPC guides and training materials and the standard setting process during the break.

### **5. Consultation on ISPMS**

#### **5.1 1st Consultation: Draft annex *International movement of fresh banana (*Musa spp.*) fruit (2023-028)* to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)**

The draft standard was introduced by Ms Donam KIM, a member of the IPPC Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS). The annex was initially proposed to cover bananas (*Musa paradisiaca*) but was later expanded to include all *Musa* species. The draft was developed by TPCS in December 2024 and aims to support NPPOs in managing pest risks associated with the trade of fresh *Musa* fruit.

The annex applies to hands or clusters of fresh *Musa* fruit intended for consumption or processing in the importing country. It excludes fruit in bunches and any that has been processed (e.g., dried, frozen, chopped). A list of pests associated with *Musa* fruit is included based on submissions from nine contracting parties. Only pests with identified risk

management measures are listed. The annex does not serve as technical justification for regulation but provides a reference for NPPOs.

The annex outlines both general and pest-specific phytosanitary measures for pests of *Musa*. Also, it highlights the use of ISPM 35 for managing fruit fly risks and includes additional systems approaches for pests such as scales, mealybugs, and fungi, based on contracting party submissions. An appendix provides visual references for the different forms of *Musa* fruit (hands, clusters, bunches) as described in the annex.

#### **General comments:**

JAPAN disagrees that contaminating pests should be excluded from commodity standards as it is a country's sovereign right to regulate pests. JAPAN proposed that guidance should be developed to clarify under what circumstances contaminating pests or diversion from intended use of the commodity correspond to the examples provided.

THAILAND's position was that the commodity standard should only include significant pests that pose a risk for being carried with the plant part for trade. They believe the standard should be simplified.

CHINA believed that pests should be screened for association with commercially produced bananas and pests needed to be screened before inclusion in the commodity standard annexes.

KOREA had similar comments and was concerned that some pests are not associated with the traded commodity. They noted that there are normally no requirements for some of the pests generally. As more commodity standards are developed a solution is needed.

SINGAPORE supports the draft annex and considers it a guidance document and a starting point for risk analysis.

AUSTRALIA stated that the TPCS can only work with the information that they receive from what was submitted by countries. They noted that TR4 was contentious however, one country that submitted the pest does regulate it on bananas for consumption and has a measure in place. It is difficult for the TPCS to say that a country's PRA is wrong, and it is not correct for the CPM to say it is wrong. Sovereign rights should not be affected by the commodity standards. The documents need to be useful to the countries that use them. It shows that countries do regulate them. Perhaps the pest lists are too long but countries still need to conduct PRA. It is a difficult line but how we manage it is important.

JAPAN believes that some pests are minor but there is no indication of contaminating pests or pests that are of concern if the commodity is diverted from intended use.

NEW ZEALAND said that the TPCS has developed 5 annexes now. The TPCS agrees that there are difficulties with the process for including pests in commodity standards. The TPCS had a lot of debate about what to include and what not to include. These discussions started with the mango standard where pests were included if a measure was provided by a submitting country and the pest was regulated by one contracting party. The TPCS have come up with a list of reasons for exclusions. In particular, the TPCS have been assessing if a pest is associated with the commodity. In many instances submitting countries did not include PRAs. There is a wide awareness that some pests should not be regulated. However, if the PRA, from the submitting country, says that the pest is not associated with the plant part for trade, it was excluded. The TPCS are bringing this issue to the SC in November with some proposed options for consideration. Until there is clear guidance from the SC

then it is suggested that the technical justification is provided to dispute the inclusion of pests. The more information/evidence provided then the better the annex that can be developed. Regarding the contaminating pest issue, ISPM 46 says that contaminating pests are excluded. Pests are also excluded if there are no specific measures submitted for those pests. Even if a pest is not in the pest list it does not mean that a country should not regulate them.

AUSTRALIA suggested that contaminating pests could be included in the commodity description to acknowledge them. However, it wouldn't resolve the issue for TR4. More pests in an annex are probably more useful.

The STEWARD for the TPCS was clear that PRA is still required and that the original wording in the mango standard was clear that this was needed. Countries can decide whether to use commodity standards or not and they can regulate pests that are not in the standard.

The CHAIR summarized the key points made in the general comments. The CHAIR was clear that it was important to follow ISPM 46 with respect to contaminating pests and diversion from intended use. The role of the TPCS is described in the specification but they may need to be reconsidered.

Ms Lihong ZHU highlighted that in 2026 the APPPC is intending to have a regional workshop on commodity standards, and she asked that members and observers send her ideas for topics to be covered for the workshop (e.g. pest lists).

KOREA has indicated that it would consider contributing to the trust fund for IPPC workshop which might be in early 2027 so that the IPPC could have a broader discussion to improve commodity standards. The CHAIR proposed that the commodity standards should be minimum requirements and that they are becoming too complicated.

The general regional comments agreed were:

The APPPC notes several key points regarding commodity standards that warrant further consideration and clarification by the SC going forward:

### **1. Inclusion of pests in commodity standards**

There remains ambiguity regarding the inclusion or exclusion of certain pests in commodity standards, particularly those that:

- a) are associated with plant parts not intended for trade or with incidental contamination (e.g. leaves, soil, debris) or, are contaminating pests within the consignment, and are regulated by some NPPOs;
- b) are linked to waste generated during processing or consumption (e.g. fruit skins);
- c) pose a risk only when the commodity is diverted from its intended use (e.g. planting instead of consumption), especially when such diversion is frequent or occurs inadvertently.

The APPPC proposes that these categories of pests are:

- a) explicitly excluded from commodity standards; or,
- b) supplementary explanatory text is included in annexes when pest association with the commodity is unclear or diversion from intended use is common.

This issue needs further discussion within the Standards Committee (SC), as it may have implications for the interpretation and application of ISPM 46.

## **2. Enhancing transparency in pest exclusion**

To improve transparency and support NPPOs in submitting relevant information, the APPPC proposes that the TPCS publish a brief explanation on the IPP, outlining the rationale for excluding specific pests submitted by contracting parties.

Also, this would clarify the mandate of the TPCS and their decisions about pest list development to foster greater understanding among contracting parties.

The APPPC proposes that this could form part of the CPM-20 side session on commodity standards.

Ms Joanne WILSON, the TPCS steward, committed to preparing a paper to the SC with these general APPPC comments.

### **Substantive and technical comments:**

#### ***Section 2: Description of the commodity and its intended use***

CHINA wanted to make it clear what the difference between hands, clusters and bunches was by referring to the figures in Appendix 1 [para 28]. Also, to include ‘peeled’ as an example of processed fruit that are excluded. [No regional comment was agreed.](#)

#### ***Table 1. Pests considered to be associated with fresh Musa spp. fruit***

The PHILIPPINES, CHINA and others proposed including additional pests however, evidence/references were required and should be made as country comments. [No regional comment was agreed.](#)

JAPAN proposed a new synonym for *D. texensis* and questioned the inclusion of TR4. [No regional comment was agreed.](#)

#### ***Section 4: Options for phytosanitary measures***

NEW ZEALAND proposed deleting the measure of green bananas in Table 3 for *B. musae* as evidence was provided that the measure was ineffective. [No regional comment was agreed.](#)

#### ***Table 3. Pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures***

The PHILIPPINES queried whether measures should be applied alone or in combination with another measures. The STEWARD explained that it could be either, and the number of measures used depended on a countries appropriate level of protection as described in paragraph 266.

#### ***Table 5. Options for systems approaches (SAs)***

KOREA proposed removing ISPM 14 from the general measures as it is already included in the note to Table 5.

[The regional comment agreed was: If the additional reference is not available, merge SA2 & 3. If merged, Table 3 should be modified.](#)



## 5.1 References

New Zealand had proposed a new reference demonstrating that green bananas is a host of *B. musae*. No regional comment was agreed.

**ACTION 7:** APPPC members and observers to send ideas to Ms Lihong ZHU ([Lihong.Zhu@mpi.govt.nz](mailto:Lihong.Zhu@mpi.govt.nz)) regarding topics to be covered during the planned regional workshop on commodity standards in the Philippines in 2026.

**ACTION 8:** APPPC members and observers to send to the IPPC Secretariat by 15 October, technical information for apple fruit called for by the Technical Panel for Commodity Standards (TPCS).

**ACTION 9:** APPPC members and observers to support the agreed regional comments in the IPPC OCS and add any country comments on the Draft annex *International movement of fresh Musa spp. fruit* (2023-028) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*) considering the discussions at the regional workshop.

## 5.2 1st Consultation: Draft *International movement of fresh taro (Colocasia esculenta) for consumption annex* (2023-023) to ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*)

The draft standard was introduced by Ms Sophie PETERSON, the Standards Committee steward for the TPCS. Taro was proposed as a commodity standard subject in 2023 and added to the TPCS work programme by CPM-18 in 2024. Unlike ISPMs, commodity standards do not require specifications or country consultations. Due to trade implications, the CPM retains authority over the inclusion of subjects in the TPCS work programme.

The annex applies to fresh taro corms intended for consumption or processing, excluding those with leaves or lateral buds and any that have been processed. The format and structure of the annex follows the template established by ISPM 46.

The draft annex lists 17 pests, including viruses, based on submissions from contracting parties. All pests listed have associated phytosanitary measures used in trade. The inclusion of viruses reflects the higher risk of propagation from the commodity, a concern relevant to vegetatively propagated crops like taro.

Taro presents unique challenges due to its nature as a root crop because it is inherently dirty and has a rough surface. These characteristics make inspection more difficult and time-consuming. New text has been added to the draft (paragraph 13) to address these issues and guide contracting parties.

As a relatively new commodity type for assessment, taro introduces novel considerations. While the number of pests is limited, the physical characteristics and propagation risks require tailored approaches. Feedback, proposed text modifications, and comments from contracting parties are encouraged to refine and improve the annex.

### General comments:

The same general comments to the banana standard were made by countries for the taro standard. Waste management was discussed and how it could be expressed in the text for commodities that are propagatable.

## Substantive and technical comments:

### **Section 1. Scope**

A correction to the scientific name was proposed in para 25. The regional comment agreed was to change Alisanmatales to Alismatales.

### **Section 2. Description of the commodity and its intended use**

THAILAND proposed that the description of the commodity in para 27 should be ‘...without leaves, sprout arises from the petiole base or from a lateral bud, cormel and root.’. It should align with the ASEAN standard for taro i.e. *without leaves, and sprouts arises from the petiole base (pseudo-stem) or from a lateral bud, cormel, and root.*

The regional comment agreed was:

*[para 27] This commodity standard applies to fresh C. esculenta corms, without leaves, sprout arises from the petiole base or from a lateral bud, cormel and root.*

The PPPO proposed merging sections 1 and 2 to reduce complexity and repetition. No regional comment was agreed.

### **Section 3: Pests associated with fresh Colocasia esculenta**

THAILAND proposed to include ‘corms’ after the species name in the title [para 28].

The regional comment agreed was: ‘*Section 3: Pests associated with fresh Colocasia esculenta corms*’

#### **Table 1. Pests considered to be associated with Colocasia esculenta corms**

JAPAN proposed adding the intended use after the species name in the title of the table [para 32]. However, this is not needed as it is established in the scope section. Also, it is not consistent with other commodity standards. No regional comment was agreed.

CHINA proposed deleting the beetles [para 36-65], however beetles were submitted by Tonga rather than Australia. Australia did assess them in their PRA as being low, but these are a pest group for Tonga and require measures. No regional comment was agreed.

JAPAN proposed deleting the nematode [para 69-71] as it is a contaminating pest. The pest was submitted by Japan. No regional comment was agreed.

THAILAND proposed including a new virus but did not have the reference available. No regional comment was agreed.

KOREA proposed deleting viruses [para 78-89] from the pest list. No regional comment was agreed.

Ms PETERSON, the steward, outlined the comments made by the PPPO that managed the concerns about diversion from intended use which meant that the viruses, vectored by a planthopper, could be deleted from the pest list but referred to in the text.

### **Section 4: Options for phytosanitary measures**

CHINA proposed adding to the paragraph above table 2 to align with the ASEAN standard that specifies the length of the petiole base and leaf stems. In addition, China proposed removing mites as there is no mite listed in table 1 as the new text manages mites.

