



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

34th TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS

21 - 22 September 2022

**London, United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland**

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, 2022



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

1. Opening of the Meeting	4
2. Meeting arrangements	4
2.1 Election of the rapporteur	4
2.2 Adoption of the agenda	4
2.3 Introduction of the participants	4
3. Administrative matters	4
3.1 Documents list	4
3.2 Participants list	4
4. Presentation of regional challenges	4
4.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	4
4.2 Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission	5
4.3 Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency	7
4.4 Comunidad Andina	7
4.5 Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur	7
4.6 European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization	8
4.7 Discussion	9
4.8 Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (of the African Union)	9
4.9 North American Plant Protection Organization	9
4.10 Near East Plant Protection Organization	10
4.11 Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria	11
4.12 Pacific Plant Protection Organisation	12
4.13 Discussion	13
5. Election of new chairperson and date for Thirty-Fifth TC-RPPOs	16
6. Any other business	16
7. Welcome to the new chairperson	16
8. Introduction by new chairperson	16
9. Close of the meeting	16
Appendix 1: Agenda	17
Appendix 2: Documents list	19
Appendix 2: Participants list	20

1. Opening of the Meeting

- [1] The Chairperson of the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs), Diego QUIROGA (Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE)), welcomed all participants to the second and third sessions of the Thirty-Fourth TC-RPPOs, which was being held in person. The first session had been held in virtual mode on 12 September and is reported separately.¹

2. Meeting arrangements

2.1 Election of the rapporteur

- [2] The TC-RPPOs elected Mekki CHOUIBANI (Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO)) as the rapporteur.

2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [3] The TC-RPPOs adopted the agenda (Appendix 1), agreeing to consider item 4.7 (discussion of the first batch of RPPOs reports and consideration of the roles of RPPOs as described in the recommendations on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS)) under item 4.13, so that all the discussion could be conducted together.

2.3 Introduction of the participants

- [4] The participants introduced themselves upon their first contribution to the meeting.

3. Administrative matters

3.1 Documents list

- [5] The documents posted for this meeting are listed in Appendix 2.

3.2 Participants list

- [6] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) explained that some representatives had had to cancel at the last minute because of unforeseen circumstances and had asked to join in virtual mode. However, as the meeting had not been set up as a “hybrid” meeting, this did not prove technically possible to deliver, despite the best efforts of the secretariat and the venue staff. The meeting therefore proceeded with only those participants who attended in person.

- [7] The participants in attendance are listed in Appendix 3.

4. Presentation of regional challenges

4.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [8] The IPPC Secretary, Osama EL-LISSY, welcomed all participants and continued the update on secretariat activities started during the first session, this time focusing on potential future areas of change.

- [9] He explained that the secretariat’s management team had considered what the secretariat’s core values should be and had concluded that they should include communication, self-discipline, learning organization/curiosity, knowledge sharing, agreement, transparency, honesty, respect, support of one another, facing difficult situations not avoiding them, innovation and accountability. The secretariat had

¹ TC-RPPOs meeting reports: www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/external-cooperation/partners/technical-consultation-among-rppos

also considered the prioritization of work, with each unit mapping out their work in terms of what is important and what is less so, so that the work of the secretariat could be focused on those activities that are the most crucial to the delivery of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030. This had led to a review of the secretariat’s organizational structure, with the aim being to have a simple, streamlined, flattened structure. Based on the outcome of the review of prioritization and organizational structure, the secretariat had then started to look at some potential initiatives driven by the strategic framework. These included the development of a framework for phytosanitary programmes with guidance on how to gather and analyse surveillance data, the establishment of a team within the secretariat to respond to questions from countries about standards and implementation (to facilitate trade), and the development of the secretariat as a global centre of excellence to whom countries can turn for advice on which treatments can be used for a specified commodity or pest.

