



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

IPPC-ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION (APPPC) REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR ASIA 2020

**Virtual Meeting
7-10 September 2020**

IPPC Secretariat

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

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

© FAO, [2020]



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: “This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition.

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org

Contents

Summary	5
Report.....	6
1. Opening of the meeting	6
1.1. Welcome remarks.....	6
1.1.1. IPPC Secretariat	6
1.1.2. Executive Officer of the APPPC.....	6
1.1.3. Bureau Members	6
2. Meeting arrangements	6
3. Administrative matters	7
3.1. Participant list.....	7
4. Updates of governance and strategic issues	7
4.1. Governance and Strategy (CPM and CPM Bureau).....	7
4.2. Update from Standards Committee	8
4.3. Update from Implementation Committee.....	8
4.4. Update on Sea Containers Task Force	8
5. Section 1: Discuss the substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations	9
5.1. Audits on the phytosanitary context.....	9
5.2. Focused revision of ISPM 12 (“re-export”)	10
5.3. Draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on Phytosanitary Terms).....	11
5.4. Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)	11
5.5. Draft CPM Recommendation: Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (2018-026)	12
6. Regional issues	13
6.1. Review of APPPC two year work plan	13
6.2. Introduction of RSPM draft Specification on Seeds for planting an timeframe	14
6.3. Discussion on the proposed revision of the APPPC Standard Setting Procedure	15
6.4. Overview of the Global Fall Armyworm (FAW) programme	15
6.5. Issues arising from draft PTs or DPs (ISPMs) out for consultation in 2020.....	15
7. Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action	16
7.1. International Year of Plant Health Legacy	16
7.2. IPPC PFA Guide: how to support the implementation of the Convention and ISPMs	16
7.3. Preparation for 2021 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation.....	16
7.4. ePhyto.....	17
7.5. National Reporting Obligations	17
8. Conclusion of the Workshop/ Date and venue of the next meeting	17

9. Close of the meeting.....	18
------------------------------	----

IPPC-ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION (APPPC) REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR ASIA 2020

7-10 September 2020

Summary

- [1] The regional workshop was held in four three-hour periods over four days. This was the first time this meeting had been held virtually. Some 18 countries attended with over 60 NPPO officials participating at some time over the four days. The meeting was opened by three Bureau members.
- [2] There were three basic areas of discussion: the draft ISPMs out for consultation, the regional action programme, and the updating of IPPC issues.
- [3] Discussion on the draft ISPMs:
 - Draft ISPM on audit: two of the major concerns were the difficulties with terminology – as some terms were to be finalised in another standard; and some countries had problems with the Conflict of interest section.
 - Revision of ISPM 12 in the area dealing with re-export: discussions revealed a continuing difficulty in understanding how the requirements and terms can be clearly phrased and understood. Concerns included ‘pest risk’, the transfer of ADs and if ‘test’ should be added to inspection. The importance of clarity with this standard was stressed.
 - Commodity standard – the discussions showed that the matter of obligation may need further resolution; some countries preferred the deletion of the section on Confidence in Measures.
 - CPM recommendation on food aid was supported but there were a few comments submitted. Some countries still preferred this subject to be dealt with by a standard. The PPPO supported this thesis.
- [4] The Regional action programme:
 - The APPPC work programme was reviewed. Much of the programme will be deferred to 2021 or later because of the global Covid-19 pandemic.
 - Discussions on the APPPC regional implementation guidance on seed health certification covered: whether it be a guidance document versus an RSPM; specific issues including material on seed export systems, record keeping and traceability etc; and the review of ISPM 38 to identify any components that require further work.
 - Priority items identified were the FAW workshop, the ePhyto workshop including establishing an APPPC ePhyto Working Group and the development of a benefits and strategic value paper.
- [5] IPPC issues:
 - IPPC activities and issues reviewed included: CPM, SC and IC activities; the IYPH legacy; the IPPC PFA guide; preparation for 2021 call for topics; the operation of the NRO; and updates on the SCTF, the FAW programme and ePhyto work.

Report

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1. Welcome remarks

1.1.1. IPPC Secretariat

- [6] The IPPC Secretary opened the meeting with an introduction to the International Year of Plant Health (IYPH). He noted the 40 % losses caused by plant pests and encouraged the IPPC community to continue to protect plants from pests through establishing and implementing international standards for phytosanitary measures. The International Year of Plant Health is intended to raise the public awareness of the importance of plant health and will include a series of events at global, regional and national levels. Mr Xia urged all to work together to make the IYPH a successful and historic event.

1.1.2. Executive Officer of the APPPC

- [7] Mr Yubak Dhoj GC welcomed all the participants to the workshop in its virtual mode. He noted that all APPPC countries worked together to consider the draft standards and to develop cooperative policies. Invasive pests continue to cause problems for Asia and Pacific countries and to disrupt important trade in the area. The consideration of the draft standards and the development of comments will not give rise to agreed APPPC comments as has happened in previous years. Mr Yubak thanked all the experts involved in the programme to develop the comments for this workshop.
- [8] Ms Ornusa Petchkul, FAO, Bangkok was introduced to the meeting.

1.1.3. Bureau Members

- [9] **Mr Wang Fuxiang, Bureau member for Asia** addressed the meeting. He noted that this was an especial meeting because of the impact of Covid-19. However, the IPPC Bureau, SC and IC have continued to work. The IYPH will increase the public awareness of the pests and the losses the pests can produce. The Regional Workshops are an important platform for reviewing the draft standards and discussing amendment to the standards. This is the first time this meeting has been held virtually – with a much shorter time for participant attendance. The internet capability in some countries is not good so input and discussion has been limited and countries will have to send their comments to the IPPC separately. He wished the workshop every success.
- [10] **Mr Konan L. Kouame, Vice Chair of the CPM, Cote D'Ivoire.**
- [11] He wished the meeting's participants a successful meeting.
- [12] **Mr Peter Thomson, Bureau member for the SW Pacific, New Zealand.** The impact of Covid-19 has made so many things more difficult – but the lack of travel has provided the opportunity for more people to take part in the meeting. Because the ISPMs make an important part of the trade facilitation framework, Mr Thomson asked participants to make the most of the opportunity to improve the draft standards. The workshop is also an opportunity to learn from each other by listening to others – and to share with colleagues in the important job of improving the draft ISPMs.

2. Meeting arrangements

- [13] An Organizing Committee (OC) for the IPPC-APPPC Regional Workshop (RW) was set up composed of Ms Kyu-Ock YIM (Republic of Korea and Chair of the RW), Mr Fuxiang WANG (CPM Bureau representative), Mr Masahiro SAI (Japan and SC representative), Mr Chris DALE (Australia and IC representative), Mr John HEDLEY (Report writer), Mr Yubak DHOJ GC and Ms Ornusa PETCHKUL (APPPC Secretariat) and Mr Brent LARSON & Ms Ewa CZERWEIN (IPPC Secretariat).