The regional comment agreed was:

1. Remove mites as there is no mite listed in Table 1. 2.

2. Recommend to add in "cutting .." since petioles also pose the risk of harbouring pests. '...

**Table 2. General options for phytosanitary measures**

THAILAND proposed using the scientific name throughout rather than taro. The steward will check with the editor on this point.

The PHILIPPINES requested including ISPM 10 in Table 2 as it is an effective measure for managing some pests (e.g. nematodes) associated with taro. However, Japan withdrew the nematode, so it was agreed that the addition of the ISPM 10 in the Table is not applicable for the nematode but could be applicable to other pests. No regional comment was agreed.

**Table 3. Pest-specific options for phytosanitary measures**

KOREA proposed removing paragraph 99 regarding cleaning as the text does not mention any specific options. The STEWARD disagreed as it is a new type of commodity i.e. below-ground. No regional comment was agreed.

KOREA proposed referring to 10 *Papuana* species or *Papuana* to spp. to be more specific about which species are being managed to align table 1 and 3.

The regional comment agreed to give options to the steward was:

The pests in Table 1 and Table 3 must match.

1. Change the pest list from "10 *Papuana* species" to "*Papuana* spp."; or
2. Specify "10 *Papuana* species" instead of "*Papuana* spp." in the pest-specific options.

The PHILIPPINES proposed several additional pests and measures. The steward asked for the PRA information to be provided to support their inclusion.

**Table 5. Options for systems approaches (SAs)**

CHINA highlighted that there is no systems approach for *Phytophthora colosasiae*. AUSTRALIA clarified that the requirement is pending market access negotiations. It is a new measure for trade so therefore the SA1 should be retained. No regional comment was agreed.

**Section 5: References**

CHINA noted that there was no way to check some of the references as there are no corresponding links. The STEWARD will investigate this. One link will be referenced but at the time of writing it was unpublished. Not all countries publish their risk analyses.

JAPAN asked for their reference to be deleted as they have withdrawn their pest.

**ACTION 10:** APPPC members and observers to support the agreed regional comments in the IPPC OCS and add any country comments on the Draft annex *International movement of fresh Colocasia esculenta* fruit (2023-023) to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) considering the discussions at the regional workshop.

**ACTION 11:** Ms Joanne WILSON to prepare a paper to the IPPC Standards Committee concerning:

- a. The inclusion of pests in commodity standards
- b. Enhancing transparency for the exclusion of pests in commodity standards

Ms WILSON to circulate the draft paper to the APPPC SC members for review before submitting to the IPPC Secretariat by mid-October.

### **5.3 2nd Consultation: Draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021- 010)**

The draft standard was introduced by Ms Joanne WILSON, the SC steward for the draft standard. She explained that there had been 822 comments received during the first consultation on the standard in 2024 which has changed parts of the draft ISPM. The key changes were to terminology updates, great explanations to some areas, removal of timeframes, removal of duplication and the retention of removed content.

Terms such as “host material,” “transient,” “wild adults,” and “inseminated” were replaced with more precise language like “host fruit,” “breeding population,” “fertile adults,” and “gravid” to improve clarity and consistency.

New text was added to clarify the role of Sterile Insect Technique (SIT) in maintaining PFA status, potential interference of attractants in trapping multiple fruit fly species and data recording requirements for sample handling and species identification. Duplication was removed by consolidating the requirements for packing, storage, processing, and treatment facilities into a single section to streamline the standard.

Previously removed annexes and appendices (e.g., Annex 3, Appendix 1 & 2) were renamed and temporarily placed at the end of the draft standard to preserve valuable guidance until a suitable location is identified.

#### **General comments:**

JAPAN made a general comment that the terminology of FF-PFA status and FF-PFA designation could be misinterpreted as a PFA cannot be a phytosanitary measure until it has been maintained. They proposed amending paragraph 49 by reverting PFA designation to FF-PFA status. The designation is more than the status and is in the convention.

JAPAN also raised that there was a difference between pest absent in an area and a pest free area.

The regional comment agreed was:

1. After the first consultation, the term 'FF-PFA status' in the draft was used and replaced with 'FF-PFA designation' in the draft for the second consultation, but this should be reverted to 'FF-PFA status'. (\*Require to differentiate "FF-PFA status" with "pest status") - Based on the Convention text and the requirements of ISPM 4, the 'PFA designation' is one of the elements considered during the establishment of a PFA. A PFA that is still under establishment cannot be used as a phytosanitary measure because its maintenance has not yet been implemented. - The suspension, resumption and revocation of a PFA means the suspension, resumption and revocation of the maintenance of a PFA as a phytosanitary measure after its establishment. - Changing the “FF-PFA status” to “FF-PFA designation” could be interpreted as if a PFA is suspended, reinstated or withdrawn during the process of establishing it. - As stated in the general comments from Japan, provided that this ISPM clearly specifies (by amending paragraph 49) that "an area which pest status of the targeted fruit fly is

absent" is distinct from "a pest free area of the targeted fruit fly (FF-PFA)", reverting "FFPFA designation" to "FF-PFA status" should not pose a problem.

2. In this ISPM, it should be clearly stated that "an area which pest status of the targeted fruit fly is absent" differs from "a pest free area of the targeted fruit fly (FF-PFA)". A pest free area is a phytosanitary measure and established and maintained by National plant protection organization (NPPO) based on the requirements of ISPM4.

Therefore, ISPM 26 should be clearly stated that FF-PFA does not simply refer to an area where the target fruit fly species is not present (i.e., an area which pest status of the targeted fruit fly is absent) but it is an area established and maintained by NPPOs as phytosanitary measures based on the requirements of this ISPM.

## Substantive and technical comments:

### Definitions

JAPAN proposed including an additional sentence *"Because some species of fruit fly may infest plant parts other than fruit, references to 'fruit' in this standard should be understood to include other host plant parts, such as stems and leaves, that the species of fruit fly may infest."* This aligned with what the PPPO agreed.

The regional comment agreed was to propose including an additional sentence (after paragraph 47) in definitions, that is:

*'Because some species of fruit fly may infest plant parts other than fruit, references to "fruit" in this standard should be understood to include other host plant parts, such as stems and leaves, that the species of fruit fly may infest.'*

### Outline of requirements

JAPAN proposed text changes to clarify the difference between pest status as absent and a PFA and how to apply the two terms in the context of the standard.

*[Para 49] An FF-PFA is a phytosanitary measure that may be used to protect plant resources and facilitate safe trade. ~~National~~ It is an area where a national plant protection organization (NPPOs) should determine that its pest status is absent in accordance with ISPM 8 (including when the target fruit fly has been eradicated in accordance with ISPM 9) and establish and maintain it as a pest free area in accordance with this standard. NPPOs should consider an FF-PFA to be a phytosanitary measure that, when used alone, is sufficient for managing the pest risk posed by a specified target fruit fly.*

AUSTRALIA suggested that instead, the paragraph [49] should refer to ISPM 4 rather than ISPMs 8 and 9. Other options considered were breaking the sentences up to separate concepts.

*[Para 49] An FF-PFA is a phytosanitary measure that may be used to protect plant resources and facilitate safe trade. ~~National~~ It is an area where a national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) should determine that its pest status is absent in accordance with ISPM 8 (including when the target fruit fly has been eradicated in accordance with ISPM 9). NPPOs should establish and maintain it as a pest free area in accordance with ISPM 4 and this standard. NPPOs should consider an FF-PFA to be a phytosanitary measure that, when used alone, is sufficient for managing the pest risk posed by a specified target fruit fly.*

No regional comment was agreed.



THAILAND commented that the outline of requirements should include all relevant topics indicated in the standard. As a result, the title for resources and infrastructure, as well as the review activities from the general requirements section, should be included. The regional comment agreed was to propose additional wording in the outline of requirements:

*[Para 50] This standard provides requirements for resources and infrastructure, review activities, for programme improvement, programmes to establish and maintain an FF-PFA and buffer zone, surveillance activities (fruit fly trapping and fruit sampling), corrective action planning, control measures in the event of pest detections, and the suspension, reinstatement and withdrawal of the FF-PFA designation. It also includes requirements for resources and infrastructure, review activities for programme improvement, documentation, resources and record-keeping and for transparency, infrastructure, communication, stakeholder engagement, review activities, documentation and stakeholder communication.*

JAPAN proposed deleting some information on sterile insects to make it clearer. The regional comment agreed was to propose removing some text:

*[Para 51] Sterile fruit flies released in a sterile insect technique are not considered to be pests in an FF-PFA, as they may be used as part of a pest control programme ~~in the FF-PFA and buffer zone.~~*

## **Background**

There was considerable discussion of the last paragraph of background [para 55] about confusing the difference between pest absence and official maintained PFAs. It was proposed the sentence is revised as:

*[Para 55] ~~Areas initially free from fruit flies may remain naturally free from fruit flies as a result of the presence of physical barriers, unsuitable climatic conditions or the absence of hosts. Other Areas where fruit flies are absent initially free from fruit flies may need to be established and maintained free as pest free areas through restrictions on the movement of regulated articles and related measures (if fruit flies have the potential to establish there). Areas where fruit flies are present may be made free by an eradication programme (ISPM 9 (Guidelines for pest eradication programmes)).~~ No regional comment was agreed.*

## **Impacts on biodiversity and the environment**

NEW ZEALAND proposed that paragraph 57 is modified to align with ISPM 5 this should say “.. fruit flies that are regulated pests” as “regulated fruit flies” is not defined in ISPM 5 only “regulated pest”. The regional comment agreed was to propose the following change:

*[Para 57] This standard may contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by preventing the introduction and spread of regulated fruit flies that are regulated pests. When establishing and maintaining FF-PFAs, countries are encouraged to consider measures and phytosanitary procedures that minimize impact on biodiversity and the environment.*

## **GENERAL REQUIREMENTS**

### **Section 1: Resources and infrastructure**



It was proposed to add an additional paragraph after 59 to cover authorization of entities and reference ISPM 45 and 47. The regional comment agreed was to propose the following additional text:

*[Para 59a] In circumstances where an entity is authorized to undertake certain activities on behalf of an NPPO, this should be done in accordance with ISPM 45 (Requirements for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions) and ISPM 47 (Audit in the phytosanitary context).*

## **Section 2: Communication and stakeholder engagement**

NEW ZEALAND proposed to rewrite the paragraph on communication [para 65] and stakeholder engagement to be in plain language. AUSTRALIA proposed deleting the last sentence based on PPPO comments. AUSTRALIA also agreed that simpler language is better. THAILAND did not understand the word ‘parties’ which was changed to stakeholders. The regional comment agreed was to propose the following:

*[Para 65] The support and participation of people close to the area is important for the success of an FF-PFA programme, especially in areas where the risk of introducing the target fruit fly is higher. This includes the local community individuals who travel to or through the area, and stakeholders with direct or indirect interests. The NPPO of the exporting country should therefore implement a public-awareness programme. The public and stakeholders should be informed through different media (e.g. written, radio, television, social media, internet) of the importance of establishing and maintaining the FF-PFA, and of avoiding the introduction or reintroduction of potentially infested hosts. This may contribute to and improve compliance with the various measures used to establish and maintain the FF-PFA.*

## **Section 3: Review activities**

KOREA proposed a title change to “Review and supervision activities to better reflect the contents of the section. AUSTRALIA thought it was more about “Review and maintenance activities” rather than supervision. JAPAN proposed renaming “Review and Oversight Activities”. The changes proposed by the CHAIR mean that a title change is no longer required.

NEW ZEALAND proposed rewriting paragraph 68 to be plain language. There were also discussions about the use of the term ‘adjust’ and whether ‘update’ is a better term. The regional comment agreed was to propose the following:

*[Para 68] The National Plant Protection Organization should regularly review and the FF-PFA maintenance programme, and update as needed, once the FF-PFA is established. This includes the administrative activities by the NPPO to verify correct implementation of the maintenance programme. These reviews and adjustments updates allow the NPPO to find and correct deficiencies, incorporate any new and relevant information on the target fruit fly or associated pathways, and improve the maintenance programme.*

The CHAIR proposed including ISPM 47 in paragraph 69 as audit is an essential part of authorizing entities. She also suggested moving the paragraph to “Resources and infrastructure” section. The regional comment agreed was to propose moving the paragraph to under resources and infrastructure and to include reference to ISPM 47.