- [10] The IPPC secretary informed the TC-RPPOs that the secretariat would be discussing these potential initiatives with RPPOs, the Bureau of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) in due course.
- [11] The TC-RPPOs chairperson thanked the IPPC secretary and invited comments.
- [12] The representative from the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) emphasized how important it was for RPPOs to support the secretariat in implementing the IPPC, and affirmed EPPO’s continued support for this.
- [13] The observer from the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) also affirmed the support of ECOWAS for the work of the secretariat and highlighted the potential usefulness of the proposed phytosanitary framework, particularly for developing countries that still struggle to manage pests.
- [14] The representative from the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) commented on the diversity within the APPPC region, with some countries having a well-developed system of surveillance but other countries lacking this. Referring to the proposal to develop the secretariat as a centre of excellence, the APPPC representative said that some countries within the APPPC region had already suggested to the APPPC that there be a regional centre of excellence. The representative added, however, that it was important for RPPOs to consider how best they can streamline the role of RPPOs in supporting countries.
- [15] The NEPPO representative called for more work to be done on improving the understanding by countries of the World Trade Organization Trade Facilitation Agreement and its relationship with the WTO’s Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement), to make it clear that the goal is not simply to process consignments as quickly as possible upon import but also about ensuring that trade is safe.
- [16] A representative from each RPPO then gave a short presentation covering issues such as technical and capacity-development achievements, emerging pests and issues, surveillance projects and activities, and proposals for further collaboration (agenda items 4.2–4.13).²

4.2 Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission

- [17] In the presentation from the APPPC, the APPPC representative started by giving an overview of the main pests and key phytosanitary challenges in the Asia and the Pacific region.³ He explained that the main invasive pests were fall armyworm, desert locust, fruit flies, brown planthopper, and wheat yellow rusts, the latter including a virulent new strain, UG99. Although the region was addressing invasive pests, the current approach was focused on pesticides, with many of the world’s highly hazardous

² RPPO presentations: www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/external-cooperation/partners/technical-consultation-among-rppos/2022-34th-2nd-and-3rd-sessions-tc-among-rppos

³ VM01_08_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

pesticides being in use in the region. He said that there was therefore a need to look at how best to revitalize the use of integrated pest management. Other phytosanitary challenges include issues relating to maximum residue limits and non-compliance, and the inadequacy of institutional strengths in monitoring, surveillance, pest alerts and risk communication.

- [18] The APPPC representative then highlighted some of the main achievements within the region, from technical and capacity development to pest management. Technical capacity development had included the training of more than 900 individuals, together with various activities at the organizational level and above, such as the development of an SPS Platform, production of technical guidance on locust and fall armyworm, and development of a regionally specific surveillance IPM package on FAW. Publications produced had included not only the aforementioned technical guidance but also papers published in scientific journals. The regional fall armyworm control initiative had been successful in reducing infestations over the last three years in some countries, although this had been achieved primarily through the use of pesticides. The representative reiterated, however, that pesticide use is not the ultimate goal, so more guidance was needed on other techniques for fall armyworm control.
- [19] Turning to emerging pests and issues, the APPPC representative explained that there are country-specific differences in emerging pests and also differences in the use of electronic phytosanitary certificates (ePhytos), with some countries have a well-developed phytosanitary certification system using the IPPC ePhyto Solution but others still using paper phytosanitary certificates and needing more support to convert to ePhyto. There was also a need to develop a web-based portal regarding regulated pests and commodities.
- [20] The APPPC representative gave an overview of surveillance projects and activities in the region, explaining that there were different levels of technological advance in different countries. Whereas advanced methods such as radar-tracking or epidemiological modelling and forecasting were used in a small number of countries, most countries used traditional methods such as pheromones and light traps. For the forthcoming APPPC Session, countries have been asked to bring information on surveillance activities, so that the APPPC can consider how best to engage with stakeholders within the region.
- [21] Finally, the APPPC representative highlighted two areas of potential further collaboration or cooperation. The first was collaboration with the Standards and Trade Development Facility to scale-up projects on pesticide risk mitigation and promotion of biopesticides, building on an existing project currently being implemented in nine countries within the region. The second was a possible collaboration with the United States Department of Agriculture of America, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), regional organizations and other agencies to understand how to strengthen need-based phytosanitary compliance activities by building institutional capacities.
- [22] The TC-RPPOs thanked the APPPC representative for the presentation and invited comments.
- [23] The representative from the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) commented on the similarities between the challenges faced in different regions and the value of sharing resources that have been developed to tackle these challenges, such as those developed in North America for khapra beetle. Referring to the over-reliance on pesticides for the control of locusts, she suggested that it might be helpful for APPPC colleagues to listen in to a forthcoming NAPPO workshop on biocontrol of locusts, to be held in virtual mode in November 2022.
- [24] The APPPC representative thanked the NAPPO representative for her offer and agreed that there were also possibilities for inter-regional collaboration in addition to the areas mentioned in his presentation. He commented that the locust is currently dominant in Pakistan, India and to some extent the Islamic Republic of Iran, together with some other areas depending on wind direction.
- [25] The observer from ECOWAS observed that Africa faces similar issues and challenges as those faced by the APPPC region, and he expressed interest in further collaboration. He asked the NAPPO representative whether it would be possible to share the link for the NAPPO workshop on locusts with ECOWAS as well as the APPPC, and the NAPPO representative confirmed that she would do this.