- [14] In addition Ms Lihong ZHU (New Zealand), Ms Joanne WILSON (New Zealand and SC member), Mr Prateep ARAYPITTIPONG (Thailand), Mr Dilli SHARMA (Nepal and IC regional member), Ms Sophie PETERSON (Australia and SC regional member) and Mr Peter NEIMANIS (Australia and ePhyto Steering Committee member) supported the OC.
- [15] The committee corresponded by e-mail and met virtually on 7 and 25 August 2020 to discuss RW arrangements. It was decided to hold the RW virtually in four sessions of three hours from 7 to 10 September 2020. The agenda items were rearranged to fit the time available, keeping the original agenda numbers so that it would be easier to link it to the associated information (Power Point presentations) posted on the IPP (<http://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/regional-ippc-workshops/2020-ippc-regional-workshop/>) The committee modified agenda and schedule is presented in Appendix 1.
- [16] The OC also recommended, that to save time at the virtual meeting, all participants would be requested to review and study the Power Point presentations for the updates, as these presentations would not be delivered during the virtual meeting. Participants would be asked to prepare any questions in advance and time would be set aside to answer them. Also, it was recommended, because of the difficulties with discussions involving many people at a virtual meeting, that agreement on proposed amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*) not be attempted. Countries would be encouraged to enter all their comments on draft ISPMs in the OCS for the Standards Committee to examine and evaluate.”
- [17] Ms Kyu-Ock YIM (Republic of Korea), as Chairperson for the meeting, outlined the rules for the meeting. Only substantial comments will be considered. There will be no agreed APPPC comments as per previous meetings. The aim was for speakers to be brief and succinct in their comments. It was noted that a good range of experts were available to comment on the draft ISPMs.

3. Administrative matters

3.1. Participant list

- [18] On the first day there were some 60 participants from 18 countries. The list is presented in Appendix 2 contains the contact details of most of the participants.

4. Updates of governance and strategic issues

4.1. Governance and Strategy (CPM and CPM Bureau)

- [19] The presentation summarised the Bureau decisions taken in light of the Covid-19 pandemic. The Bureau, Standards Committee and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee agreed to meet virtually. CPM-15 was postponed and the SPG meeting will be held virtually. Some decision points from CPM-15 were approved for the Bureau consideration. It was agreed to move the CPM-15 ministerial segment, the International Plant Health Conference and the closing ceremony to the 1st semester of 2021. May 12 would be proposed to the UN General Assembly to celebrate the International Plant Health Day championed by Zambia. The regional meetings would be fully supported.

Discussion of Governance

- [20] A participant asked – will there be an SPG meeting this year? Mr Thomson noted that there will be a two-day virtual meeting with four sessions on the 8-9 October.
- [21] Another question was – is there a contingency plan for next year’s CPM – virtual or face-to-face? The Bureau is trying to keep things moving but not to take decisions that should be taken by CPM.

Re support for the International Day for Plant Health (IDPH). It was suggested that countries write a support letter using the IYPH support letter as a template. This could be sent by a Minister to the FAO DG or to the COAG chair (with a copy to the country's Permanent Representative) or the country could just communicate with the Permanent Representative.

4.2.Update from Standards Committee

- [22] The SC recommended three standards for adoption by the delayed CPM -15; those concerning Glossary amendments, the revision of ISPM 8 and the requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments. The SC also prepared four ISPMs for their first consultation: Glossary amendments, the revision of ISPM 12 re re-export, Audits in a phytosanitary context and Commodity-based standard for phytosanitary measures. (The development of commodity-based standards was supported by the Bureau.) Twelve phytosanitary treatments were also advanced. Three specifications were provided for consultation: the use of systems approaches for the phytosanitary certification of seeds; more information on the determining of host status of fruit flies; and a Technical Panel for Commodity standards. Future work is likely to include the reorganization of Pest Risk Analysis related standards. The CPM is to consider the draft ISPM on authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions as the SC could not reach a consensus on the subject. Two expert working groups are planned for 2021 – on the use of specific import authorizations and the revision of ISPM 4 on pest free areas.

4.3.Update from Implementation Committee

- [23] The presentation listed the committee members and the 2020 virtual meetings. The sub-groups and teams included the sub-group for Implementation Review and Support System, the Sea Containers Task Force (SCTF), the team on National Reporting Obligations and the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation Tool. The SCTF is to have its mandate extended an additional year. The topics for the IC consideration were those submitted from the 2018 call for topics and those submitted to the CPM prior to the formation of the IC. The guides for priority development were listed.

4.4.Update on Sea Containers Task Force

- [24] The video presentation, prepared and presented by Ms Ketevan LOMSADZE, (IPPC Secretariat) showed the major tasks of the SCTF are to measure the impact of the IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of practice for Packing Cargo Transport Units (CTU Code) by monitoring the uptake of the Code and developing a joint IPPC/IMO/industry protocol for the collection of data related to the contamination of sea containers, and to increase the awareness of pest risks of sea containers.
- [25] There was an attempt to measure the impact of the CTU Code to some extent by the Sea Container Questionnaire, issued to understand NPPO activities, legal frameworks in place and the status of Sea Container National surveys. However, the NPPO's involvement in the questionnaire has been less than hoped for. The same applies to the NPPOs and industry participation and delivery of sea containers surveys.
- [26] There has also been some work exploring the feasibility of using the Authorized Economic Operator and WCO Data Model for tracking sea container cleanliness and including sea container cleanliness questions in IMO inspection programmes.
- [27] It is hoped to increase the awareness of pest risks of sea containers by having some input into the revision of the CTU Code. The IPPC Best Practice Guidance and associated leaflet are serving the same purpose. It is hoped that the holding of an International Workshop on Sea Containers under the leadership of the North American Sea Container Initiative and the World Bank will come up with the real solutions and agreements between stakeholders involved to manage risks associated with the movement of sea containers. NPPOs and RPPOs are especially asked to establish sea container surveys, to work with national contact points of the IMO and local/national.

- [28] Mr Larson noted that there had been continuing efforts to work with the IMO and the WCO. Since 2017 progress had been made in increasing the awareness of the pest risk of sea containers by CPs and components of the shipping industry. Ms Gu (China) agreed that much work had been done but more was required to deal with the risk of repositioned sea containers that are still not cleaned before being reshipped after being emptied. The non-mandatory nature of the CTU Code was noted and preference of China (and some other CPs) for a comprehensive sea container ISPM restated.
- [29] The Chair noted that the CPM will have had 6 years of activities to evaluate if the CTU Code has produced the desired effects. Some countries take the pest risks of sea containers seriously while many do not. A strengthened response from countries might be needed if any authoritative action was to be proposed – such as through the IMO and the CTU Code.

5. Section 1: Discuss the substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations

5.1. Audits on the phytosanitary context

- [30] The presentation offered a few general comments on the draft ISPM. It mentioned the general considerations to be taken into account for audits and followed this with the steps of execution of an audit. It also described audit frequencies, settling disputes over audit findings and agreeing on financial agreements between parties. It should be noted that the authorization standard is not yet agreed to. Participants were asked to consider if there are implementation issues that need to be brought to the attention of the IC.
- [31] The presenter from Australia (S. Peterson) said the major issues related to clarity of the text. Some of the text is also in the authorization standard. The main concerns were:
- Confusion regarding the terms ‘audit’ and ‘verification procedure’ and the differences. Some comments have been submitted.
 - Clarity about which NPPOs were referred to e.g. NPPO auditors or NPPO auditees. On some occasions it was unclear if it was the auditor or auditee was being discussed. Also, it was asked if the auditee can be an individual? (see under Roles). It was discussed whether the dispute facility should be a requirement or an option.
 - Para 75 - The establishment of an audit framework. It was questioned whether this should be considered or developed for the ISPM. It was suggested that this could be inserted into the outline for a guide and could involve a proposal for the call for topics. New Zealand suggested that this is an implementation matter for each NPPO developing their own framework.
 - Para 107 - Selection of auditors, China believes audits require two people. New Zealand appreciated the reason for this requirement, but New Zealand would not support this as it would have to double its auditing capacity which would be unlikely and unnecessary in the NZ context.
 - Para 118 - Conflicts of interest was a concern for New Zealand who proposed that they ‘should be identified and managed’ rather than being free from conflicts as this was unfeasible for small countries. China thought that freedom from conflicts of interest should apply to both parties and proposed text that the auditee would have the right to choose the authorized entity it was audited by or reject if necessary. This would protect the rights of the auditee. Australia is unsure about this. It would be preferable if it was agreed before the audit is commenced. NZ noted it made a comment that an audit should be mutually agreed

procedure, and suggested that choice of auditee could be mutually agreed prior to the audit and noted in the Terms of Reference

- Para 125 - Dispute settlement, Japan suggested to change ‘should’ to ‘may’ as discussions on resolution of disputes ideally should be part of the first pre-audit discussions. New Zealand agreed with Japan’s proposal.
- Paras 175-176 - Non-conformities. No comments were forthcoming, but it was noted that these terms come from the authorization of entities draft ISPM.