*[Para 69] In circumstances where an entity is authorized to undertake certain activities on behalf of an NPPO, this should be done in accordance with ISPM 45 (Requirements*

*for national plant protection organizations if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions) and ISPM 47 (Audit in the phytosanitary context).*

## **Section 5: Establishment of the fruit fly pest free area**

### **Section 5.1: Surveillance for the establishment of the fruit fly pest free area**

JAPAN thought that the purpose of the detection survey is to detect the target fruit fly to determine if the target fruit fly is absent, not to detect an established population. The regional comment agreed was to propose the following:

- *[Para 91] the sensitivity of the survey method used (e.g. how effective a trapping network is at detecting ~~an established population~~ the target fruit fly).*

### **Section 5.4: Additional technical information for the establishment of the fruit fly pest free area**

THAILAND proposed moving section 5.4 to section 4 as the details also related to the initial step in FF-PFA establishment. The title would also need to be deleted, and economic importance removed. AUSTRALIA thought that it did not quite fit with section 4 and suggested moving it to the end of section 4. Knowledge of the host in the area was thought to need further explanation or it could be deleted as it is unclear. It was agreed to delete ‘*knowledge of the host in the area*’. JAPAN proposed deleting ‘*of economic importance*’ from the last bullet as it is irrelevant. The regional comment agreed was to propose the delete the bullet point [para 115] on ‘*knowledge of hosts in the area and delete economic importance [from para 116]*’ as there is a need to know all fruit flies during the establishment of an FF-PF and not only the species of economic importance.

### **Section 5.5: Criteria for the area to qualify as a fruit fly pest free area**

NEW ZEALAND made suggestions to improve clarity in paragraph 118 of section 5.5. The regional comment agreed was to propose the following amendments to text:

*[Para 118] For the area to qualify as an FF-PFA, there should be ~~no verifiable evidence of a~~ confirming that no breeding population ~~(established or not)~~ of the target fruit fly is present.*

JAPAN proposed including ‘voltinism’ into paragraph 119 to determine the period required to confirm the absence of the target fruit fly. This is because they argued it is necessary to consider the number of generations in which the absence has been maintained. Therefore, the voltinism (whether it is a multivoltine species that occurs several times a year, such as the Oriental fruit fly, or a univoltine species that occurs once a year, such as the Citrus fly) that affects the number of generations that occur in a certain period should be taken into consideration. No regional comment was agreed as experts would need to be consulted.

### **Section 5.6: Official declaration of the fruit fly pest free area**

JAPAN proposed updating paragraph 122 to reflect process which is a ‘may’ not a ‘should’. They also proposed deleting ‘official’ since designation by an NPPO means an official act, and the term “official” is redundant. Agreed as a regional comment.

*[Para 122] When the pest status in the area is determined as absent in accordance with ISPM 8 (including when the target fruit fly has been eradicated in accordance with ISPM 9) and an FF-PFA has been established in accordance with the*

*requirements of this standard, the NPPO of the exporting country ~~should officially~~ may designate the area as an FF-PFA.*

AUSTRALIA suggested changing the paragraph around to make it a ‘should’ if all requirements have been met. **No regional comment was agreed.**

### **Section 6: Maintenance of the fruit fly pest free area**

JAPAN commented that the management of the PFA is one element of maintaining the PFA. Furthermore, surveillance and collection of relevant data are necessary elements for maintaining the PFA and is not considered solely for informing the management of the FF-PFA. However, collection of data does not in itself maintain the FF-PFA. AUSTRALIA suggested replacing ‘inform’ with ‘support’ the management of the FF-PFA. **The regional comment agreed was to propose the following amendments to para 126:**

- *surveillance and collection of relevant data to ~~inform~~ support the management of the FF-PFA, including a pest detections; and*

### **Section 6.2: Surveillance for maintaining the fruit fly pest free area**

JAPAN proposed replacing ‘declaring’ with ‘establishing’ in para 131 and CHINA proposed to delete the last sentence as it is unneeded. **The regional comment agreed was to propose the following amendments to text:**

*[Para 131] After ~~declaring~~ establishing the FF-PFA, the surveillance programme should be continued at a level assessed as providing sufficient confidence that the FF-PFA is being maintained. Surveillance records should be well maintained and reports on surveillance activities should be made available on request. ~~The information available in section 5.1 and Annex 1 is relevant to both establishment and maintenance of the FF-PFA.~~*

### **Section 6.3: Corrective actions**

JAPAN proposed modifying the section heading [para 132] to ‘Corrective action plans’ as the content is about the correct action plan. NEW ZEALAND thought that the title was sufficient. CHINA also thought that corrective actions was the correct title as later in the section it talks about corrective actions. THAILAND also agreed that corrective actions was a broader, encompassing term. **No regional comment agreed.**

KOREA thought that ‘unacceptable risk to plant trade’ [para 146] ‘may’ allow discretion by NPPOs. So, to avoid this, they proposed the following text changes:

*~~In circumstances where the target fruit fly is considered unable to establish a breeding population within the FF-PFA, no action may be necessary~~ In circumstances where the target fruit fly is considered unable to establish a breeding population within the FF-PFA, corrective action may not be required, unless a scientifically justified assessment determines that the presence of the target fruit fly ~~poses an~~ posed unacceptable risk to plant trade phytosanitary risk.*

AUSTRALIA proposed deleting the paragraph [146] as the concept is covered in the previous paragraph. **No regional comment was agreed.**

### **Annex 1: Specific surveillance for fruit flies (trapping and fruit sampling)**

#### **Section 1.5 Trap servicing**

NEW ZEALAND proposed that section 1.5 [para 189] needed to be clearer that it is the trap lures or baits not just refreshing the traps. AUSTRALIA also suggested from PPPO comments to include ‘*The traps should be replaced when deemed unserviceable (e.g. damaged or broken)*’. The regional comment agreed was to propose the following amendments to text:

*[Para 189] The frequency of trap servicing (maintaining traps and refreshing ~~the traps~~ lures or baits) during the period of trapping should depend on the longevity of attractants (attractant persistency) and killing agents, the retention capacity (e.g. sticky traps’ retention capacity declines over time), the rate of catch of target and non-target species, the placement of the traps, the biology and ecology of the target fruit fly species, and environmental conditions. The traps should be replaced when deemed unserviceable (e.g. damaged or broken).*

## **Section 2. Fruit sampling procedures**

The PHILIPPINES suggested that Section 2 states explicitly if immature stages of the fruit fly larvae are subject for identification will be reared into adult stage for identification. Since adult stage identification will be more accurate and reliable. AUSTRALIA highlighted that the section doesn’t tell the reader how to identify the pest but that it should be done.

AUSTRALIA suggested that [Para 194] ‘*Samples should be held in suitable conditions to maintain the viability of all immature stages of fruit flies in infested host fruit for identification either by morphological or molecular techniques*’. This was agreed as a regional comment.

The PHILIPPINES proposed to include that low-risk areas with no market activity or commercial movements can also be considered, in case of any unforeseen occurrences or low density or prevalence of the target pest in the fruit sampling procedures. AUSTRALIA thought the problem was with the word ‘*high*’ risk. AUSTRALIA proposed that ‘*high*’ is removed from the bullet [para 199]. There was also discussion about whether the list is a ‘*should*’ or a ‘*may consider*’. The agreed regional comment was to remove the word ‘*high*’ from the bullet [para 199]. That is,

- *[Para 199] the targeting of areas that are likely to be at ~~high~~ risk of having infested fruit:*

## **Section 3. Handling of samples and identification of species**

JAPAN proposed adding two new bullets under information about the sample that should be collected [para 214] i.e. number, sex and developmental stage of fruit fly individuals; - host information (species and number of host plants); No regional comment was agreed as it is not easy to obtain such information when samples are collected.

AUSTRALIA questioned the use of the word ‘*should*’ from information to be collected [para 214] or delete ‘*for example*’. MALAYSIA highlighted that they are all types of information that should be collected as described in ISPM 6, 2.2.6. The agreed regional comment was to propose removing ‘*for example*’ from para 214. It was also agreed to propose including – *any other relevant observations* – in para 220.

## **Annex 2: Corrective action plans**

### **Section 2. Actions to implement the corrective action plan**

#### **Section 2.1 Determination of the pest status upon detection**

CHINA suggested changing ‘an unacceptable risk to ~~plant~~ fruit trade in para 240. The regional comment agreed was to remove ‘*plant*’ from para 240.

NEW ZEALAND suggested that ‘total harvest’ [para 247] is removed from section 2.3 as removing all fruit from trees may aid adult fruit flies to disperse in search of new host plants, potentially aiding their spread to other areas. The lack of oviposition sites is a known trigger for active dispersal. Removing and destroying fallen fruit provides better control as premature fruit can be indicative of fruit fly infestation. In addition, they proposed to remove treatment as it is unlikely to manage the risk sufficiently. That is, ‘total harvest and destruction, treatment or removal and destruction of fallen host fruit;’ It was agreed as a regional comment to propose to remove para 247.

AUSTRALIA proposed modifying para 248 and 249 to:

- *destruction of infested and fallen host fruits;*
- *destruction of other plant host material*

Both suggestions were agreed as regional comments.

### ***Annex 3: Control measures when a breeding population is detected within a fruit fly pest free area***

JAPAN proposed that the first and second sentences of paragraph 264 refer to the criteria for corrective measures, but they summarise the contents of Sections 1 and 2 of Annex 2 (Corrective action plans) and are redundant, so should be removed. Furthermore, the second sentence states that " This is the case for both established populations and, where applicable (see section 2 of Annex 2), populations that are not able to establish ", but that it contradicts Section 2 of Annex 2 (paragraph 240), which states that " If the detection is of a population that is not able to establish (pest status “present: transient” according to ISPM 8) then no action may be necessary". JAPAN therefore proposed deleting this sentence as it may cause misunderstanding that control measures are required even for populations that cannot establish. It was agreed as a regional comment to propose to modify para 264:

*[Para 264] The objective of control measures should be to eradicate the population of the target fruit fly and restore the FF-PFA, protect the surrounding FF-PFA, and meet the phytosanitary import requirements of importing countries. In particular, control measures are needed because movements of regulated articles from and through an eradication area pose a potential risk of spreading the target fruit fly.*

### ***Section 1. Initiation of an eradication area***

SINGAPORE suggested removing the para 267. AUSTRALIA suggested deleting the paragraph as it is covered in other paragraphs. AUSTRALIA also suggested that ‘circle’ is changed to ‘a boundary’ in the next para

The regional comment agreed was to modify paragraph 266 to ‘...the FF-PFA should be withdrawn in accordance with this standard, *if necessary*’, remove paragraph 267 and change ‘circle’ to ‘boundary’ in para 268 where it occurs and ‘overlapping shapes’.

The CHAIR updated the participants on the development of guides to support standards. She asked countries to provide suggestions on the best way to do this for the fruit fly PFA which will add value to the standards. THAILAND supported having a separate guide from the ISPM.

**ACTION 12:** APPPC members and observers to support the agreed regional comments in the IPPC OCS and add any country comments on the draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010) considering the discussions at the regional workshop.



#### **5.4 2nd Consultation: draft annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)**

The draft standard was introduced by Mr Masahiro SAI, the Standards Committee steward for the draft standard. The first consultation in 2024, generated 573 comments and was revised and approved by the SC in May 2025 for the second consultation.

In response to country comments, the annex was restructured to improve clarity and reduce duplication. Key changes included moving the “Scope” section to the beginning and renaming sections to better reflect the objectives of field inspection and shifting from passive to active voice throughout the text.

The SC considered a proposal to develop the annex as a standalone ISPM, given that field inspection may apply to plants not forming part of a consignment. However, the SC concluded that the annex should remain part of ISPM 23, particularly considering the broader revision of ISPM 23 currently underway, which will ensure alignment between the core standard and this annex.

The annex defines field inspection as a phytosanitary measure applied to plants during their growing or dormant stages, primarily for the detection of pests or verification of compliance with phytosanitary requirements. It may be used as a standalone measure, as part of a systems approach, or in combination with other measures. The annex does not cover the inspection of consignments.

Terminology within the annex has been refined for consistency and clarity. For example, the term “tolerance level” has been replaced with “threshold,” and distinctions have been made between “a specified pest” and “the pest of concern,” depending on context. The annex also clarifies the use of terms such as “phytosanitary import requirements” versus “phytosanitary requirements” more generally.