- [26] The TC-RPPOs suggested that each region consider the points made in the various regional presentations and identify which issues are similar between regions and which issues have potential for RPPO collaboration. These could then be drawn together into a potential agenda for collaboration by the end of this meeting.

4.3 Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency

- [27] The representative from the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency had been unable to attend, so this agenda item was not considered. However, a presentation had been received.⁴

4.4 Comunidad Andina

- [28] The representative from the Comunidad Andina had been unable to attend, so this agenda item was not considered. However, a presentation had been received.⁵

4.5 Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur

- [29] In the COSAVE presentation, the COSAVE representative first introduced COSAVE, explaining that it has seven member countries and operates a rotating presidency between these countries.⁶ In March 2002, COSAVE had approved its strategic guidelines for the biennium 2022–2024, and the rest of the presentation outlined the main components of these guidelines.
- [30] The first component aims to strengthen interaction with public-sector organizations. This includes participation in a project on huanglongbing, a virtual meeting on health and family farming productions, and a regional project with the International Atomic Energy Agency on fruit flies. It also includes COSAVE's ongoing, active involvement with IPPC subsidiary and oversight bodies, meetings of the inter-American coordinating group in plant protection (El Grupo Interamericano de Coordinación en Sanidad Vegetal (GICSV)), and regional cooperation with other RPPOs.
- [31] The second component of the strategic guidelines aims to improve public–private liaison. This includes continuation of a regional pilot plan for the phytosanitary certification of *Zea mays* seed under a systems approach, and the development of a liaison framework with the private sector.
- [32] The third component aims to increase intra-regional cooperation. This includes various “spaces” for exchanging experiences, ranging from a contingency plan simulation to workshops on various issues, including a workshop on locusts to be held in Argentina. It also includes ongoing consideration of how COSAVE can use its resources more efficiently, given the large amount of work it has, and ongoing work with the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture, for which there is an annual operating plan. The COSAVE representative also highlighted the regional virtual course on phytosanitary inspection that would be held in 2023, for which there would be a call. Ongoing activities relating to intra-regional cooperation include regular meetings of working groups, a meeting to agree regional comments for IPPC documents under consultation, and participation in the IPPC Regional Workshop for Latin America.
- [33] The COSAVE representative highlighted some regional products, including an update to the regional list of quarantine pests, which is updated every two years, the harmonization of phytosanitary requirements for *Vitis* spp. and *Citrus* spp., a list of pests that are present in the region on *Eucalyptus* spp. and *Pinus* spp., and guides or guidelines on the control of plant propagation material, systems approaches and the risk assessment of microbes intended for use as biological control agents. She explained that work was also underway to develop a contingency plan for the IPPC ePhyto Solution.

⁴ VM01_14_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

⁵ VM01_12_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

⁶ VM01_10_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

- [34] The fourth component of the strategic guidelines is communication. For this, COSAVE had drawn up a communication plan, established a network of experts in communication, and had recently launched a Twitter account.
- [35] The COSAVE representative finished the presentation with a list of regional challenges: pest alert systems and emergency responses; development and use of tools, analytical methods to improve decision-making and use of resources; communication; and private–public interaction (i.e. industries and other stakeholders in the sea-container issue).
- [36] The TC-RPPOs chairperson thanked the COSAVE representative and invited comments. There were no comments.