[32] It was noted that the authorization standard will have to go to the CPM for discussion. A webinar will be held to resolve some of the problems. This will be held on 20th October.

5.2.Focused revision of ISPM 12 (“re-export”)

[33] The presentation, shown by Mr M. Sai, listed the changes made to the text, which in some cases, required new text being inserted and in others, existing text being moved. Section 6.1 now provides a comprehensive list summarizing all the requirements that should be met for a re-export certificate. Where conditions cannot be met, a re-export certificate should not be issued but a country of re-export may carry out appropriate phytosanitary actions and issue a PC for export. One revised section deals with the procedures agreed between countries of origin and re-export for satisfying the phytosanitary import requirements of both the re-exporting country and country of destination when re-exports routinely occur.

[34] Countries discussed why ‘phytosanitary status’ is proposed to be replaced by ‘pest risk’ and noted that this was an SC decision. The matter was complex and not easily discussed virtually. Mr Sai had produced a summary Handout which was very useful in understanding the issues involved. Discussion points included:

- Para 60 - Various additions were put forward as ‘pest risk’ does not seem to be a suitable replacement for ‘phytosanitary status’. There is also difficulty with para 164 but pest risk could be used here.
- Para 85 Point (3) in Mr Sai’s summary. The case is not covered well by this draft. Republic of Korea made useful suggestions.
- Para 229, it was noted that there was difficulty in understanding what the ‘change in nature’ is e.g. does a seed coating change the nature of a seed? Thailand proposed a footnote could be added to the ISPM to make it clear what constitutes a change. Potentially there could be a link to ISPM 32.
- Para 241, New Zealand suggested to add ‘or test’ to ‘inspection’ re the verification that a consignment has not been exposed to infestation or contamination by pests. This would follow the use of the terms in the PC. Japan suggested adding treatment as well – treatment could be used to disinfest a consignment.
- Para 246 regarding the transfer of Additional Declarations to new PCs and that the original certificate should accompany the re-export certificate. New Zealand proposed that the two paragraphs 246 and 253 should be aligned regarding transfer of additional declaration. Japan suggested additional declaration from the original phytosanitary certificate should not be transferred to the phytosanitary certificate for export because additional declarations on phytosanitary certificates for re-export should be based on the activities of the NPPO of the country of re-export. Republic of Korea commented the same point and proposed to replace “transferred” by “referred” in para 253.
- Countries questioned whether a ‘test’ or ‘treatment’ (instead of an inspection) could be used to verify that a consignment has not been exposed to infestation or contamination by pests.

- [35] The chair encouraged the participants to present their comments clearly. The chair commented that there are now many more cases of re-export than ever before and therefore it is more important to produce a correct revision.

5.3.Draft 2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on Phytosanitary Terms)

- [36] The presentation showed the one deletion (incidence), and three revisions, (emergency action, clearance (of a consignment) and detection survey), contained in this amendment. This ISPM was not discussed at the meeting.

5.4.Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)

- [37] The presentation, shown by Ms J Wilson (New Zealand), described the purpose of the draft ISPM plus the lists of pests and corresponding phytosanitary measures. This ISPM is meant to be an overarching concept standard that provides guidance on the use, content and publication of commodity-based standards. It has two key elements – the facilitation of trade and the safeguarding of agriculture, forests and the environment. Principles to help the use of the standard included that: sovereign rights are not affected by commodity standards; and such standards do not impose additional obligations on importing countries. The commodity standards are intended to provide benefits for both importing and exporting countries. The measures included are not seen as requirements but should be considered unless there is good reason not to.
- [38] Several ISPMs provide information on verification of compliance – ISPM 7, ISPM 12, ISPM 13, ISPM 18 and ISPM 20. Criteria for inclusion of measures into commodity standards are listed. Important requirements include that a measure is used as a phytosanitary import requirement by at least one CP and that experience from use in trade, not just experimental evidence, may be taken to indicate that the measure is effective. The commodity specific standards are posted separately on the IPP as annexes to this standard and have ISPM status. The Technical Panel on Commodity Standards will review data related to the standards and revise them as necessary.
- [39] The main discussion points were:
- Para 37 (Outline of Requirements), China suggested that the footnote for para 37 re obligations on contracting parties should be included in the text. China did not want there to be any obligation. However, New Zealand intimated that standards do place an obligation on contracting parties to use them unless there is a reason not to. New Zealand proposed alternative wording re obligation similar to that in the APPPC Mango fruit standard, to the effect that NPPOs of importing countries should consider or recognise the use of this standard. Also, slide 14 of the presentation and Para 130 state that the annexes to the commodity standard have the status of an ISPM and should be considered accordingly. Republic of Korea agreed with this. Japan noted that a similar footnote exists in ISPM 28 as part of the Scope.
 - Para 47 (Principles), New Zealand did not like the use of the term ‘Principles’ as these are not all principles, and suggested that some other term be used or that the points be incorporated into different sections of the draft.
 - Para 58 (Purpose and use of commodity standards), Thailand suggested that the “should” should be a “may”.
 - Para 83 (Pests), Japan proposed the text - These pests should be listed based on technical justification as the quality of PRA can be subjective.
 - Para 85 (Pests), Indonesia and New Zealand agreed that this section be kept as it contained useful information

- Para 89 (Options for phytosanitary measures), China proposed addingthe point of import and before import ...
- Para 94 (Verification of compliance), Thailand suggested this be deleted or additional references added.
- Para 99 (Criteria for inclusion of measures in commodity standards), China proposed to delete this point – it was felt to be invalid.
- Para 115 Participants discussed ‘Section 5 Confidence in Measures’ at length. Japan suggested that it was really impossible to categorize measures into high, medium and low levels of confidence and that a two-category system based on numerical data, such as detection data, efficacy level, or interception data, could be used. New Zealand noted that commodity standards are quite different from treatment standards, measures should only be included if there is confidence that they are effective, and suggested that Section 5 be deleted as measures could be included by meeting the criteria in Section 4. Republic of Korea added that confidence levels were not used in the APPPC Mango fruit standard but that the concept of ‘historic’ treatments (where efficacy data might not be available) was included.

[40] It was mentioned that the IC is dealing with implementation component pages as a contributory resource. Treatments that are in use in trade can be examined by the TPPT and then placed on a resource page.