The annex outlines the objectives of field inspection, including pest detection and verification of compliance with phytosanitary requirements. It also distinguishes field inspection from specific surveillance, noting that while both may be used to determine pest status, field inspection is focused on plants intended for international trade.

The annex outlines assumptions that underpin the use of field inspection, including the visual detectability of pests at certain plant growth stages and the practicality of field inspection compared to consignment testing. The annex also details factors that NPPOs should consider when deciding to use field inspection, such as pest biology, plant phenology, field conditions, and timing relative to harvest.

The responsibilities of NPPOs are clearly outlined. These include designing and implementing field inspection programmes, ensuring adequate resources and training, and maintaining communication with importing countries where appropriate.

It is acknowledged that there will be potential implementation challenges, and it is suggested that commodity-specific guides with case studies could be developed to support contracting parties in applying the standard effectively.

#### **General comments:**

THAILAND suggested that implementation is clearer and would like information regarding ISPM 45 to be reinstated as with the previous version. It was agreed to look at this in the appropriate place in the annex.



Also, the terms ‘sign and symptom’ and ‘sign and symptom’ should be used consistently throughout the draft.

#### **Substantive and technical comments:**

##### ***Section 1: Scope***

CHINA suggested deleting paragraph 31 of the scope section they considered it unnecessary. However, KOREA thought that the paragraph should be retained. INDIA asked for examples of regulated pests. [No regional comment was agreed.](#)

KOREA and SINGAPORE proposed to include the content of paragraph 35 in paragraph 31, as paragraph 35 is a scope, not an objective. SINGAPORE shared similar comments and proposed modified text. [The following proposal was agreed as a regional comment:](#)

*[\[Para 31\] In the context of this annex, the term “field inspection” applies to the inspection of plants in field \(including plants in open fields, in nurseries, and in controlled environments\) during the growing period or dormant stage in fields \(including plants in open fields, in nurseries and in/under controlled environments\). The term “pest” may refer to a single regulated species or multiple regulated species. Field inspection can also be used as part of a specific surveillance \(ISPM 6 \(Surveillance\)\) to determine pest status in accordance with ISPM 8 \(Determination of pest status in an area\)](#)*

##### ***Section 2: Objectives of field inspection***

CHINA proposed to change the title to ‘Purpose’ but thought that ‘Objective’ was more appropriate given that it matched the text better.

JAPAN proposed modification of text in first paragraph to avoid duplication between the text in Para 35 and the subsequent bulleted list, merge the text in Para 35 with the opening sentence of the bulleted list. CHINA also thought that it was repetitious with the scope section and suggested deleting the first paragraph. Also, it was agreed to shift the new text to under the scope. [It was agreed as a regional comment to propose deleting paragraph 35 and incorporate a new sentence under the scope.](#)

KOREA commented that the contents of paragraph 35 and paragraph 43 were redundant, so suggested deleting section 3. Field inspection and specific surveillance and move the related text to paragraph 35.

JAPAN proposed modifying para 44 to avoid confusion between field inspection and specific surveillance and clarify the purpose of both. That is, ‘National plant protection organizations may use field inspection to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements for the international movement of plants as described in this annex, ~~but it can,~~ NPPOs may also be ~~used~~ use this means as part of specific surveillance (ISPM 6 (Surveillance)) ~~to determine for the purposes of determining~~ pest status in accordance with ISPM 8 (Determination of pest status in an area).’ [It was agreed as a regional comment to move para 44 to under scope rather than modify the wording.](#)

##### ***Section 4: Assumptions involved in the application of field inspection***

CHINA asked for clarity on why field inspection is more practical than testing. The CHAIR explained that field inspection can be more effective than testing and AUSTRALIA also thought there were circumstances when field inspection is more practical than testing. [No regional comment was agreed.](#)

## **Section 5. Other considerations for field inspection**

THAILAND proposed to include a new bullet "*the pathway of introduction and spread of the target pest in an area.*" As this aspect should be considered in the initial step of field inspection. Others did not understand the meaning of this and asked for further clarification. THAILAND said the comment was related to seeds. AUSTRALIA thought that it is covered by the pest status in the area and other points. It was also, discussed if '*pathway*' was the problem and that it was about the potential for introduction and spread. [No agreed regional comment.](#)

JAPAN proposed clarifying that the cost for inspection can be taken into consideration when selecting an inspection method, as there may be cases where laboratory testing is cheaper than conducting field inspection. [It was agreed as a regional comment to propose to include cost in para 58, i.e.](#)

- *inspection method, timing, [cost](#) and frequency, and the technical equipment needed;*

## **Section 6: Specific requirements for field inspection**

NEW ZEALAND proposed separating para 67 into two bullets as they are referring to two separate concepts. '*Conformity with other phytosanitary requirements*' is not necessarily visual. [Not agreed as a regional comment.](#)

### **Section 6.1: Examination of relevant documents**

SINGAPORE proposed deletion of several bullet points as there was overlap with Section 2.1 of the main standard. THAILAND wanted to retain the bullets. The CHAIR also referred to the EWG and the different scenarios that were discussed. She suggested that retaining the bullets was valuable information. The STEWARD also noted that the annex was about field inspection whereas the main standard focussed on consignment inspection so there was value in retaining the examples in the bullets. MALAYSIA agreed with both the opinions. [No regional comment agreed.](#)

NEW ZEALAND and KOREA proposed deleting '*trace-forward*' from para 79 as it was unclear the purpose of the example. [Agreed as a regional comment](#)

### **Section 6.3.1: Detection of pests**

NEW ZEALAND proposed to reference ISPM 31 to guide sampling methodology for field inspection. [It was agreed as a regional comment to propose:](#)

*[\[para 85\] The method and the intensity of inspection should allow the pest to be detected at the desired level of detection with the desired level of confidence in accordance with ISPM 31.](#)*

Also, INDIA proposed replacing '*ability*' with '*[effectiveness](#)*' in para 85 which was [agreed as a regional comment.](#)

### **Section 6.3.2: Verification of conformity with other phytosanitary requirements**

THAILAND proposed deleting bullet 3 [para 91] because it is difficult to achieve in practice and could become a barrier to trade. However, MALAYSIA pointed out that most countries require this and it is achievable with GPS although it can be difficult. [Not agreed as a regional comment.](#)

JAPAN proposed amending para 93 to replace ‘conditions’ with ‘practices’ as it was unclear. NEW ZEALAND questioned whether this was about the environment rather than practices. JAPAN clarified that it by proposing examples are added. [The agreed regional comment was to propose to amend para 93 as follows:](#)

- [specific production ~~conditions~~ practices e.g. environment, plants in open field, in nurseries, controlled environment – glasshouses, enclosure; or](#)
- [specific cultural practices](#)

### **Section 7: Field inspection methods**

SINGAPORE thought that the phrase ‘looking for anomalies within the crop’ in para 97 was vague as it does not clearly define the characteristics to be observed. They proposed to replace ‘~~looking for anomalies within the crop~~’ with ‘detecting variations from normal growth patterns’. [The agreed regional comment was to propose the following amendment:](#)

[a general visual assessment of a field, or part thereof, to check the physiological condition of the plants, ~~looking for anomalies within the crop~~, detecting variations from normal growth patterns and for any noticeable, poorly growing plants or patches of plants or those with obvious symptoms;](#)

CHINA proposed adding a new bullet point to the section i.e.

- If there is a pest trap, you can check whether the pests are caught

[This was not agreed as a regional comment](#)

SINGAPORE proposed to remove the para 102 " *The timing should coincide with a life stage of the pest that is suitable for detection and for the plants to show signs or symptoms*" as they thought it was obsolete and not practical due to the staggered planting in a field (local cropping practices) leading to a mixed population of a pest rather than a specific life stage. There would be farmers who would stagger the planting in a field to ensure a steady supply to meet contractual requirements. As such, the life stages of a pest are most often staggered due to this staggered planting. A pest will have different life stages in the field under staggered planting at a given time. The CHAIR acknowledged that this is not always practical but pointed out that it was in other countries. The wording is not strong but emphasized that timing was important. AUSTRALIA agreed with the CHAIR and suggested removing the first sentence and rewriting the second. [The agreed regional comment was to propose to amend para 102 as follows:](#)

- [The timing should coincide with a life stage of the pest that is suitable for detection and for the plants to show signs or symptoms. This varies between pest and plant species and may depend on the season, growing conditions and local cropping practices.](#)

KOREA thought there is a need for clarification on ‘another phytosanitary measure’ in para 110 and proposed adding examples (e.g. laboratory testing, export testing, etc.). AUSTRALIA proposed amending the examples to make it broader. [The agreed regional comment was to add \(e.g. testing, treatment\) to para 110 as examples for clarity.](#)

### **Section 8: Field inspection outcome**

THAILAND proposed removing the second sentence from para 113 since it seems to clarify a particular activity that would be at conflict with the sentence ‘*Such phytosanitary actions are outside the scope of this annex*’ in the scope i.e.

If the pest of concern is detected or its population size exceeds the specified threshold, or if conformity with other phytosanitary requirements is not verified, the NPPO may

take further actions to meet phytosanitary requirements. ~~These actions may be determined by the nature of the findings, considering the pest or other objectives, and the circumstances; for example, the NPPO may exclude the place of production from further phytosanitary certification for export.~~ **Not agreed as a regional comment.**

### ***Section 10: Responsibilities of national plant protection organizations***

The CHAIR suggested adding a new bullet point about the responsibilities of the NPPOs after para 126. AUSTRALIA provided the wording that the PPPO had proposed. **The agreed regional comment was to include a new bullet after para 126 as such:**

- *if using authorized entities to perform inspection, audit, and verification of field inspection activities, ensuring this is done in line with ISPMs 45 and 47.*

**Action 13:** APPPC members and observers to support the agreed regional comments in the IPPC OCS and add any country comments on the draft annex Field inspection (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines of inspection*).

### **5.5 Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)**

The draft specification was introduced by Mr Masahiro SAI. In 2023, the topic proposing the revision of ISPM 23 was submitted during the IPPC call for topics. The CPM-18 in 2024 approved the inclusion of this topic as a priority 2 item on the IPPC work programme. Subsequently, in May 2025, the SC reviewed the draft specification and approved it for country consultation.

ISPM 23 was adopted 2005 and has served as a foundational standard for the inspection of plants, plant products, and other regulated articles in international trade. However, since its adoption, several definitions in ISPM 5, such as “inspection,” “compliance procedure,” “identity,” and “integrity” have been revised or newly introduced. These changes have created inconsistencies between ISPM 23 and ISPM 5. For instance, ISPM 5 defines “inspection” narrowly as the official visual examination of regulated articles to detect pests or verify compliance with phytosanitary requirements. In contrast, ISPM 23 uses the term more broadly, encompassing document checks and verification of consignment identity and integrity.

The revision of ISPM 23 aims to clarify inspection procedures and incorporate modern methodologies and technologies. It also seeks to align the core text of ISPM 23 with the content of the draft annex on Field Inspection (2021-018), which is currently under development.

The scope of the revision includes ensuring consistency with ISPM 5 definitions, clarifying both inspection and related compliance procedures, and updating the procedural requirements to reflect current practices. The revised standard will also establish a clear connection with the Field Inspection annex.

The Expert Working Group (EWG) who will revise the ISPM will identify which sections of ISPM 23 align with ISPM 5 and which extend beyond its definitions. The group will revise the content to ensure comprehensive coverage of inspection activities and determine whether any sections should be moved to implementation materials. Additionally, the EWG will review references to ISPM 23 in other standards and propose any necessary updates.

The EWG will consist of five to seven members with expertise in consignment and field inspection, compliance procedures, and pest risk management. Members of the former EWG

on Field Inspection (2021-018) are encouraged to participate. A representative from the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) will also be invited to contribute as an expert or observer.

The CHAIR advised that regional standards are not normally made on draft specifications and countries should submit comments as country comments. She highlighted that experts will be called for and countries should consider nominating

#### **General comments:**

The PHILIPPINES support the revision. They highlighted that the guidelines should be clear and actionable including for applying risk-based inspection methodologies. The revision should guide implementation of digital tools and technologies and offer a perspective where countries may opt to develop criteria on risk-based inspection. The CHAIR noted that risk-based inspection had been discussed before and is under development as a guide rather than a standard. Digital technologies are more appropriate as implementation materials. NEW ZEALAND agreed but that there should not be prescriptive requirements and that it could be addressed with the guide. The STEWARD noted that the comments were useful for the revision of the specification.