4.6 European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization

- [37] The EPPO representative gave an overview of activities for the period 2021–2022.⁷ He explained that EPPO has 52 member countries, extending over a range of different geographical areas. The pests that are present differ in different parts of the region.
- [38] The EPPO representative informed the TC-RPPOs that updated versions of five EPPO standards were to be considered for approval at the EPPO Council meeting the following week. There had also been interest in developing a new standard on raising awareness, among professional operators, of regulated and emerging plant pests. Once approved, EPPO standards are published in the *EPPO Bulletin* and are freely available.
- [39] The EPPO representative then introduced EPPO's lists of pests recommended for regulation as quarantine pests and a couple of web platforms. He explained that there are two lists of pests – the A1 list comprising those that are absent in the region and the A2 list comprising those that are locally present – and both are available on the EPPO website. The EPPO platform on pest risk analyses (PRAs) acts as a central hub for PRAs conducted within the region and contains more than 1 500 documents, many of which are publicly available. The recently launched EPPO platform on communication material is designed as a means for national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) within the region to share material used in communication campaigns; however, the EPPO representative invited RPPO representatives to contact the EPPO Secretariat if they wished to have access to it.
- [40] Turning to another resource, the EPPO Global Database, the EPPO representative informed the TC-RPPOs that there was an ongoing programme of updating pest datasheets. He explained that more than 190 new and revised datasheets were now available and EPPO had made them dynamic, so that if the pest distribution is changed on the global database the datasheet is automatically updated. A further 130 datasheets or more are still to be worked on, and this work is likely to take another one-and-a-half years to complete. The updates are based on advice from experts from both within and outside the EPPO region.
- [41] The EPPO representative explained that workshops to support NPPOs in the region had been difficult to hold because of COVID-19 restrictions, resulting in several workshops being postponed. Recently, however, EPPO had held its first in-person workshop since the start of the pandemic, which was on the use of digital technology in the efficacy evaluation of plant-protection products. In addition to continuing work on diagnostic protocols, PRAs, information services, biological control, and efficacy testing of plant-protection products, future work would include an EPPO workshop on pest reporting and a workshop for inspectors on targeted inspection. Both of these workshops are scheduled for the first half of 2023.
- [42] Having completed his overview, the EPPO representative highlighted four challenges faced by EPPO: the coordinated monitoring of the spread and control of the emerald ash borer (*Agrilus planipennis*); the difficulties arising from the geopolitical situation, which make travelling within the region difficult

⁷ VM01_09_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

and hence make it impossible to conduct all the intended monitoring and workshops; the timing of the consultation deadline for draft specifications (31 August), which falls within the holiday season in the EPPO region and is before their regional workshop, which therefore limits discussion within the region; and potential for overlap between the work of EPPO and the European Union. He confirmed that EPPO collaborates closely with both the European Union and with the European Food Safety Authority to avoid overlap. He also commented on the possibility of EPPO organizing workshops on contingency planning.

[43] Regarding collaboration with other RPPOs, the EPPO representative commented on the potential for sharing materials and participating in workshops.

[44] The TC-RPPOs chairperson thanked the EPPO representative and sought clarification on exactly who was deemed a “professional operator” in the context of the awareness-raising standard mentioned. The EPPO representative confirmed that it was professional plant traders: the standard itself would be targeted at NPPOs, as are all EPPO standards, but it would give guidance on how NPPOs can work with operators, what to look for, and so on. In some countries within the region the operators would need to be registered, but not in others, depending on national legislation.

[45] The EPPO representative confirmed that EPPO never develops a standard or diagnostic protocol if there is already an IPPC one in existence or under development, and if an IPPC standard is produced that duplicates an existing EPPO standard then EPPO withdraws its standard. He added that the exception to this is if there is something specific to the EPPO region that needs to be in the standard, in which case EPPO will liaise with the IPPC Secretariat or relevant IPPC bodies (e.g. technical panel). The NAPPO representative commented that NAPPO takes a similar approach: if there is broad overlap between one of its regional standards and an IPPC standard, then NAPPO archive its regional standard.

[46] The EPPO representative confirmed that viruses need to be a clearly defined entity before EPPO will conduct a PRA, develop a diagnostic protocol or build a pest datasheet. The taxonomic rules and nomenclature followed by EPPO are those set out by the International Committee on Taxonomy of Viruses.

4.7 Discussion

[47] This item was considered under agenda item 4.13.

4.8 Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (of the African Union)

[48] The representative from the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council was not present, so this agenda item was not considered.

4.9 North American Plant Protection Organization

[49] The NAPPO representative gave a brief introduction to the functions and structure of NAPPO and an overview of the state of NAPPO in 2022.⁸ She explained that one of the unique features of NAPPO is that industry professionals play a role in its governance structure. Industry and academics are also involved in the Expert Groups that develop NAPPO’s regional standards, along with regulatory officials.

[50] Turning to the activities during 2022, she highlighted the publication of an updated NAPPO strategic plan, the production of an updated letter of understanding concerning the United States–Mexico–Canada Agreement (referred to as “the new NAFTA”), and updates to the dispute settlement process. The Forty-Fifth NAPPO annual meeting would be held in October and would include a symposium on climate change. Other activities had included the coordination of GICSV and a review of NAPPO’s foundational documents. Continuing the list of activities undertaken in 2022, the NAPPO representative highlighted a ring test for diagnosis of tomato brown rugose fruit virus, guidance on improving the

⁸ VM01_04_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

implementation of International Standard for Phytosanitary Methods (ISPM) 25 (*Consignments in transit*) in North America, ePhyto implementation in North America, a phytosanitary alert system, and further development of materials on risk-based sampling. She explained that NAPPO has a role regarding transboundary pests that affect two or more countries within the NAPPO region, and work on this during 2022 had included work on boxtree moth (*Cydalima perspectalis*). A discussion document on citrus greening had also been updated and the regional standard on certification of commercial arthropod biological-control agents had been revised.