5.5.Draft CPM Recommendation: Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (2018-026)

[41] This presentation, introduced by Ms L. Zhu (New Zealand) concerned proposals for actions to protecting countries receiving food and other humanitarian aid from being exposed to pests that could become established and have an impact on the economy and environment. The recommendation suggests that countries develop and maintain an emergency response plan and undertake preparedness activities to reduce the introduction of regulated pests with food or other aid. Countries should also identify and engage with relevant stakeholders to raise the awareness of the pest risk associated with food and other aid materials. The appendices to the recommendation include lists of examples of commodities or other materials that are not capable of being infested with regulated pests, that are capable of being infested with regulated pests, and which themselves are capable of causing harm.

[42] The discussion noted that the Task force on Topics had suggested this subject should be a CPM recommendation instead of a concept standard – and to include non-plant products in the scope. Few comments were received on this draft recommendation and though it was generally supported, some countries also preferred a concept standard to deal with this subject. Ms Zhu encouraged countries to continue review and provide examples for the appendices as country comments. The discussion included:

- Para 36, China suggested that NPPOs/RPPOs should guide the relevant stakeholders (eg aid agencies, exporters, regulators) in the implementation of specific measures ...
- Para 38, China proposed text to the effect that it was the responsibility of the donor countries NPPOs to deal with pre-dispatch and in-transit treatments. New Zealand supported this and recalled that it made comment last year to place responsibilities on the exporting countries to manage the phytosanitary risks. Australia agreed and stressed that often receiving countries would not have the ability or capability to undertaking phytosanitary actions due to emergency.
- Para 39, China suggested a new paragraph concerning the NPPO of the receiving country conducting treatments or returning the goods.

- [43] Mr G. DULLA, (Guam) PPPO Chair noted the increasing frequency of major storms or emergencies that require the provision of aid. He recalled that when aid agencies are approached regarding taking pest risk into account, the aid agencies required some appropriate documentation. The PPPO recognises this and would like to provide protocols to cover biosecurity assurance. Also, the PPPO wanted such a protocol to become a standard rather than a recommendation. It was felt that a recommendation is not really sufficient and would like a standard so to mandate that the pest risk is considered in the provision of aid. The PPPO hopes to develop a regional standard and in this enterprise seeks support from APPPC members. The PPPO has formed a working group to develop a draft regional standard.

6. Regional issues

6.1. Review of APPPC two year work plan

- [44] Ms Yim noted that the work plan had been approved at the 31st session meeting last year. However, it was quite clear that some items could not be conducted under the present conditions. Some items may be able to be postponed to the second year of the biennium.
- [45] Regarding the items on the work plan:
- Item 1 - The surveillance workshop will not be held this year. But the FAW workshop that was to be part of the surveillance meeting could be held separately as a virtual meeting.
 - Item 2 – The workshop on ISPM 32 categorization of commodities might be deferred.
 - Item 3 - This hands-on training on Molecular diagnostic of SALB is practical and therefore cannot be held virtually. This may be postponed. All the papers for this workshop are available.
 - Item 5 - It is hoped that the APPPC Regional Workshop on Commodity-based standards will be able to go on or it may be held virtually. New Zealand said that it would be agreeable for this workshop to be delayed.
 - Item 6 – The ePhyto meeting is considered high priority and should go ahead. There could be some exchange of material.
 - Item 7 – The work on the seeds guidance document with the chilli annex is to go ahead. The specification has been prepared by Thailand – this was discussed in the meeting.
 - Item 8 – The Revision of RSPM standard setting procedures is on track and documentation will be shared later this year with the SC and next year with all members.
 - Item 9 – There will be an APPPC coordination meeting if a face-to-face CPM meeting is held.
 - Item 10-12 - Pesticide workshops will probably not take place but discussions will be held.
 - Item 13 – The workshop on emerging pests may have be delayed and held next year.
 - Item 14 – It is hoped to prepare for and hold the Working group for the 32nd session plus the SC meeting prepare next year.
 - Item 15 – If global health and travel conditions permit, the 32nd session will be held in China in October 2021.
 - Item 16 – It is hoped that a paper on the benefits and strategic value of the work of the APPPC will strengthen the cooperative efforts of the APPPC members.
- [46] The chairperson noted that the priority items were: the FAW workshop, the ePhyto work and the development of the benefits and strategic value paper. Australia said the FAW will go ahead in October.

- [47] Regarding the financial position of the APPPC, the Executive Secretary noted that not all members had submitted their contributions so the complete budget is not available. The Secretary presented some figures. Countries were reminded of the annual contributions to APPPC.
- [48] The position regarding the APPPC website was discussed. There is still no website and this is seen as a serious problem. The Republic of Korea has supplied funds to the IPPC and designated some of the funds to the development of an APPPC website. The Executive Secretary is to contact the IPPC Secretariat regarding this. Mr Larson noted that FAO does not allow the publication on its websites of non-FAO-reviewed documents and this could limit what is posted on an APPPC site.
- [49] Regarding the matter of an APPPC Trust Fund. The Republic of Korea would like to set up such a fund for APPPC so annual contributions and additional funds could be sent to this. The Executive Secretary was asked to investigate the establishment of a Trust Fund. It was noted that FAO does not view multi-donor Trust Funds favourably and their establishment can be limited by various controls and expenses.
- [50] Mr Larson described the function of FAO Permanent Representatives.
- [51] New Zealand suggested that APPPC should focus on a few things and do them well, and that we should have a round of prioritisation of the work plan. The chairperson stated that there could be another virtual meeting to confirm the next year's work programme.

6.2.Introduction of RSPM draft Specification on Seeds for planting an timeframe

- [52] Mr Prateep Arayakittipong (Thailand) went through the presentation. The background issues included a short history of the process so far with the establishment of a working group to try to solve the problems. A draft specification, Guidance on Phytosanitary Procedures for Seed Health Certification, was shown and major points in the scope were noted: the seeds are for field planting and the measures in a seed export system were listed. The guidance would be for commercial seed production only, excluding seeds for research purposes or breeders' seed lines
- [53] A major discussion point was whether this document would be a normal guidance document or an RSPM. New Zealand clarified that this is a regional implementation guidance document to support the implementation of ISPM 38, it is not a RSPM and is not enforceable. The guidance would include generic regional guidance to implement specific aspects of ISPM 38. New Zealand noted that the development process for a guidance documents would be potentially simpler than for an RSPM and should be managed by the APPPC Standard Committee (as the APPPC does not have the equivalent of the IPPC IC). The guidance document would be a living document that could be amended readily and would link to the specific commodity standards.
- [54] Specific seed commodities will be dealt with developing attachments for different seeds, with chilli seeds the first to be developed based on the work already done. Specific aspects to be considered for inclusion were: measures related to seed export systems; traceability and record keeping; examples of pests and seed treatments accepted in trade; and accepted and validated diagnostic testing protocols.
- [55] New Zealand suggested that members should review ISPM 38 and identify components of ISPM 38 that would benefit from further explanation or implementation material development, e.g. re-export, guidance with research of breeder's lines. If there are sufficient components requiring further development of guidance, a new proposal should be prepared for consideration at next APPPC Session in 2021.
- [56] The guidance document is intended to be completed by the 32nd APPPC Session in October 2021. The Chairperson said there should be more input – from countries. Input from Thailand, New Zealand and Australia were acknowledged.