JAPAN commented that the revision should be broader than the ISPM 5 definition of inspection. They also thought that a member of the TPG should be invited to the EWG.

**ACTION 14:** APPPC members and observers to provide country comments in the IPPC OCS on the specification for the revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2023-014) considering regional discussions.

**ACTION 15:** APPPC members and observers to consider nominating suitable candidates for the expert working group (EWG) for the revision of ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*) (2023-014) when an IPPC call for experts is made and submit discussion papers to support the work of the EWG.

#### **5.6 Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Annex Remote audits to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*)**

The draft specification was introduced by Ms Mi Chi YEA. ISPM 47, which was adopted in 2022, provides guidance on audits conducted in the phytosanitary context by NPPOs, either within their own territories or in collaboration with other NPPOs. It also covers audits conducted by entities authorized by NPPOs. However, ISPM 47 does not currently include specific guidance on remote audits.

The development of an annex on remote audits responds to the increasing use of remote audit techniques, enabled by technological advancements. Remote audits have become particularly relevant in situations where in-person audits are not feasible due to travel restrictions, emergencies, financial limitations, or the unavailability of experts. These audits offer a flexible and efficient alternative, allowing for the continuation of audit activities and broader participation of experts, while maintaining appropriate levels of oversight.

The annex is intended to provide clear guidance for NPPOs on conducting remote audits, whether within their own territory or in cooperation with another NPPO. It will also address audits carried out by authorized entities on behalf of NPPOs. The purpose of the annex is to



promote a harmonized approach to remote audits, thereby enhancing trust and mutual understanding among contracting parties.

The EWG tasked with developing the annex will undertake several key activities. These include defining what constitutes a remote audit, identifying the circumstances under which remote audits may be used, and reviewing current best practices and hybrid models. The EWG will also assess the advantages, limitations, and risks associated with remote audits, and determine which audit activities are most suitable for remote execution.

Furthermore, the EWG will describe the specific requirements for conducting remote audits and consider any potential impacts on biodiversity and the environment. The EWG will also evaluate operational and technical challenges that contracting parties may face in implementing the annex.

Following the consultation period, the steward of the specification will review the comments received and revise the draft accordingly for further consideration by the SC.

#### **General comments:**

The PHILIPPINES shared insights into the draft specification. They suggested that it clearly defines the necessary information and documentation for remote audits, security of data handling through encryption to protect confidentiality. Also, to establish criteria for evaluating capabilities of auditors and auditees and specify the conditions under which a country can conduct remote audits. Furthermore, the procedures for remote audits should be detailed to outline online tools and to strengthen points. CHINA wanted to include minimum requirements.

NEW ZEALAND have experience on remote auditing and proposed adding types of remote audits, describing when audits can, should and should not be done. In the past New Zealand has received requests for remote audits that are impractical. JAPAN also thought that best practice guidelines should be included. JAPAN proposed a new task that highlighted that a stable internet connection was needed. NEW ZEALAND proposed separating tasks for identifying advantages from limitations and how risks and limitations can be managed.

NEW ZEALAND suggested adding minimum requirements for equipment and technology to assess if it is the best option. CHINA proposed a new task about formulating contingency plans to ensure the continuity of remote auditing activities. INDIA and JAPAN questioned how to address non-conformities and THAILAND proposed adding a reference from ISO.

The CHAIR and AUSTRALIA suggested that comments could be made on whether this should be a standard or a guidance document.

**ACTION 16:** APPPC members and observers to provide country comments in the IPPC OCS on the specification for the Annex *Remote audits* (2023-031) to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*).

**ACTION 17:** APPPC members and observers to consider nominating suitable candidates for the expert working group (EWG) for the Annex *Remote audits* (2023-031) to ISPM 47 (*Audit in the phytosanitary context*) when an IPPC call for experts is made and submit discussion papers to support the work of the EWG.



### **5.7 Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*)**

The draft specification was introduced by Ms Joanne WILSON. The topic was submitted through the 2023 IPPC Call for Topics and was added to the List of Topics for IPPC Standards by CPM-18 in 2024, with priority 1 status.

ISPM 12, which provides guidance on phytosanitary certification, underwent a revision in 2022 that focused specifically on re-export procedures. However, that revision did not address several other critical issues that have since been identified. The current revision aims to clarify and update the standard to reflect the operational challenges of NPPOs, particularly in light of the ongoing transition from paper-based phytosanitary certificates (PCs) to electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhytos).

The revision seeks to harmonize the use of paper and electronic certificates, promote ease of use of the standard, and provide clearer requirements for complex scenarios such as re-export of stored products or cases involving multiple inspection dates. It also aims to clarify what additional phytosanitary information may be included in certificates, and to distinguish between requirements and implementation guidance.

The purpose of the revision is to enhance the implementation of ISPM 12, facilitate the transition to electronic certification, and ensure consistency and clarity across different formats of phytosanitary certificates. The scope includes reviewing the entire text of ISPM 12, including its annexes and appendices, and updating requirements related to re-export, security and authentication, and Appendix 1.

The EWG will consider whether additional phytosanitary information is needed, revise and update requirements for both paper and electronic certificates and identify operational and technical challenges that may affect implementation.

#### **General comments:**

The PHILIPPINES recommended that the revision takes account of several elements including defining extended timeframes for re-exported articles. THAILAND was interested in clarifying secure storage. JAPAN thought it was important to provide information about the transition from paper phytos to ePhyto. Also, if online authentication was introduced, it could impose a burden on contracting parties. JAPAN encouraged countries to post examples of phytos on the IPP. They also proposed a period of validity of phyto certs and their certified copies as additional information.

THAILAND proposed a call for information from CPs regarding the duration of validity and the relevant situations.

NEW ZEALAND commented on Japan's comment re QR codes and the issue it has created for New Zealand. NEW ZEALAND described a new task that related to partial release of a consignment. The task was deleted by the SC as an in-depth description of the issue could not be provided.

KOREA proposed adding a task regarding emergency/contingency task.

CHINA wanted consideration of developing countries.

**ACTION 18:** APPPC members and observers to provide country comments in the IPPC OCS on the specification for the revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (2023-020).

**ACTION 19:** APPPC members and observers to consider nominating suitable candidates for the expert working group (EWG) for the revision of ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*) (2023-020) when an IPPC call for experts is made and submit discussion papers to support the work of the EWG.

### 5.8 Discussion on rethinking ISPMs

The discussion topic was introduced by Ms Joanne WILSON. She highlighted that during the 2023 consultation on reorganizing pest risk analysis ISPMs, comments were received about broader challenges faced by contracting parties in interpreting and complying with certain ISPMs. A paper was developed from these comments and presented to the SPG and later CPM-19.

The paper identified several key issues. First, many ISPMs suffer from low readability. They are often difficult to understand due to long, repetitive sentences, the use of specialized terminology, and a lack of alignment with the FAO's plain language style. Second, the technical language used in ISPMs presents challenges for accurate translation, particularly in regions where FAO languages are not widely spoken. This can lead to misinterpretation and hinder effective implementation.

Third, the paper noted that core requirements within ISPMs are often unclear. The frequent use of the term “should” created ambiguity about what is obligatory versus recommended. Additionally, guidance information is sometimes overly detailed and may be mistaken for requirements. The naming conventions of ISPMs also contribute to confusion, with some standards titled as “Requirements for...” and others as “Guidelines for...”, implying differing levels of obligation.

To address these issues, the paper proposed several options. These include drafting ISPMs in plain language, incorporating visual and digital tools, and layering information to present core requirements upfront followed by detailed guidance. Another option is to draft ISPMs that focus solely on core requirements. The paper also encouraged learning from other standard-setting organizations to improve clarity and usability.

Workshop participants were invited to reflect on the regional relevance of these issues, identify any gaps not addressed in the paper, and propose practical solutions to improve ISPMs. They were also encouraged to consider implementation challenges and formulate key messages to be communicated to the SPG.

Ms WILSON said that the next steps include providing regional feedback to the IPPC Secretariat, ensuring that regional representatives on the SC, IC, and Bureau are informed of these discussions, and considering the development of regional or national discussion papers for the SPG. The SC and IC are currently preparing papers on the future of ISPMs for the 2025 SPG meeting, which will inform recommendations to CPM-20.

### Comments

KOREA said that most ASEAN countries use their own languages and needed to translate the ISPMs into their own languages. This is becoming harder as ISPMs become more difficult to

understand. KOREA thought that the idea of core requirements up front in an ISPM could be a good idea with more guidance in a main document. They agreed that editing was important. They also thought that not every ISPM needed to be revised. For example, DPs are highly technical, and the end user should be an expert. They thought that the revision of ISPMs 2 and 11 could be a pilot.

JAPAN wanted to focus on the difference between requirements and guidance. They did not think that ISPM 28 caused problems for CPs. It is difficult to interpret some ISPMs that have a lot of guidance. If guidance was to be omitted from ISPMs then the guidance needs to be somewhere. They thought it would be challenging to revise ISPM but liked the idea of layering information with concise summaries upfront. Another way could be to separate requirements and guidance in the same ISPM.

THAILAND strongly supported the idea of rethinking ISPMs. They want ISPMs to be clear and understandable. They currently have a side co-publishing agreement and have difficulty translating the ISPMs. Implementation should be easier if ISPMs were clearer.

CHINA supported the ideas and thought a paper on plain language to the CPM was needed.

The CHAIR's experience is that EWGs are not keen or able to write in plain language. Drafting from the beginning to end of an ISPM is different. One problem is the inconsistent use of terminology. This could be replaced by different terminology. One example is a treatment – used for many other purposes. The ISPMs don't make it clear what the treatment is for. Even in English it is not clear. Terminology is important so that everyone is on the same page.

Japan, the Philippines, Australia and NZ are going to SPG. A paper from the APPPC will be championed by Japan, and by the Philippines as the Bureau member.

**ACTION 20:** APPPC members and observers to support the Asian region paper on '*Rethinking ISPMs*' by agreeing/not agreeing by 26 September for the IPPC SPG meeting in late October 2025 and elect a champion to present it at SPG.

**ACTION 21:** APPPC members and observers to consider preparing and submitting papers to the SPG about their country perspectives on '*Rethinking ISPMs*'.

## SECTION 2: FAO/RPPO FRAMEWORK

### 6. Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/RPPOs

#### 6.1 APPPC activities

The topic was introduced by Ms Lihong ZHU on behalf of the Executive Secretary of the APPPC. She provided a comprehensive overview of the Commission's activities and strategic priorities for the 2024–2025 biennium. It emphasized the critical importance of plant protection in safeguarding food security, biodiversity, and global trade, noting that up to 40% of food crops are lost annually due to pests and diseases. The presentation highlighted the role of the IPPC as the sole global standard-setting body for plant health, and outlined its governance structure, including the CPM, Standards Committee, and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee.

The APPPC's role as a RPPO was detailed, including its coordination of plant protection activities among 25 member countries, its leadership in areas such as Integrated Pest Management (IPM), pesticide management, and plant quarantine, and its contribution to the development and implementation of ISPMs and RSPMs. The presentation also outlined the structure of the APPPC, including its advisory group and standing committees.

Key activities conducted during the biennium included a regional workshop on minor crop pesticide management in China, expert working group meetings to develop RSPMs for sea containers and specific commodities, and a training workshop on molecular diagnostics for South American Leaf Blight (SALB) of rubber in Malaysia. Upcoming events include TC-RPPO APPPC meeting in Thailand in late September, a workshop on Fall Armyworm management in China, and an e-commerce workshop in the Philippines in November 2025.

The presentation concluded with a financial report detailing member contributions to the APPPC trust fund as of 31 December 2025, showing both received and outstanding amounts. Overall, the presentation underscored the APPPC's continued commitment to strengthening regional cooperation, enhancing technical capacity, and supporting the implementation of ISPMs.

### **RSPM Safe movement of shipping containers**

The topic was presented by Ms Joanne WILSON, the APPPC steward for the RSPM. The RSPM was jointly developed by experts from the APPPC and the Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO). The initiative was included in both organizations' work plans, with formal collaboration beginning in 2024. A specification was developed and approved in early 2025, and a Joint Expert Working Group was formed to produce the draft RSPM in June 2025. The draft RSPM was subsequently approved for a 60-day consultation period from 1 September to 31 October 2025.