- [51] The NAPPO representative then listed the emerging pests of concern. Khapra beetle (*Trogoderma granarium*) is not present at the moment in North America and the aim is to keep it that way; high-risk lymantrids, such as *Lymantria dispar asiatica*, and seed-transmitted pathogens are also of concern. Six other pests or pest groups are of concern to some but not all NAPPO countries: boxtree moth (*Cydalima perspectalis*), spotted lantern fly (*Lycorma delicatula*), potato wart (*Synchytrium endobioticum*), boll-weevil (*Anthonomus grandis*), European cherry fruit fly (*Rhagoletis cerasi*) and other Tephritidae.
- [52] The NAPPO representative finished her presentation by suggesting some possible opportunities for collaboration, ranging from the TC-RPPOs itself to RPPOs sharing information, using each other's regional standards as models, and working together on events. Specific examples included a workshop on e-commerce (to complement the forthcoming IPPC e-commerce guide), collating photographs of quarantine pests, holding webinars (NAPPO are planning webinars on risk-based phytosanitary treatments and the single-window approach), inputting opinions on the role of RPPOs as described in the POARS recommendations (see agenda item 4.13), and collaboration on the transboundary movement of beneficial insects.
- [53] The TC-RPPOs chairperson thanked the NAPPO representative and invited comments.
- [54] The EPPO representative confirmed that the photographs in the EPPO Global Database are available for non-commercial purposes, provided the reference is given. There is also an ongoing invitation to people to upload photographs for this purpose.
- [55] Regarding the guidance on improving the implementation of ISPM 25, one of the COSAVE representatives referred to the COSAVE standard on transit procedures, explained that it was a very practical standard and asked whether NAPPO were familiar with it. The NAPPO representative confirmed they were and that they had looked at all relevant documents when starting their work on the guidance. She clarified that the guidance is going to be for non-NPPO personnel.
- [56] The observer from ECOWAS suggested that as well as having photographs of quarantine pests online, it would also be beneficial to have a catalogue of photographs for dissemination to NPPOs.

4.10 Near East Plant Protection Organization

- [57] The NEPPO representative gave an introduction to NEPPO, its establishment and its membership, listing its 11 member countries.⁹ He commented on the political instability in the region and the effect of this on the work of NEPPO and its constituent NPPOs.
- [58] He then listed some of NEPPO's technical and capacity-development achievements. These included various meetings: organization of virtual workshops on pests of concern (*Opuntia cochineal*, citrus black spot and green scale of date palm); participation in IPPC webinars on fall armyworm, organization of a high-level virtual meeting on *Xylella fastidiosa*; organization of a training course on participation at IPPC meetings, as there is a gap in knowledge about this within the region; organization of a pre-CPM meeting in March 2022; organization of training on the biological control of locusts, in which 11 countries participated; participation in the monthly regional meeting on fall armyworm; and participation in regional monthly meetings on red palm weevil. The NEPPO representative also informed the TC-RPPOs about ongoing work to prepare guidelines and a pest free area protocol for red

⁹ VM01_07_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

palm weevil, NEPPO's aim to gather and disseminate information in real-time as much as possible, and NEPPO's participation in the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee's strategic team on phytosanitary capacity evaluation.

- [59] The NEPPO representative finished his presentation by highlighting four emerging pests of concern to the region: *Xylella fastidiosa*, fall armyworm, red palm weevil, and *Opuntia cochineal* on prickly pear cactus *Opuntia ficus-indica*.
- [60] The TC-RPPOs chairperson thanked the NEPPO representative and invited comments.
- [61] The NAPPO representative commented that there appeared to be regional meetings that may be of interest to other regions, and speculated on the best way for RPPOs to notify each other of what is happening in their respective regions.
- [62] One of the APPPC representatives commented that the APPPC region is also looking at desert locust but needed coordination from FAO in Rome. The representative also asked whether other regions have the same strain of fall armyworm. The NEPPO representative clarified that there are two strains of fall armyworm – one present on maize (mostly in Africa) and the other that prefers rice – but he did not know the distribution of these strains in his region. The representative from the Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) confirmed that there is an expert entomologist in Australia who can give expert advice on strains.
- [63] The TC-RPPOs discussed how best to share information on events: for example, RPPOs could inform the IPPC Secretariat and the secretariat then disseminate information every two months, or the details could be added to the IPPC calendar of events on the International Phytosanitary Portal with a link. However, the TC-RPPOs noted that the IPPC calendar is very long and comprises mostly generic events rather than regionally specific ones; also, it may not be desirable to open all regional meetings to everybody, as some of these meetings need to have a regional focus. Hence, it might be better to offer a small number of places to other regions and just circulate information among the RPPO representatives.
- [64] The secretariat commented that red palm weevil is another pest for which there may be potential for inter-regional collaboration.