6.3. Discussion on the proposed revision of the APPPC Standard Setting Procedure

- [57] Ms Peterson (Australia) noted the PPPO and APPPC versions of the standard setting procedure were presently similar. They could both be revised. APPPC is now tasked with dealing with implementation material so both organisations need to have information on different procedures to deal with the standards and implementation material. Draft procedures will be completed and circulated to the SC members before the end of the year. This material will be sent to all countries next year. Implementation material does not need to be as detailed as for standards procedures or to be agreed to by all countries.

6.4. Overview of the Global Fall Armyworm (FAW) programme

- [58] This was presented by Mr C. Dale (Australia). The FAO document on FAW, The Global Action for Fall Armyworm Control, Action Framework 2020/2022, is most useful. The objectives of this framework were to establish and implement a global coordination system to link FAW response efforts, to scale up capacity development on integrated management of FAW in affected countries in Africa, Asia and the Near East and to ensure that risk of further introduction and spread of FAW into new areas is reduced. The global and regional information sources were outlined. Priority pest preparedness and forecasting tools were discussed.
- [59] The Global action for FAW was outlined: it is directed by the FAO Director General. The implementation plan is the real action area. A list of the technical groups that have been set up was shown along with the global, regional and national coordination arrangements which included further committees and secretariats. The FAW implementation plan and schedule were discussed under three major outcome headings. The work of the IPPC and FAW Phytosanitary Technical Working Group and the APPPC Regional Fall Armyworm Steering Committee were noted.

6.5. Issues arising from draft PTs or DPs (ISPMs) out for consultation in 2020

- [60] This was presented by Mr M. Sai. There are no draft DPs under consultation at this time.
- [61] Regarding the call for topics for Phytosanitary Treatments - proposals are reviewed by the TPPT and approved by the SC for country consultation. Usually there are 2 rounds of country consultation. Those under consideration at the moment include:

- 1st round
 - Irradiation treatment for *Sternochetus frigidus*
 - Irradiation for Tortricidae on fruit
 - Cold treatment for *Thaumatotibia leucotreta* on *Citrus sinensis*
 - Cold treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis*
 - Vapour heat-modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* on *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica*
- 2nd round
 - Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Vitis vinifera*
 - Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Vitis vinifera*
 - Cold treatment for *Bactrocera tryoni* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica*
 - Cold treatment for *Ceratitis capitata* on *Prunus avium*, *Prunus salicina* and *Prunus persica*

- Irradiation treatment for the genus *Anastrepha*
- Irradiation treatment for *Carposina sasakii*
- Irradiation treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis*

[62] China expressed concern about vapour heat–modified atmosphere treatment which has not ever been used on a commercial basis. And China also noted the impact on quality when implementing the treatment schedules on the drafts.

7. Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action

7.1. International Year of Plant Health Legacy

[63] The presentation described the objectives of the IYPH, the key global initiatives, the IYPH communication efforts and the national and regional initiatives. This was followed by a discussion on the global IYPH legacy: this included the proposal of an International Day of Plant Health (12 May); Proceedings of an International Plant Health Conference; a study on the impact of plant health on climate change; a travellers campaign; other publications and activities for farmers, students and children. Country representatives were encouraged to be involved, to contribute and to share their efforts.

[64] Ms Yim spoke to the subject. She noted that the programme will be extended to the end of June 2021. The Plant Health Conference will still be held in Helsinki but in June/July 2021. Many coins and stamps have been produced by countries to celebrate the IYPH. It is intended to follow on from this IYPH with the International Day of Plant Health. This will be championed by Zambia with the help of China.

[65] Australia proposed that the APPPC prepare a letter of support for the International Day of Plant Health. The proposal would go through the same procedure at the United Nations as did the IYPH. The Chair suggested that a draft be prepared and circulated and countries can each send a copy to COAG. FAO country perm reps should be notified and work through them.

7.2. IPPC PFA Guide: how to support the implementation of the Convention and ISPMs

[66] Prior to discussing PFAs and associated areas, the presentation outlined the situation regarding the increase and movement of plant pests. The presentation then noted the frameworks including PFAs and the definitions of PFAs, PFPPs, PFPSs and ALPPs. The very important differences between these areas were listed. The implementation framework was described in detail including the initiation and programme development phases, the establishment phase, and the maintenance and market access phases. Examples of PFA and PFPP and current action to advance PFA were discussed. An implementation framework for ALPP under similar headings as for the PFA discussion was provided. The usefulness of the guide was stressed and countries encouraged to use it.

7.3. Preparation for 2021 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation

[67] The presentation, shown by Mr C. Dale (Australia) noted the place of a call for topics in the standards setting system and described its purpose. The biennial process was shown in detail. Problems with earlier submissions were listed and the work in the region to solve these problems discussed. Key elements of a successful proposal were outlined.

[68] The meeting agreed to put forward a draft commodity standard, for mango fruit, as a call for a topic. New Zealand would submit this for the APPPC. Mr Yubak was asked to seek support from other RPPOs.

7.4.ePhyto

- [69] This was discussed by Mr P. Neimanis (Australia). This presentation repeated earlier descriptions of the system. The ePhyto solution including the Hub, the GeNS (Generic ePhytos National System) and the harmonized message was briefly discussed. Representations were shown and country participation noted. Case studies and future work were outlined. Over 41 countries are exchanging ePhytos. Fourteen countries are testing the system. There are 20 countries testing the GeNS system. When these are on line, there will be 60 or so countries exchanging certificates. Case studies show the saving of finance and time in the solving of problems. The benefits of the ePhyto were listed. A Roadmap for ePhyto GeNS implementation in the Pacific was presented.
- [70] New Zealand suggest that given the increasing importance of ePhyto in the Covid-19 pandemic environment, the APPPC ePhyto Working Group should be reinstated to progress the implementation of ePhyto Solution in the region. The Chairperson stated that she will send an email to members calling for WG member nomination.

7.5.National Reporting Obligations

- [71] Mr D. Sharma presented the subject to the participants. This presentation included a general review of NROs, a list of NROs recent achievements, material on the NROs new webpage and information on FAQs and guidance on NROs reporting process.

8. Conclusion of the Workshop/ Date and venue of the next meeting

- [72] The chair asked for the participants to send their full contact details to the Secretariat of the APPPC. It was stressed again that APPPC approved comments were not developed this year so it was imperative that all countries fully develop their own comments and post them on the OCS.
- [73] Last minute communications to participants included:
- Regarding the International Day of Plant Health, countries should contact their FAO permanent representative to see how support can be provided. Also, countries should report their IYPH activities to the IPPC Secretariat.
 - Participants are requested to visit the IPP and see what guides are available.
 - Regarding the call for topics – the mango RSPM and the food aid material will be submitted as topics for standards. APPPC countries should support these submissions.
 - It is suggested that audit guidance be proposed as a topic also.
 - The FAW workshop may be prepared by Australia for October.
 - There will be a half day virtual meeting on ePhyto in November. Countries are asked to answer the questionnaire.
 - The ePhyto working group will be re-established.
 - Countries are requested to add comments to the Seed Specification.
 - Regarding the APPPC website – efforts will be made to try to restore this.
 - The Executive Secretary will remind countries about the mandatory contributions.
 - A Budget report will be prepared – and be circulated to APPPC members.
 - The matter of an APPPC Trust fund will be investigated by the Executive Secretary.
 - It is regrettable that so many activities will be postponed. However, the Chairperson will try to set up a virtual meeting to discuss the prioritisation of future activities.
 - Mr Larson will circulate a Survey Monkey questionnaire.
 - Mr Larson would also like to receive items for an IPPC Secretariat publication on this APPPC Regional Workshop.