The RSPM aims to define the scope of phytosanitary concerns related to shipping containers, categorize types of contamination, and identify critical control points and measures to minimize contamination. It also outlines procedures for verifying and certifying compliance and clarifies the roles and responsibilities of NPPOs. The standard distinguishes between regulatory components, such as import requirements, compliance verification, and auditing, and non-regulatory components like best practice guidelines, training, and awareness programs. Appendices provide examples of contamination, activities that NPPOs can recognize entities to perform on their behalf, mitigation measures, and documentation. APPPC members are invited to submit comments via the IPPC online system by 31 October 2025.

### **Comments**

The CHAIR encouraged APPPC members to comment on the draft RSPM and allowed further discussion at the end of day three. Examples of documentation was discussed. AUSTRALIA emphasized that stakeholders need to be consulted if they are affected by the RSPM.

SINGAPORE commented that they were not aware of countries requiring measures on importing countries and the RSPM would be challenging to implement.

AUSTRALIA highlighted that the IPPC has been working on this issue for 15 years and have not developed a standard. AUSTRALIA also highlighted that two countries of the APPPC as well as the PPPO have asked for a standard so that there was a need to have a standardized approach. There is currently an impact, and the standard aims to have a coordinated and

controlled approach. AUSTRALIA said that the PPPO had drafted a sea container strategy and would circulate to APPPC members and observers.

SINGAPORE is looking forward to the implementation and will talk to stakeholders.

NEW ZEALAND acknowledged that this is difficult and may take time to get over the line. If needed a second round of consultation would occur. It was important that the RSPM would be beneficial and there was no need to rush the RSPM.

The CHAIR asked what the expected impact would be. The STEWARD thought that this standard had the potential to minimize the spread of pests and diseases via shipping containers. An RSPM is obligatory and goes further than the CPM recommendation.

CAMBODIA requested if the RSPM could be circulated by email.

**ACTION 22:** APPPC members and observers to provide comments on the RSPM *‘The safe movement of shipping containers’* by 31 October using the IPPC OCS.

**ACTION 23:** Ms Sophie PETERSON to circulate to APPPC members and observers a copy of the draft Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) sea container strategy.

### **RSPM Commodity Standards for fresh durian and green coffee beans**

The topic was presented by Ms Kyuock YIM, the APPPC steward for the RSPMs. She described the two standards under development. Durian and green coffee beans. She noted that Durian did not list specific measures for managing pests. The two drafts will be out for consultation soon (60 days). Commodity standards may not need to go out for a second consultation and could be adopted at the biennial session.

**ACTION 24:** APPPC members and observers to provide comments on the RSPM *Options for phytosanitary measures for the international movement of fresh durian (Durio zibethinus) fruit*, when it is released for consultation.

**ACTION 25:** APPPC members and observers to provide comments on the RSPM *Options for phytosanitary measures for the international movement of green coffee (Coffea spp.) bean*, when it is released for consultation.

### **6.2 IPPC Call for topics: lessons learned and future topic submissions**

The topic was presented by Ms Mi Chi YEA.

The IPPC Call for Topics is a mechanism designed to identify phytosanitary issues of global relevance and address gaps in international plant health systems. It enables contracting parties and regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) to propose new standards, revisions to existing standards, and implementation resources that align with the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. The Call for Topics also helps shape the work of the CPM by ensuring that proposed activities reflect global priorities.

Since CPM-13, the Call for Topics has evolved to become more inclusive and responsive. The 2018 call combined submissions for both standards and implementation resources. In 2021, the



process was refined to incorporate insights from the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) 2020. The 2023 Call for Topics received 28 submissions, including proposals for 14 standards, 3 implementation resources, and 11 diagnostic protocols, submitted by 9 contracting parties and 3 RPPOs. The 2025 Call for Topics opened on 6 May and will remain open throughout the year as part of a two-year trial.

Submissions may include proposals for new ISPMs, additions to existing standards (such as annexes or glossary terms), revisions to adopted standards, and new diagnostic protocols. Implementation resources such as guides, training kits, and e-learning courses may also be proposed. Additionally, topics for surveys and studies under the IPPC Observatory are welcomed.

Lessons learned from previous calls have led to several improvements. These include enhanced clarity in submission forms, better alignment with IPPC priorities, and the inclusion of draft specifications for proposed standards and resources. The form design has been refined to reduce omissions and misinterpretations, and submission monitoring has been strengthened to ensure timely follow-up. Communication with contracting parties and RPPOs has also been streamlined to improve efficiency.

Looking ahead, the year-round Call for Topics will be assessed in 2027 at CPM-21 to determine its effectiveness and future viability. For the 2025 cycle, the Secretariat will compile submissions in September and share them with the SC, IC, and relevant technical panels. These panels will review the proposals and provide feasibility assessments and prioritization. Final recommendations will be made by the SC and IC in December and submitted to CPM-20 in 2026.

The IPPC Secretariat encourages all stakeholders to actively participate by submitting topics, sharing the call widely, and contributing to the development of future international plant health standards. Submissions can be made via the IPPC website.

**ACTION 26:** APPPC members and observers to consider submitting via the IPPC website, new topics for ISPMs, implementation materials and guidance.

### **6.3 Identification of regional IPPC implementation issues to share with the IC**

The IPPC Secretariat presented an overview of how IPPC Regional Workshops can serve as a strategic platform for identifying implementation challenges faced by contracting parties in applying the IPPC Convention and ISPMs. These challenges, once identified, are intended to be shared with the IC to inform future support activities, including the development of guides and training materials.

The presentation began with a reminder of the IPPC's role as an intergovernmental treaty established in 1951 to protect global plant health. With 185 contracting parties, the IPPC promotes ISPMs to safeguard food security, facilitate safe trade, and protect the environment. However, implementing these standards presents practical challenges, particularly for developing countries, which often face resource constraints and capacity limitations.

ISPMs play a critical role in ensuring that phytosanitary measures are scientifically justified and harmonized across countries. They cover a wide range of technical areas, including pest surveillance, risk analysis, inspection protocols, and certification systems. Despite their technical rigor, many countries encounter difficulties in applying ISPMs consistently and effectively within their national contexts.



To support implementation, the IPPC Secretariat provides technical assistance, develops e-learning courses and guides, and facilitates knowledge exchange. The IC oversees a coordinated programme to strengthen phytosanitary capacity globally, focusing on infrastructure enhancement, legislative alignment, and dispute avoidance.

Regional workshops have been restructured to be more interactive and collaborative, enabling the IPPC Secretariat to better understand the concerns of NPPOs. These workshops aim to build capacity, review ISPMs and specifications under consultation, and promote technical resources. In 2025, particular emphasis is being placed on identifying real-world implementation challenges that countries face, which can inform the development of future support materials.

The presentation emphasized that while ISPMs are developed through inclusive consultation processes, many implementation challenges only become apparent when countries attempt to apply the standards in practice. Regional workshops provide a valuable opportunity to capture these challenges and feed them into the IC's work programme.

Considering the ongoing Call for Topics for standards and implementation, contracting parties are encouraged to document specific ISPMs that present difficulties, describe the practical obstacles encountered, propose potential solutions, and formally submit these issues for consideration. This process supports the development of targeted guidance and training resources that address the actual needs of countries.

APPPC members were invited to share specific implementation challenges. Feedback will help the IC take appropriate actions to support contracting parties in strengthening their phytosanitary systems and improving compliance with international standards.

### **Discussion:**

The CHAIR discussed the process for developing implementation material. Hearing about implementation issues is important for the prioritization process. Asian countries are generally quiet and do not raise concerns. She encouraged participants to speak up and highlight issues with the IPPC Secretariat.

NEW ZEALAND highlighted that implementation issues are always available in the OCS at the end of the draft standards. This is a good starting point for the SC and IC. She also talked about transparency and funding issues. It would be useful to understand the cost of developing implementation material so that countries could choose topics to support.

Ms Maki IIZUKI said that the information is available on the IPP although this does not itemize costs. AUSTRALIA followed on by talking about how the SC and IC can align better for the development of implementation material to support ISPMs. She talked about how there was currently a disconnect and that issue has not been resolved yet. The CHAIR continued to discuss funding and how in the past the IPPC was asked to develop a 'wish list' but this never eventuated. She committed to taking the APPPC concerns to the IC in November.

## SECTION 3: MOVING TOGETHER FROM IDEAS TO ACTIONS

### 7. Moving together from ideas to action

#### 7.1 Regional issue on IPPC ePhyto solution

The topic was introduced by Ms Kyu-Ock YIM. She did not go through the presentation as participants were aware of the progress. She asked if countries were investing in getting e-Phyto online. Money was the limiting factor for most that had not adopted it.

General comments from BHUTAN were that they were very new to the OCS system so hadn't made any comments on ISPMs yet. They hope to make comments soon but needed to consult with industry. They are working towards e-Phyto

SRI LANKA joined the GENS system recently. They have issues with countries that will only accept e-Phytos and not paper copies. They are also wanting to incorporate e-payment into the e-Phyto system.

MALAYSIA are exchanging with some countries already and welcome others. They can also receive hard copies. From July 2026 they expect full implementation.

SINGAPORE asked how money is collected when there is a change to e-Phyto. They need to factor fee recovery into the system. E-Phyto is not cost effective for them at present.

NEW ZEALAND shared their experience. New Zealand cost recovers from industries who require phytos. When e-Phyto was taken up by New Zealand, costs were shared between importers and exporters through a levy as both are beneficiaries. No extra costs are passed on to these stakeholders. New Zealand is changing their electronic system to a trade single window system in February 2026. There won't be any noticeable difference. New Zealand is working with trading partners and on a business continuity plan if the system goes down.

AUSTRALIA said that from a Pacific perspective it is difficult especially for phytos for passenger personal hand luggage. Cost recovery from the public is difficult and so is e-Phyto. An App is under development for this.

From the IPPC Secretariat, Jean Luca is the contact point for technical assistance. Ms IIZUKI was happy to liaise if needed. The CHAIR said that requests could be sent to Ms IIZUKI who will forward them to Jean Luca.

CAMBODIA has yet to develop the e-Phyto system and requires assistance especially with funding. The CHAIR said there were a few funding agencies and advised to contact the IPPC Secretariat to find out more.

#### 7.2 IPPC Plant Health Campus

Ms MAKI IIZUKI introduced the IPPC Plant Health Campus during the 2025 Regional Workshops as a major advancement in global phytosanitary capacity development. Developed with financial support from the European Union and technical input from global plant health experts, the Campus serves as a centralized, accessible portal for e-learning courses, guides, and training materials related to plant health and phytosanitary systems.

The Campus is designed to support a wide range of users, including staff of NPPOs, PCE facilitators, farmers, exporters, importers, and other stakeholders involved in plant health. It

offers free, certified e-learning courses that can be completed independently or integrated into structured training programmes. These courses are available in French, with Spanish translations underway, and the IPPC Secretariat is encouraging further support to expand access in other FAO languages such as Arabic, Chinese, and Russian.

The e-learning offerings include foundational courses such as “Working with a National Plant Protection Organization” and more advanced modules covering topics like pest surveillance, emergency preparedness, phytosanitary export certification, stakeholder engagement, and pest risk analysis. A specialized learning pathway tool helps users identify relevant courses and guides based on their roles and career goals within NPPOs.

Upon completion of courses, learners receive digital badges or certificates, which they are encouraged to share on professional platforms like LinkedIn to foster a global community of plant health professionals. The Campus is also designed to be adaptable for use by universities and academic institutions, allowing integration of IPPC content into formal curricula.

Since its launch, the IPPC Plant Health Campus has seen strong uptake, with 6,290 students participating between June 2024 and June 2025. A webinar held on 11 June 2025 helped promote the Campus, and a demo of the platform was provided during the workshop to guide users in navigating its features.

The IPPC Plant Health Campus represents a significant step forward in equipping countries and individuals with the knowledge and tools needed to implement international phytosanitary standards effectively and to strengthen global biosecurity.

### **Discussion:**

The CHAIR noted that some institutes liked the Plant Health Campus and there was interest in how NPPOs will use the resources for training. KOREA has a good training process, however, courses are targeted on practical skills. The Campus gives a more foundational base for NPPOs. She encouraged participants to look at the Campus as it is free and is a good resource.