4.11 Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria

- [65] The representative from the Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA) started his presentation with an overview of technical and capacity-development activities in the OIRSA region – including activities related to fruit growing, horticulture and forestry – together with an update on ePhyto implementation.¹⁰ He explained that the OIRSA fruit-growing programme includes work on Muscaee and fruit flies, the former including activities such as strengthening diagnostic capabilities and simulating actions in case of outbreaks, and the latter involving the production of scientific documents in collaboration with the International Atomic Energy Agency and the implementation of a virtual training tool. The OIRSA programmes for horticultural crops and forestry both include integrated pest management activities, with an action plan being in place to address a recent, major outbreak of southern pine beetle (*Dendroctonus frontalis*) in Honduras. Regarding ePhyto implementation, the OIRSA representative explained that seven of the countries within the region were registered or operating with ePhyotos, while two were not yet registered. Mexico had begun to exchange ePhyotos with the United States of America in 2021, followed by Guatemala in 2022, and there was ongoing work to integrate with three other countries or trading areas. Belize had experienced problems with financial support and internet connection, but OIRSA have been supporting the country with ePhyto implementation. Guatemala is currently exchanging ePhyotos with 33 countries. Costa Rica had begun a pilot plan with the United States of America in 2020 and is currently exchanging with the United States of America, the European Union and five other countries. Panama had begun exchanging

¹⁰ VM01_13_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

ePhyto with the United States of America in 2021 and is currently exchanging with three additional countries. The Dominican Republic is currently exchanging only with the United States of America and Chile.

- [66] The OIRSA representative then highlighted some of the emerging pests of concern to the region, and related issues. The giant African snail (*Achatina fulica*) had been detected in the Dominican Republic in 2016 and Costa Rica in 2019, and the bean flower thrips (*Megalurothrips usitatus*) had also now been detected in more than one country in the region. He explained that surveillance, outbreak eradication activities (chemical control) and communication programmes were being conducted to protect against the giant African snail, but by far the most important intervention is the use of dog brigades to detect snails in fields and airports. The introduction of such brigades, with associated training, in Costa Rica in 2021 had resulted in the subsequent detection of the snail in Gutaemala, demonstrating the success of the training programme.
- [67] Turning to surveillance, the OIRSA representative highlighted several activities within the region. These included the implementation of a pest alert for the central American locust, a technology platform and app for surveillance within the region, a climate-variable platform for forecasting damage impacts, general surveillance for some species (yellow sorghum aphid, zebra chip or purple tip on potato, asphalt stain on corn, and panicle rice mite), pilot projects on traceability in healthy plant production and on digital surveillance, and a “sentinel farm” for satellite monitoring of Panama disease tropical race 4 (TR4).
- [68] The OIRSA representative finished his presentation with a list of ongoing and forthcoming areas of collaboration, including satellite monitoring, two technological platforms, risk maps with climatic and genetic variables, tolerant or resistant varieties, canine brigades, and capacity evaluations (including simulations). He also listed the various international organizations with whom OIRSA continues to collaborate.
- [69] The TC-RPPOs chairperson thanked the OIRSA representative and invited comments.
- [70] When asked about management of the giant African snail, the OIRSA representative acknowledged that control of this species presents a huge challenge. He explained that the most important element is early detection, because once the distribution is widespread, control is difficult. In Costa Rica, the species had been detected at an early stage and at a specific point that was near the border with Nicaragua and had a dry climate. In this case, strategic control had been implemented using chemical control and surveillance; the surveillance had been through both the day and night, because it is a nocturnal pest. Recently, dog brigades had been deployed in field operations to detect small populations of the snail. Looking to the future, the OIRSA representative speculated that it may be too late to eradicate the snail in the Dominican Republic, but eradication may be possible in Costa Rica. The TC-RPPOs noted that the snail presents a public-health danger as it is a vector of a pathogenic nematode that affects human health; it is therefore important to emphasize to people that they should not eat the snail.