- Republic of Korea will try to arrange for the funds to hold a face-to-face APPPC Regional Workshop on draft ISPMs next year.

[74] The Executive Secretary thanked participants for their input to the meeting.

9. Close of the meeting

[75] The Chairperson closed the meeting on 10th September at the end of the 4th three-hour session.

APPENDIX 1: IPPC-APPPC Regional Workshop**7-10 September 2020 (10:00~13:00 hrs; Bangkok time)****Virtual Workshop**

In light of the global COVID-19 pandemic and associated public health concerns, the IPPC-APPPC Regional Workshop (RW) for Asia Region will be convened virtually. The move to a virtual mode followed consultations with IPPC Secretariat, Organizing Committee, Experts, and Member Nations. The conference will be conducted on the Zoom platform from 7~10 September 2020 (10:00~13:00 Hrs. (Bangkok time) 3 hours daily all in the English medium.

This RW will be a forum to discuss the country and regional priorities on plant protection. The major discussion will be held on three draft ISPMs (Audit, ISPM 12 and Commodity Based Standard) and CPM recommendation on Food Aids. For the review, the documents have made accessible to NPPOs through On-Line Commenting System (OCS). The presentations will be posted on IPP before the session. Details on the program can be consulted in APPPC secretariat Yubak.GC@fao.org and Ornusa.Petchkul@fao.org

Program Agenda

Agenda N°	Items	Time (min)	Presenter	Day
Day 1				
1, 2 & 3	General opening, meeting arrangements, and administrative matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> RW Chair, Ms YIM <input type="checkbox"/> IPPC Secretariat, Mr LARSON / Mr Xia (video) <input type="checkbox"/> APPPC Secretariat, Mr GC <input type="checkbox"/> CPM Bureau member, Asia region, Mr WANG and Vice-Chair of CPM 	10:00-10:45 (45 min)		7 September
4	Specific questions regarding updates	10:45-11:00 (15 min)	Mr Fuxiang Wang Mr Brent LARSON	7 September
5.1	Audits in the phytosanitary context	11:00-12:00 (60 min)	Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON	7 September
7.2	IPPC PFA guide: how to support the implementation of the Convention and ISPMs	10:40-11:40 (60 min)	Mr Chris DALE	7 September
Day 2				
7.1	IYPH Legacy	10:00-10:40 (40 min)	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM	8 September
5.2	Focused revision of ISPM 12 ("re-export")	12:00-13:00 (60 min)	Mr Masahiro SAI	8 September
7.3	Preparation for 2021 Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation	11:40-12:40 (60 min)	Ms Joanne WILSON Mr Chris DALE	8 September
7.5	National Reporting Obligations	12:40-05 (25 min)	Mr Dilli SHARMA	8 September

Agenda N°	Items	Time (min)	Presenter	Day
Day 3				
6	Regional issues			9 September
	Review of APPPC two year work plan	10:00-10:30 (30 Min)	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM	9 September
	Introduction of RSPM draft Specification on Seeds for planting and timeframe	10:30-11:00 (30 min)	Mr Prateep ARAYAKITTIPONG	9 September
	Discussion on the proposed revision of the APPPC Standard Setting Procedure	11:00-11:30 (30 min)	Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON	9 September
	Overview of the Global Fall Armyworm (FAW) program	11:30-12:00 (30 min)	Mr Chris DALE	9 September
	Issues arising from draft PTs or DPs (ISPMs) out for consultation in 2020	12:00-12:30 (30 min)	Mr Masahiro SAI Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON	9 September
	Issues arising from Draft specifications for ISPMs out for consultation in 2020 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Annex to ISPM 38: Annex 1 – Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) Priority 1 □ Criteria for the determination of host status for fruit flies based on the available information (Annex to ISPM 37) (2018-011) Priority 3 	12:30-13:00 (30 min)	Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON Ms Joanne WILSON	9 September
Day 4				
4.4	Update on the Sea Containers Task Force	10:00-10:45 (45 min)	Mr Brent Larson Mr. John HEDLEY	10 September
5.4	Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008)	10:45-11:45 (60 min)	Ms Joanne WILSON	10 September
5.5	Draft CPM Recommendation: Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (2018-026)	11:45-12:15 (30 min)	Ms Lihong ZHU	10 September
7.4	e-Phyto	12:15-12:30 (30 min)	Mr Peter NEIMANIS	10 September
Closing		Chair		

APPENDIX 2: IPPC-APPPC Regional Workshop 2020

Virtual Meeting via Zoom
7-10 September 2020, Daily 10:00-13:00 hrs. (Bangkok time)

List of Participants

Australia

Bertie Hennecke
Assistant Secretary, Plant Health Policy
Tel: + 61 2 6272 4277
Mobile: +61 466 465 161
Email: Bertie.Hennecke@agriculture.gov.au

Joanne Pearce
Director, Plant Health Policy
Tel: + 61 2 6272 5663
Email: Joanne.Pearce@agriculture.gov.au

Sophie Peterson
Assistant Director, Plant Health Policy
Tel: + 61 2 6272 3769
Mobile: +61 466 867 519
Email: Sophie.Peterson@agriculture.gov.au; sophie.peterson@awe.gov.au

Chris Dale
Assistant Director, Plant Health Policy
Tel: + 61 2 6272 5192
Mobile: +61 466 459 129
Email: Chris.Dale@agriculture.gov.au

Bhutan

Namgay Om
Principal Plant Protection Officer
National Plant Protection Center
P.O. Box 670, Thimphu Bhutan (Alternate IPPC focal)
Tel: +97517807800
Email: om.namgay@gmail.com

Sonam Yonten
Sr Regulatory Quarantine Inspector
Bhutan Agriculture & Food Regulatory Authority
P.O. Box. No 1071, Thimphu, Bhutan (NPPO, Bhutan)
Tel: +97517415159
Email: syonten@moaf.gov.bt

Yeshe Lhamo
Sr Regulatory Quarantine Officer
Bhutan Agriculture & Food Regulatory Authority
P.O. Box. No 1071, Thimphu, Bhutan (NPPO, Bhutan)
Tel: +97517541479
Email : ylhamo96@gmail.com

Sonam Dorji N
Sr Regulatory Quarantine Officer
Bhutan Agriculture & Food Regulatory Authority
P.O. Box. No 1071, Thimphu, Bhutan (NPPO, Bhutan)
Tel: +97517629596
Tel: Email: sdorjin@moaf.gov.bt

China

Fuxiang Wang
Deputy Director, National Agro-Tech Extension and Service Centre
Ministry of Agriculture, P.R. China
No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street
Beijing 100125, P.R. China
Email: wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn

Guanghao Gu
Deputy Director
Animal and Plant Quarantine Division
Shenzhen Customs
No.2006 Shennan Road,
Futian District, Shenzhen 518026, P.R. China
Email: 317352941@qq.com

Shuangyan Sun
Senior Agronomist
Research Center of GACC for International Inspection and Quarantine Standards and Technical Regulations
Building3, No.20Hepingli Dongjie,
Dongcheng District, Beijing 100013, P.R. China
Tel.: +86 10 57954651, 13811467742
Email: sunshyan2008@163.com

Liping Zhang
Deputy Director,
Animal, Plant and Food Inspection and Quarantine Department of Lanzhou Customs
No.9, Yin'an Road, Lanzhou City,
Gansu Province 730000, P.R. China
Email: 349451627@qq.com