### **7.3 E-commerce**

Ms Maki IIZUKI presented the findings and progress of the IPPC Observatory Study on E-commerce, which aims to assess the phytosanitary risks associated with the growing volume of international trade conducted via online platforms and postal/courier services. This study responds to the increasing complexity of managing plant health risks in the context of e-commerce and supports the implementation of CPM Recommendation R-05 and the IPPC Guide on E-commerce.

The study was launched in August 2024 and involved a global survey distributed to all IPPC contracting parties. Its objectives were to establish a baseline for measuring key indicators, evaluate the implementation of CPM recommendations, identify challenges and gaps in phytosanitary risk management, and guide future work in this domain. The survey focused on three primary areas: governance frameworks, implementation of phytosanitary systems, and monitoring mechanisms.

A five-phase methodology was used, and the study is currently in the final phase of report writing. The response rate was 41.1%, and data collection spanned from August 2024 to January 2025. Responses were cleaned, verified, and analysed using a structured scoring system to generate indicators across the key areas.

Key insights from the study revealed significant regional disparities in the existence and coverage of regulatory and non-regulatory frameworks. Africa showed the weakest presence of governance tools, while Europe and Latin America relied heavily on legal frameworks that may lack flexibility. Most regions lacked alignment with CPM R-05, particularly in mechanisms to identify domestic e-commerce traders.

Implementation challenges were also evident. Many regions lacked accessible online lists of prohibited and regulated articles, limiting traders' ability to comply with phytosanitary requirements. Pre-border and at-border risk management systems were inconsistently applied, with Africa and Latin America showing critical gaps. Capacity-building efforts and public awareness campaigns were limited across most regions, with Asia and North America being exceptions.

Monitoring mechanisms were underdeveloped. Only 30% of respondents had publicly available online reporting platforms, and just half used data analysis to monitor compliance. These gaps highlight the need for enhanced digital infrastructure and data-driven oversight.

The study recommends increasing awareness of IPPC e-commerce resources, addressing gaps in governance frameworks, strengthening border risk management, and improving monitoring systems. It also calls for targeted regional support, particularly in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, to build capacity and improve access to regulatory information.

The next steps include finalizing and publishing the study report, distributing findings, developing outreach materials, and presenting recommendations to CPM-20 in 2026.

#### **Discussion:**

NEW ZEALAND has been working with the large e-commerce platforms and wondered if this has been captured by the IPPC. The CHAIR said that might need to be an individual country action as it is more difficult for the IPPC. There was some response on the survey, but not all countries did this. The survey results are important as without information the big picture could not be understood. AUSTRALIA urged countries to respond to the survey to understand what e-commerce management is today compared to the future.

The CHAIR acknowledged that there had been a lot of surveys and there was effort made to reduce the numbers. There are ongoing issues with survey but there is no other way to get information from NPPOs. Surveys are confidential.

Ms IIZUKI encouraged participants to share information on tracking plant products traded by e-commerce.

#### **7.4 IPPC Observatory: Overview of the IPPC 3rd general survey questionnaire**

Ms Maki IIZUKI presented the design and objectives of the Third IPPC General Survey, which is being developed under the IPPC Observatory. The Observatory is a system that monitors and evaluates the implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs, CPM Recommendations, and Development Agenda Items under the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030.

The Third General Survey is being redesigned to address limitations identified in previous surveys conducted in 2012 and 2016. Earlier methodologies were found to be inadequate for capturing the evolving realities of implementation and lacked the analytical depth required for strategic decision-making. The new survey aims to provide a more standardized, focused, and data-driven approach.

The primary objectives of the Third General Survey are twofold: first, to assess the extent to which contracting parties align with select obligations and responsibilities under the IPPC; and second, to understand how these obligations are being operationalized, including identifying best practices, challenges, and capacity needs. This information will inform the development of targeted support tools and resources.

The scope of the survey has been refined to focus on the existence and quality of implementation of select obligations that all contracting parties must meet. Eighteen ISPMs have been factored into the survey, categorized based on their relevance to trade, phytosanitary oversight, and international cooperation. CPM recommendations, which are not binding, have been excluded from this general survey and may be addressed through thematic studies.

The survey design incorporates both quantitative and qualitative questions, structured to cover legal frameworks, operational systems, implementation processes, and data management. It will be administered via SurveyMonkey, with a downloadable Word version also available to facilitate completion. Measures are in place to ensure data quality, including pilot testing, version control, and regular reviews.

To optimize participation, the survey will be launched formally to NPPO heads and contact points, supported by multilingual materials and regional engagement strategies. Participants will be recognized in the final report and receive certificates of participation.

The data analysis methodology will include descriptive statistics and indicator development to support meaningful interpretation of the results. The final survey design will be shared with the SPG for feedback, and the launch is being considered around the CPM to maximize engagement.

#### **Discussion:**

The CHAIR indicated that the previous version of the survey was not well designed or analysed and therefore not that valuable. The IPPC Secretariat intends to be modified, and participants are encouraged to respond. A form needs to be sent to the IPPC Secretariat to make changes as this cannot be done directly by NPPOs.

**ACTION 27:** APPPC members and observers to check IPPC contact point information on the IPP and update as needed with the IPPC Secretariat to ensure APPPC and IPPC notifications are received.

**ACTION 28:** APPPC members and observers to respond to IPPC surveys when requested by the IPPC Secretariat.

### **7.5 IPPC workshop on Systems Approaches**

Ms Sophie PETERSON introduced plans for the upcoming Global Workshop on Systems Approaches, scheduled to take place from 1 to 5 December 2025 in Santiago, Chile. This workshop will focus on the application of systems approaches in phytosanitary risk management, particularly in the context of increasingly complex trade pathways and evolving production and market practices.

Systems approaches offer integrated, risk-based, and technically justified alternatives to single phytosanitary measures. They are designed to be less trade-restrictive while



maintaining the appropriate level of protection required by importing countries. These approaches are grounded in ISPM 14 and supported by related standards such as ISPM 2, ISPM 11, and ISPM 21. A systems approach involves the combination of multiple independent measures that collectively reduce pest risk, and it is particularly valuable when no single measure is sufficient.

The workshop will be organized by the IPPC Secretariat in collaboration with the Chilean NPPO and regional partners including Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE), the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), and IPPC contracting parties such as Australia, Canada, and the United States. The CPM Bureau confirmed the event in April 2025, and venue proposals are currently under review. Up to 100 participants are expected to attend.

An organizing committee has been established, comprising subcommittees for programme development, logistics and finances, and communications. Responsibilities are shared among the IPPC Secretariat, Chile, COSAVE, IICA, and supporting countries. The IPPC Secretariat will lead programme development and speaker coordination, while Chile will manage on-site logistics and interpretation. COSAVE will provide bilingual interpretation, and IICA will support registration and co-funding.

The official Call for Participants will be launched in September 2025. Participation will be open to NPPOs, RPPOs, and other key stakeholders involved in systems approaches. The call will include application procedures, selection criteria, workshop details, and information on financial support where applicable. Participants will engage in technical sessions, share national experiences, contribute to programme discussions, and participate in a field visit.

The IPPC Secretariat encourages contracting parties to prepare success stories on systems approaches for submission. These contributions will help showcase innovations, strengthen collaboration, and shape the future of phytosanitary risk management globally.

#### **Discussion:**

JAPAN asked if the presentations from the workshop would be made available. Ms PETERSON said they would be and there would also be a meeting report available. JAPAN also asked about if numbers would be capped and if there could be virtual participation. Ms PETERSON said that the venue would restrict numbers to approximately 100 and that the IPPC call for participants will be made soon.

**ACTION 29:** APPPC members and observers to submit ‘success stories’ on systems approaches to the IPPC Secretariat when the call for participants for the IPPC *Workshop on Systems Approaches* in Chile in December 2025, is issued.

## **CLOSING SESSION**

### **8. Conclusion of the workshop**

The CHAIR reminded participants to submit their country comments on the draft ISPMs and thanked all participants for their contributions.

KOREA will submit regional comments on the draft ISPMs through the IPPC Online Commenting System (OCS).

#### **9. Online survey of the workshop**

The IPPC Secretariat requested that meeting participants complete the online survey of the workshop. Korea also requested participants to complete a survey.

#### **10. Date and venue of the next regional workshop**

The next Regional Workshop of the APPPC will be held in the Republic of Korea, 7-11 September 2026.

#### **11. Evaluation of workshop and adoption of report**

The action points for the meeting were discussed and circulated to participants before the close of the meeting. The full meeting report will be reviewed by the Chair, IPPC Secretariat and rapporteurs and will be circulated to all participants.

#### **12. Close of meeting**

Ms Lihong ZHU thanked the hosting country, Korea, the Australian Government for supporting some participants attending the meeting, the NPPOs for attending and participating in discussions, the OCS team, the report writer, the technical team for supporting the meeting and the Chair.

Ms Maki IIZUKA, from the IPPC Secretariat, expressed her pleasure at working with the APPPC and thanked the Chairperson for her excellent work in facilitating the workshop. She thanked participants for their contributions to the review of the draft ISPMs and standard setting processes. She expressed her appreciation for the work of the host country, the Republic of Korea, and the excellent field trip. She also thanked the technical support staff and SC members.

Mi Chi YEA introduced the Director General of APQA who expressed his gratitude for the participants enthusiasm and active engagement and cooperation in the workshop for addressing global phytosanitary issues. Since 2006, APQA has hosted the meeting, he thanked the Chair and the participants and hoped all enjoyed their stay in Korea. Ms YEA hoped that all would enjoy the lunch hosted by APQA.

Lastly, the Chair thanked all members for their participation and closed the meeting.



## ATTACHMENT 1: Agenda

### Agenda for the 2025 APPPC-IPPC Regional Workshops in Asia

Amid Hotel, Seoul  
Rep. of KOREA

No	Item	Presenter / Facilitator	Time (min.)	Document
<b>Day 1, morning Opening session:</b>				
<b>1</b>	<b>Opening of the Session</b>			
1.1	Welcome remarks: - IPPC Secretariat  - APPPC Secretariat  - High Level Authority Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency, Rep. of Korea	IPPC Secretary (via video) IPPC secretariat officer	30	Video In-person IPPC secretariat officer
<b>2</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>			
2.1	Election of the Chair and the Rapporteur	All	5	
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	All	5	Doc
<b>3</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>	Organizer		
3.1	Participants list	Organizer	5	Doc
<b>4.</b>	<b>Updates on Governance and Strategic issues</b> (this will involve presentations, discussion, and questions from workshop's participants)			
4.1	Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)	Sophie P/ IPPC Secretariat	20	Doc/PPT
4.2	Update from IPPC Secretariat on Communications (IDPH & Coms Networks)	IPPC Secretariat	20	PPT
4.3	Update from SC	Sophie P/IPPC Secretariat	15	PPT
4.4	Update from IC	X. Wang (IC Member of Asia)/ IPPC Secretariat	15	PPT
4.5	Getting In Touch About CPM FG on Sea Containers	J Wilson, Australia/IPPC Secretariat	15	PPT
4.6	Getting In Touch About CPM FG on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (FGSA)	Sophie P / IPPC Secretariat	15	PPT
4.7	Getting In Touch About CPM FG on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination (FG GPRC)	L. Zhu/ IPPC Secretariat	15	PPT
4.8	Getting In Touch About CPM FG on plant health in the context of One Health	IPPC Secretariat/Bureau Member/	15	PPT
<b>Day 1, Afternoon session</b>				
<b>5</b>	<b>Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations</b> (this will involve presentations, discussion, and questions from workshop's participants)			
<b>Breaks</b>	- Advertising slides and video on guides and training materials and standard setting process		<b>10</b>	<b>Presentation /Video</b>