4.12 Pacific Plant Protection Organisation

- [71] The PPPO representative gave a presentation on behalf of Visoni TIMOTE, Executive Secretary of PPPO, who had not been able to attend the meeting.¹¹ The PPPO representative first introduced the RPPO, which has 26 member countries. She commented that whereas countries have formerly been referred to as either “founding members” or “Pacific Island Countries and Territories”, there was now a move away from this terminology, so that all member countries are treated the same (in keeping with the PPPO’s tagline “A PPPO family where no member is left behind”).
- [72] The PPPO representative then highlighted some of the PPPO activities. She explained that implementation of the IPPC ePhyto Solution had been a substantial area of work in the region, and a regional ePhyto coordinator had been engaged. The need to implement ePhyto had become more urgent

¹¹ VM01_11_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

during the COVID pandemic, as most Pacific islands closed their borders and remained closed for over two years. Implementation of ePhyto was being rolled out in two phases, with test certificates now exchanged between Phase 1 countries and a workshop for stakeholders arranged for October 2022.

- [73] Four technical working groups are addressing preparedness and response to regional emerging risks, with one group for each of the following: fall armyworm, Panama disease TR4, coconut rhinoceros beetle, and khapra beetle. The group on fall armyworm had met once and complements the international (FAO) technical working group on the same species; the intention is to use the materials developed in the FAO's Asia region and modify them so that they are relevant to the PPPO region. Khapra beetle is not present in the region but is found in containers moving through the region. Discussions are ongoing about the possibility of having a regional technical working group on "priority pests".
- [74] In other activities, a workshop on sea containers had been held recently, so that a regional view could be formed and taken to the CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers, and the IPPC regional workshop had been held in person for the first time since the start of the COVID pandemic. During the pandemic, a monthly Talanoa (discussion) Session had been instigated to allow the PPPO community to stay connected, and it had subsequently been agreed to continue this because it enables issues to be resolved more quickly and before they become more of a problem.
- [75] The PPPO representative then outlined some of the initiatives and outputs resulting from partnerships and collaborations with other organizations, including the NPPOs of Australia and New Zealand, the European Union and the Green Climate Fund. These ranged from a project focusing on transboundary pests that are exacerbated by the effects of climate change to initiatives on value chains, ePhyto, export systems, and more.
- [76] In other activities, the PPPO representative informed the TC-RPPOs that it had been successful in its call for the establishment of a CPM focus group on safe aid. The PPPO had five representatives on this focus group and factsheets on safe aid had been produced. A Pacific Week of Agriculture would be held in March 2023.
- [77] The PPPO representative finished her presentation by highlighting some of the challenges faced by the region. Many of these related directly or indirectly to the challenges of the COVID pandemic: travel had been restricted for much of the pandemic, but even after restrictions have been lifted, the cost of travel to meetings can still be a problem; virtual meetings with international colleagues are often in the middle of the night; deadlines and responses had been more challenging with personnel working from home; and with the borders opening, there is a need to manage expectations for meetings and projects, as everyone is not yet back to normal. She added that there can also be problems of procurement and logistics with initiatives such as the IPPC ePhyto Solution.
- [78] The TC-RPPOs chairperson thanked the PPPO representative and asked, in his capacity as a COSAVE representative, whether there was an agenda for the workshop in October for ePhyto stakeholders, as COSAVE are also thinking of holding a stakeholder workshop and it would be useful to see the intended workshop structure. The PPPO representative agreed to arrange for the agenda to be sent the chairperson.

4.13 Discussion

Roles of RPPOs as described in the recommendations on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems

- [79] The TC-RPPOs chairperson confirmed that all of the RPPOs had submitted comments on the roles of RPPOs as described in the POARS recommendations.¹² As the outcome of this needed to be presented to the SPG in October but there was insufficient time within this meeting to analyse all the comments in depth, he proposed that the NAPPO representative be invited to prepare a summary document to

¹² POARS recommendations: VM01_05_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept; RPPO responses: VM01_06_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept.

present to the SPG. This would outline the main ideas and vision of the RPPO comments, as well as the detailed comments.