Lie Qian
Deputy Section Chief
Animal and Plant Quarantine Division of Shenzhen Customs
Shennan Road, Futian District,
Shenzhen, P.R. China
Tel : +86 755 84395649, +86 15815550192
Email: 38157368@qq.com

Maoyu Chen
Supervisor
Sungang Customs P.R. China
No. 2, Baogang Road, Luohu District, Shenzhen, P.R. China

Tel : +86 13603098966

Email: cmaoyu@foxmail.com

Haixin Yu

Senior Agronomist

Inspection Division of Nantong Customs House (affiliated to Nanjing Customs District)
No.102 Chongchuan Road, Chongchuan District,
Nantong City, Jiangsu Province 226000, P.R. China

Tel: +86 0513 68588180, +86 13485123698

Email: haixin.007@163.com

Zhankui Qiu

Deputy Section Chief

Animal and Plant Quarantine Division of Liao Ning Customs District
No.60 East Changjiang Road, Zhongshan District,
Dalian, Liaoning Province 116001, P.R. China

Tel: +86 411 87952056, +86 13842809569

Email: qiuzhankui@126.com

Fenfen Kang

Director of Phytosanitary treatment Lab

Animal & Plant and Foodstuffs Inspection Center
Tianjin Customs District

No.158, Jingmen Road, Free Trade Zone,

Tianjin 300461, P.R.China

Email: kangkang74@126.com

Jinguo Wu

Deputy Section Chief

Inspection Division of Meishan Customs House (affiliated to Ningbo Customs District)

Gangcheng Building, Meishan Free port Zone Area,

Ningbo City, Zhejiang Province 315832, P.R. China

Tel: +86 13777127486

Email: 534185911@qq.com

Jing Huang

Agronomist

Research Center of GACC for International Inspection and Quarantine Standards and Technical Regulations

Building3, No.20 Hepingli Dongjie,

Dongcheng District, Beijing 100013, P.R. China

Tel: +86 10 57954653, 13811725245

Email: biofilmhj@126.com

Bo Gao

Deputy Chief of Manual Checking Division II of

Shanghai Waigaoqiao Port Customs District

Room 309, No.1299 Ganghua Road,

Pudong New District, Shanghai 200137, P.R. China

Tel: +86 021 50644688, + 86 13816853611

Email: 28453813@qq.com

Xiaoyu Lu
Senior Agronomist
Animal and Plant Inspection and Quarantine Technology Center
Shenzhen Customs District
No.1011 Fuqiang Road,
Shenzhen 518010, P.R.China
Email: 115143289@qq.com

Ling Zhou
Clerk
Logistics Monitoring Section II of Shanghai Longwu Customs District
Room 307, No. 4100 Longwu Road,
Minhang District, Shanghai 201108, P.R. China
Tel: +86 021 64340412, +86 15800499150
Email: zhouling_sh2014@163.com

Jie Gong
Principle staff member
Integrated Affairs Section of Shanghai Yangpu Customs District
Room 402, No. 1000 Pingliang Road,
Yangpu District, Shanghai 200090, P.R. China
Tel: +86 13681684220
Email: 271482942@qq.com

Tao Sun
Agronomist
Chongqing Customs Technology Center
No.8 Hong Huang Road,
Jiang Bei District, Chongqing 400020, P.R. China
Tel: +86 13883289676
Email: suntaocq@126.com

Xiaodong Feng
Division Chief, National Agro-Tech Extension and Service Centre
Ministry of Agriculture, P.R. China
No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street
Beijing 100125, P.R. China
Email: fengxdong@agri.gov.cn

Xiaonan Li
Deputy Division Chief
National Agro-Tech Extension and Service Centre,
Ministry of Agriculture, P.R. China
No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street
Beijing 100125, P.R. China
Email: lixiaonan@agri.gov.cn

Xiaoliang Wang
Agronomist
National Agro-Tech Extension and Service Centre
Ministry of Agriculture, P.R. China
No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street
Beijing 100125, P.R. China
Email: wangxiaoliang@agri.gov.cn

Pei Jiang

Agronomist, National Agro-Tech Extension and Service Centre

Ministry of Agriculture, P.R. China

No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street

Beijing 100125, P.R. China

Email: jiangpei@agri.gov.cn

Côte d'Ivoire

Mr Lucien K. Kouame

Vice-Chair CPM

Bureau member, Africa Region

Inspecteur Technique

Ministère de l'Agriculture

Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire

Tel: (225) 20218442

Mobile: (225) 07903754

Email: l_kouame@yahoo.fr

India

P.S. Nain

Joint Director (PP)

PQ Division, DPPQ&S, NH-IV,

Faridabad, Haryana, India

Tel: +919833216020

Email: rpqfstm@nic.in

J Micheal Raja

Assistant Director (E)

Department of Agriculture

Co-operation and Farmers Welfare(DAC&FW)

Plant Protection Division II, Room No:493,

Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi, India -110001

Tel: +918281627552

Email: michealraja.j@gov.in

Smt. S. Latha

Plant Protection Officer (E)

PQ Division, DPPQ&S, NH-IV,

Faridabad, Haryana, India

Tel: +917550124609

Email: latha.srao@gov.in

Indonesia

Aulia Nusantara

Assistant Deputy Director of Seed for Export and Inter-Area, IAQA

Ministry of Agriculture, E Building, 5th Floor,

Jl Harsono RM No. 3, Pasar Minggu, South Jakarta

Tel: +62812 1881 1577

Email: ippc.indonesia@gmail.com

Japan

SAI Masahiro

Senior Researcher (Head of Section)

Risk Analysis Division, Yokohama Plant Protection Station

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)

Address: 5-57, Kitanakadori, Naka-ku, Yokohama-city, Kanagawa, JAPAN

Tel: + 81-45-211- 0375

Email: masahiro_sai670@maff.go.jp

SHIGEMI Teppei (Head of delegation)

Deputy Director

Plant Protection Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)

Address: 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN

Tel: +81-3-3502-5978

Email: teppei_shigemi780@maff.go.jp

YAMADA Natsumi

Section Chief

Plant Protection Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau

Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)

Address: 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN

Tel: +81-3-3502-5978

Email: natsumi_yamada740@maff.go.jp

INOUE Tatsuya

Senior Researcher

Research Division, Yokohama Plant Protection Station

Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)

Address: 5-57, Kitanakadori, Naka-ku, Yokohama-city, Kanagawa, JAPAN

Tel: + 81-45-211-7164

Email: tatsuya_inoe400@maff.go.jp

Lao PDR

Sitthiphone Phommasak

Email: psitthiphone@yahoo.com

Viengphet Vansilalom

Email: wansilalom@yahoo.com

Pheophanh Soysouvanh

Email: pheophanhs@gmail.com

Malaysia

Arizal Arshad

Deputy Director

Plant Biosecurity Division

Department of Agriculture Malaysia

Jalan Sultan Salahuddin 50632 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

Tel: +603-20301400

Email: arizal@doa.gov.my

Sabariah Kamis
Senior Principal Assistant Director
Diagnostic and Plant Pest Expertise Section
Plant Biosecurity Division
Department of Agriculture Malaysia
Jalan Sultan Salahuddin 50632 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Tel: +603-20301400
Email: sabar@doa.gov.my ; sabkam17@gmail.com

Lailatul Jumaiyah Saleh Huddin
Senior Principal Assistant Director
Plant Biosecurity Division
Department of Agriculture Malaysia
Jalan Sultan Salahuddin 50632 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Tel: +603-20301400
Email: lailasaleh@doa.gov.my; lailasaleh@gmail.com