5.1	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex International movement of fresh banana ( <i>Musa spp.</i> ) fruit (2023-028) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> )	D. Kim, Zhu L (TPCS Member), SC member/Chair	90	PPT
5.2	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex International movement of fresh taro ( <i>Colocasia esculenta</i> ) for consumption (2023-023) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> )	Sophie P, Zhu L (TPCS Member), SC member/Chair	90	PPT
<b>Day 2</b>				
	Remained discussion of draft commodity ISPMs	Chair	50	
5.3	Draft ISPM under 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation: 1. Draft revision of ISPM 26 (Establishment and maintenance of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)) (2021-010)	J Wilson (SC Member) /Chair	100	PPT
5.4	Draft ISPM under 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation: 2. Draft annex <i>Field inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 ( <i>Guidelines for inspection</i> ) + Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Revision of ISPM 23 (Guidelines for inspection)	M. Sai (SC Member) /Chair	100	PPT
5.5	Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: - Annex Remote audits to ISPM 47 (Audit in the phytosanitary context)	M. Ye (SC member) /Chair	20	PPT
5.6	Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: - Revision of ISPM 12 (Phytosanitary certificates)	J. Wilson (SC member) /Chair	20	PPT
5.7	Discussion on Rethinking ISPMs	J Wilson, SC and IC members/Secretariat	60	PPT
<b>Day 3</b>				
<b>6</b>	<b>Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPOs</b> This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants			
	Remained discussion on draft ISPMs and specifications	Chair	60	
6.1	APPPC activities	L. Zhu J Wilson, K Yim	30	Doc + PPT
6.2	IPPC call for topics: lessons learned and future topic submissions	M. Yea (SC member)	30	PPT
6.3	Identification of regional IPPC implementation issues to be shared with the IC	X. Wang (IC member of Asia)	30	PPT
<b>7</b>	<b>Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session)</b>			

	This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants			
7.1	Regional issue on IPPC ePhyto Solution	Chair/IPPC Secretariat	30	
7.2	IPPC Plant Health Campus	IPPC Secretariat / IC member of Asia	30	PPT and demo of the campus
7.3	E-commerce	IPPC Secretariat / IC member of Asia	20	Video / Preliminary outcomes Observatory Study on E-commerce
7.5	IPPC Observatory – IPPC Third General Survey	IPPC Secretariat / IC member	20	PPT
7.6	IPPC Workshop on Systems Approaches	Sophie P.	30	PPT (ideas and brainstorming)
Day 4, Field trip (to be announce by APQA, Rep. of Korea)				
Day 5				
	Remained issues from the workshop	Chair	60	
8	Conclusion of the workshop	Chair	10	
9	Online survey of the workshop	IPPC Secretariat	5	On-line survey
10	Date and venue of the next regional workshop	Chair	5	
11	Evaluation of the workshop and Adoption of the report	All participants	120	
12	Close of the meeting	Chair	10	



## **ATTACHMENT 2: List of Participants**

### **Australia**

#### **Keira BEATTIE**

Senior Policy Officer, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health  
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry  
GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601, Australia  
Email: keira.beattie@aff.gov.au, IPPC.contactpoint@aff.gov.au

#### **Sophie PETERSON**

Director, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health  
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry  
GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601, Australia  
Email: Sophie.Peterson@aff.gov.au

### **Bangladesh**

#### **Amirul Bahrain**

Additional Director  
Plant Quarantine Wing, Department of Agricultural Extension  
Room No. 403, 3'd Floor, Khamarbari, Dhaka-1215, Bangladesh  
Email: bahrainamirul@gmail.com

### **Bhutan**

#### **Sonam DORJI N**

Deputy Chief Regulatory and Quarantine Officer, Head of Plant Biosecurity Section  
Bhutan Food and Drug Authority  
Ministry of Health  
Email: sdorin@bfda.gov.bt

### **Cambodia**

#### **Chhun Hy HENG**

Deputy Director  
Plant Protection Sanitary and Phytosanitary Department/GDA  
#54B/49F, Street 395-656, Sangkat Teuk La'ark3,  
Khan Toul Kork, Phnom Penh, Cambodia  
Email: chhunhyheng@gmail.com

### **China**

#### **Xiaoliang WANG**

Deputy chief of plant quarantine division  
National Agro-tech Extension and Service center (NATESC)  
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, P.R. China  
No. 22 Mai Zi Dian Street, Beijing 100125, China  
Email: Wangxiaoliang0116@gmail.com

**Jiang Pei**

Deputy chief of pest risk analysis division (NATESC)  
National agricultural technology extension service center  
Building 20, Mai zi Dian Street, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China  
Email: jiangp2006@126.com

**Japan****Masahiro SAI**

Head of Narita Plant Protection Station Office  
Yokohama Plant Protection Station,  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), JAPAN  
1-16-10 Shin-Yamashita, Naka-ku, Yokohama. 2310801  
Email: masahiro\_sai670@maff.go.jp

**Natsumi YAMADA**

Deputy Director  
International Affairs Office, Plant Protection Division  
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), JAPAN  
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN. 100-8950  
Email: natsumi\_yamada770@maff.go.jp

**Hiroki FUJITA**

Section chief  
International Affairs Office, Plant Protection Division  
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), JAPAN  
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN. 100-8950  
Email: hiroki\_fujita450@maff.go.jp

**Malaysia****LAILATUL JUMAIYAH BINTI SALEH HUDDIN**

Senior Principal Assistant Director  
Plant Biosecurity Division  
Department of Agriculture Malaysia,  
3rd Floor, Wisma Tani, Jalan Sultan Salahuddin, 50632 Kuala Lumpur  
Email: lailasaleh@doa.gov.my

**Mongolia****ULAMBAATAR Emeel**

Director, Contact Point of Mongolia  
Plant Protection Organization of Mongolia  
Email: foreignrelation@nppo.gov.mn

**OYUNSUVD Enkhbold**

Foreign Relation and Public Affairs Officer



Plant Protection Organization of Mongolia  
Email:

### **Nepal**

#### **Prakash PAUDEL**

Senior Plant Protection Officer/ Section Chief of Pest Risk Analysis, Plant Quarantine  
Regulation and Monitoring Section of NPPO-Nepal  
Plant Quarantine and Pesticide Management Center,  
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development,  
Government of Nepal, Hariharbhawan, Lalitpur, Nepal  
Email: prakashpaudel4@gmail.com

### **New Zealand**

#### **Lihong Zhu**

NZ IPPC Contact Point  
Portfolio Manager for IPPC (International Plant Protection Convention)  
International Standards Organizations  
International Policy, Policy & Trade  
Ministry for Primary Industries - Manatū Ahu Matua  
Charles Fergusson Building, 34-38 Bowen Street  
Wellington 6140, New Zealand  
Email: lihong.zhu@mpi.govt.nz

#### **Joanne Wilson**

Principal Adviser  
Office of the Chief Biosecurity Officer  
Biosecurity New Zealand - Tiakitanga Pūtaiao Aotearoa  
Ministry for Primary Industries - Manatū Ahu Matua  
Charles Ferguson Building, 38-42 Bowen Street  
Wellington 6140, New Zealand  
Email: joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz

### **Pakistan**

#### **Muhammad Basit**

Director Technical Quarantine, IPPC Official Contact Point of Pakistan  
Department of Plant Protection  
Email : callislam10@gmail.com

### **Philippines**

#### **Rossel CASTILLO**

Agriculturist II  
Bureau of Plant Industry  
692 San Andres st. Malate Manila Philippines  
Email : npqsd.rcastillo@gmail.com

#### **Jhoana Grace SAN GABRIEL**



Supervising Agriculturist  
Bureau of Plant Industry  
692 San Andres st. Malate Manila Philippines  
Email : jhuannendal@gamil.com

### **Republic of Korea**

#### **Ji Young MOON**

Director  
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs  
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea 39660  
Email: jimoons@korea.kr

#### **Mi Chi YEA**

Deputy Director  
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs  
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea  
Email: kittymc@korea.kr

#### **Donam KIM**

Assistant Director  
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency/Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs  
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea  
Email: dongam75@korea.kr

### **Singapore**

#### **Mei Lai, Jenny YAP**

Director, Plant Science and Health, Official Contact Point for Singapore under IPPC  
National Parks Board  
Email: yap\_mei\_lai@nparks.gov.sg

#### **Li-an, Gloria ONG**

Senior Manager, Plant Biosecurity & Phytosanitary Services, Plant Science and Health  
Branch  
National Parks Board  
Email: gloria\_ong@nparks.gov.sg

#### **Noemi GESMUNDO**

Senior Manager, Plant Biosecurity & Phytosanitary Services, Plant Science and Health  
Branch  
National Parks Board  
Email: noemi\_gesmunundo@nparks.gov.sg

### **Sri Lanka**

#### **Maduka Sajani Chithrapala NABADA HEWAGE**

Assistant Director of Agriculture  
National Plant Quarantine Service

Department of Agriculture  
Email: madusajani@yahoo.com

### **Thailand**

#### **Prateep ARAYAKITTIPONG**

Standards Officer, Senior Professional level  
The National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)  
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900  
Email: Prateep\_ming@hotmail.com; ippcthailand@gmail.com

#### **Somrudee MONGKOL**

Standards Officer, Senior Professional level  
The National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)  
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900  
Email:

#### **Wasana RIDTHAISONG**

Agricultural Research Officer, Senior Professional Level  
Department of Agriculture  
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900  
Email: wasana\_rid@yahoo.com

#### **Areeya SIRIPUNYAWAT**

Standards Officer, Senior Professional level  
Department of Agriculture  
50 Phaholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900  
Email:

### **Facilitator**

#### **Kyu-Ock YIM**

Expert  
Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)  
International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)  
Email: koyim2022@gmail.com

### **IPPC Secretariat**

#### **Maki IIZUKA**

IPPC Secretariat  
Agricultural Officer  
Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU)  
International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)  
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)  
Viale Delle Terme di Caracalla 00513 Roma Italy  
Email: Maki.lizuka@fao.org



### ATTACHMENT 3: List of acronyms used in this report

AMR	Antimicrobial resistance
ANSES	French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety
APPPC	Asia Pacific Plant Protection Organization
APQA	Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency of the Republic of Korea
CODEX	Codex Alimentarius Commission
COMESA	Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa
COSAVE	Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (The Plant Health Committee of the Southern Cone)
CPM	IPPC Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
CPM-17	17th Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in 2023
CPM-18	18th Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in 2024
CPM-19	19th Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in 2025
CPM-20	20th Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in 2026
CPM-21	21st Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in 2027
CRP	Conference room paper
CTU code	Cargo Transport Units code
DIA	Development agenda items of the IPPC Strategic Framework
EBRD	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ePhyto	Electronic phytosanitary certificate
EU	European Union
EWG	Expert working group
FAO	The Food and Agricultural Organization: A United Nations organization
FF-PFA	Fruit fly pest free area
FG	IPPC Focus Group
FG-PHOH	Focus Group on Plant Health in the Context of One Health
FGSA	Focus Group on the Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid
FGSC	Focus Group on Sea Containers
GEF	Global Environment Facility (FAO regional regular programme)
GeNS	Generic ePhyto National System
GLDN	IPPC focus group on Global Laboratory Diagnostic Networking
GPRC	IPPC focus group on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination
Gy	Gray (the unit of ionizing radiation dose in the international system of units)
HWIT	Hot water immersion treatment
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
IC	IPPC Implementation and Capacity Development Committee
IFU	IPPC Implementation and Facilitation Unit
IICA	Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
IITA	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
ILO	International Labour Organization
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IPP	International Phytosanitary Portal (the official website of the IPPC)

IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISPM	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
IDPH	International Day of Plant Health
IYPH	International Year of Plant Health
NAPPO	North American Plant Protection Organization
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
OIRSA	International regional organization for plant and animal health (acronym in Spanish)
OCS	The IPPC Online Commenting System
PCE	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations
PFA	Pest Free Area
POARS	Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems
PPPO	Pacific Plant Protection Organization
PRA	Pest Risk Analysis
RIG	Regional Implementation Guide
RPPO	Regional Plant Protection Organization
RSPM	Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
SAFE	The framework of Standards to Secure and Facilitate Global Trade
SALB	South American leaf blight of rubber
SC	IPPC Standards Committee (comprises 25 members from each of the seven FAO regions)
SC-7	Standards Committee 7 (comprises seven members, one from each FAO region)
SF	IPPC Strategic Framework
SIT	Sterile insect technique
SPG	IPPC Strategic Planning Group
TC-RPPO	Technical Consultations among Regional Plant Protection Organizations
TPCS	Technical Panel on Commodity Standards of the IPPC
TPDP	Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols
TPPT	Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments
TPG	IPPC Technical Panel for the Glossary
TR4	<i>Fusarium</i> tropical race 4, Panama wilt disease
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VHT	Vapour heat treatment
WCO	World Customs Organization
WHO	World Health Organization
WFP	World Food Programme
WOAH	World Organization for Animal Health