Shahril Sabri
Principal Assistant Director
Accreditation and Export Facilitation Section
Plant Biosecurity Division
Department of Agriculture Malaysia
Jalan Sultan Salahuddin 50632 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Tel: +603-20301400
Email: shahril@doa.gov.my

Myanmar

Khin Mar Oo
Assistant Director
Plant Protection Division
Department of Agriculture
Email: directorppddoa@gmail.com

Nepal

Sahadev Prasad Humagain
Head, NPPO Nepal and
Chief, Plant Quarantine and Pesticide Management Center
Hariharbhawan, Lalitpur
Tel: +9779851010831
Email: sphumagain2014@gmail.com; chief@npponepal.gov.np

Ram Krishna Subedi
Senior Plant Protection Officer
Plant Quarantine and Pesticide Management Center
Tel: +97798512 37944
Email: rksubediipm@gmail.com; info@npponepal.gov.np

Mahesh Chandra Acharya
Senior Plant Protection Officer
Plant Quarantine and Pesticide Management Center
Tel: +9779855066222
Email: msggacharya@gmail.com; mahesh.acharya@nepal.gov.np; info@npponepal.gov.np

New Zealand

Peter Thomson
Director Plants & Pathways
Biosecurity New Zealand, Ministry for Primary Industries,
Email: peter.thomson@mpi.govt.nz

Lihong Zhu
Portfolio Manager for International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)
International Policy, Policy & Trade
Ministry for Primary Industries
Charles Fergusson Building
34-38 Bowen Street
PO Box 2526, Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Telephone: +64-4-894 0261
Mobile: +64-29-894 0261
Email: lihong.zhu@mpi.govt.nz

Joanne Wilson Principal Adviser Plants & Pathways Biosecurity Ministry for Primary Industries TSB Bank Tower, 147 Lambton Quay PO Box 2526, Wellington, New Zealand Telephone: +64-4-894 0528 Email: joanne.wilson@mpi.govt.nz	New	Zealand
--	-----	---------

John Hedley
Resource Person
Tel: +64 4 388 5070
Mobile: +64 21 75 85 45
Email: jhedley1910@gmail.com

Damian Clarke
Senior Adviser Assurance
New Zealand Food Safety
Ministry for Primary Industries
Email: damian.clarke@mpi.govt.nz

Nacanieli Waqa
Specialist Adviser Horticulture Imports, Plants & Pathways
Biosecurity New Zealand
Ministry for Primary Industries
Email: nacanieli.waqa@mpi.govt.nz

Sarah Clark
Manager Plant Germplasm Imports
Biosecurity New Zealand
Ministry for Primary Industries
Email: sarah.clark@mpi.govt.nz

Charlotte Pushparajan
Senior Advisor Plant Germplasm Imports

Biosecurity New Zealand
Ministry for Primary Industries
Email: charlotte.pushparajan@mpi.govt.nz

Philippines

Carmela B. Rivera
Senior Agriculturist
National Plant Quarantine Services Division
Malate, Manila
Philippines
Tel: 02-2442950
Email: sadarrab8@yahoo.com; pqsbp@gmail.com

Jesse Blessilda G. Antero
Senior Agriculturist
National Plant Quarantine Services Division
Malate, Manila
Philippines
Tel: 02-2442950
Email: jessichael_23@yahoo.com; pqsbp@gmail.com

Republic of Korea

Jung-Bin KIM
Director
Export management Division Department of Plant Quarantine / Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea
Tel: (+82) 54-912-0621
Email: bin386@korea.kr

Kyu-Ock YIM (Spokesperson for Korea)
Senior Researcher, Export Management Division
Department of Plant Quarantine / Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea
Tel: (+82) 54-912-0627
Email: koyim@korea.kr

Mi-Chi Yea
Assistant Director, Export Management Division
Department of Plant Quarantine / Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea
Tel: (+82) 54-912-0632
Email: kittymc@korea.kr

Sun-Joo HWANG
Assistant Director, Export Management Division
Department of Plant Quarantine / Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea
Tel: (+82) 54-912-0628

Email: hsj1420@korea.kr

Ok-Kyoung JUN
Researcher, Risk Management Division
Department of Plant Quarantine / Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
177, Hyeoksin 8-ro, Gimcheon-si, Gyeongsangbuk-do, Republic of Korea
Tel: (+82) 54-912-0645
Email: plantclinic@korea.kr

Singapore

Yap Mei Lai
Director, Plant Science & Health
Animal & Plant Health Centre
National Parks Board
Tel: (65) 63165142
Email: yap_mei_lai@nparks.gov.sg; jmlyap@gmail.com

Sri Lanka

W.A.R.T. Wickramaarachchi
Additional Director
IPPC Official Contact Point-Sri Lanka/ Head of NPPO-Sri Lanka
National Plant Quarantine Service (NPQS),
Department of Agriculture,
Canada Friendship Road
Katunayake – 11450, SRI LANKA
Tel: +94 11 2252028, +94 11 2252029
Mobile: +94 71 3044144, +94 75 9745043
Email: wartwa@gmail.com; npqs@doa.gov.lk

Thailand

Sarute Sudhi-Aromna
Director
Plant Protection Research and Development Office (PPRDO)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
50 Phaholyothin Road,
Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +6681 250 6963
Email: sarutes@yahoo.com

Chonticha Rakkrai
Agricultural Research Officer, Senior Professional level,
Plant Protection Research and Development Office (PPRDO)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
50 Phaholyothin Road,
Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +6689 128 6488
Email: rakkrai@yahoo.com

Preyapan Pongsapich
Agricultural Research Officer, Senior Professional level,

Plant Protection Research and Development Office (PPRDO)
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
50 Phaholyothin Road,
Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +662 579 5582
Email: preyapanp2000@yahoo.com

Chortip Salyapongse
Director of Export Plant Quarantine Service Group,
Office of Agricultural Regulation,
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
50 Phaholyothin Road,
Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +662 940 6467
Email: annsalya@gmail.com

Prateep Arayakittipong
Standards Officer, Senior Professional level,
Office of Standard Development,
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)
50 Phaholyothin Road,
Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: +662 561 2277
Email: prateep_ming@hotmail.com; ippcthailand@gmail.com

Vietnam

Ha Thanh Huong
Entomologist
Standards Committee of IPPC
Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine Division (PQD) Plant Protection Department (PPD) Ministry of
Agriculture and rural Development (MARD)
149 Ho Duc Di - Dong Da - Hanoi - Vietnam Tel. No.: (0084) 24 35 334 813 Fax. No.: (0084) 24 35
330 043
Email: ppdhuong@gmail.com; ppdhuong@yahoo.com

Organizing Committee

Yubak Dhoj GC
APPPC Lead
Senior Agriculture Officer (Plant Protection)
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
39 Phra Atit Road, Phranakon
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel: +6626974268
Mobile: +66858758784
Email: Yubak.gc@fao.org

Brent LARSON
IPPC Secretariat
Implementation and Facilitation Unit Leader, IPPC Secretariat
Tel: +(39) 06-5705-4915
Mobile: +(39) 340-699-9546

Email: brent.larson@fao.org

Dilli SHARMA

IC member

National Consultant

Support for Developing and Implementing Management Strategies in Response to Fall Armyworm (FAW) Incursion in Asian Countries

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

UN House, Pulchowk Lalitpur, Nepal

Tel : +977-1-5523200, Fax: +977-1-5526358

Mobile : +977-9841369615

Email: SharmaDilli.2018@gmail.com