- [80] The NAPPO representative thanked the RPPO representatives for their comments and confirmed her willingness to prepare the summary document. She explained that the proposal had been informally discussed between the EPPO, COSAVE and NAPPO representatives between sessions, who had concluded that the document should comprise a short (around one page) summary, highlighting the areas where all RPPOs agree and pointing out where there are differing opinions or differing capacities, together with the collated comments as an annex. The secretariat had agreed that the paper could be submitted after the formal deadline for SPG papers (which was 16 September). If the TC-RPPOs agreed to this approach, there would be an opportunity to finalize it later, before submission to the POARS Focus Group.
- [81] The EPPO representative emphasized that the main message to express in the summary is that RPPOs are willing to support the implementation of the IPPC and would like to have input on initiatives and proposals at an *early* stage.
- [82] The observer from ECOWAS commented on the usefulness of the document in clarifying the respective roles of RPPOs and NPPOs, which were sometimes confusing in Africa in his experience.
- [83] The NAPPO representative recalled that the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 has eight development agenda items and although the one on POARS was well advanced, others were at an earlier stage. She suggested that it would be useful, therefore, to raise at the SPG the value of inviting RPPO input early, rather than later, in the process of development.

Regional presentations

- [84] The TC-RPPOs chairperson observed that, from the various regional presentation, it was clear that some pests are of common concern to more than one RPPO, others are more specific, but what is common across all RPPOs are the ways to approach emerging pests. Other issues of common interest arising from the presentations included biological control, communication with other actors in plant protection (industry, researchers, etc.), and the proposal to share details of regional webinars.
- [85] The OIRSA representative agreed with the chairperson's observations, but commented that one pest that was of common concern to RPPOs is the khapra beetle, because it is moved around the world in sea containers. He pointed out that phytosanitary measures taken against khapra beetle differ between countries, with some applying phytosanitary treatments (fumigation), some destroying consignments upon detection, and others rejecting such consignments, and suggested that it would be helpful to harmonize these measures across the world by producing guidance on what to do if the khapra beetle is detected at a border.
- [86] The APPPC representative highlighted two areas common to all RPPOs. The first was paperless consignments, as although the IPPC ePhyto Solution is available, in practice there may be much variation in ePhyto implementation and so there is a need to harmonize its implementation. He commented that although APPPC are doing their best in their region, only one or two countries are completely paperless. The second issue of common interest was institutional strength, knowledge and capacity, which may, for example, affect a country's ability to conduct accurate pest diagnosis or to communicate pest detections once diagnosed.
- [87] The EPPO representative echoed the comments of the APPPC representative and added that although there is an ePhyto Steering Group there appears to be a missing link between the users and the developers. He commented that with greater use of paperless phytosanitary certification, there was a greater need for harmonization of the content (e.g. scientific names of pests) and said there would be a paper on this submitted to the forthcoming SPG. Referring to the chairperson's summary of collaborative areas, the EPPO representative drew the attention of the TC-RPPOs to the EPPO platform where parties can upload photographs, PRAs and awareness-raising material: he invited other regions to use this material.

- [88] When asked whether his earlier reference to biocontrol included biopesticides, the TC-RPPOs chairperson acknowledged that biopesticides are related to biological control, but commented that in his own (i.e. COSAVE) region the use of biopesticides is challenging. The EPPO representative confirmed that EPPO does work on the use of biopesticides, but also works on arthropods because the microbes used in biopesticides tend to be regulated.
- [89] The observer from ECOWAS observed that, based on his personal experience of ePhyto implementation, no country is fully paperless. He also pointed out that developing countries still need much capacity building, because there is often no electricity or computers at borders; if support from governments is not available to develop the infrastructure required for ePhyto, then paper phytosanitary certificates would still be needed. He therefore suggested that both electronic and paper certificates still need to be considered when talking about phytosanitary certification, and that if the IPPC community wished to advance the implementation of ePhyto, capacity-development support would need to be embedded in the process.
- [90] The TC-RPPOs chairperson acknowledged the importance of capacity building to develop infrastructure, but suggested that this issue was more a question for the ePhyto Steering Group or the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee, as it was beyond the mandate of the TC-RPPOs. The TC-RPPOs agreed, however, that it was within their mandate to inform the ePhyto Steering Group about the need for this further capacity building and to emphasize the importance of this.
- [91] Turning to collaboration between RPPOs, the TC-RPPOs considered how best to achieve this and in particular how to avoid duplicating efforts. Suggestions made included RPPOs participating in the training delivered by other RPPOs and the TC-RPPOs holding more than one meeting per year (even if virtually) as had been agreed in the past. This would enable knowledge, and information on workshops and training, to be shared.
- [92] The TC-RPPOs agreed that, as there was insufficient time at this meeting to discuss the many issues being raised, they would convene for a fourth session, to be held in virtual mode. This would provide the opportunity not only to finalize the POARS paper, but also to consider the agenda for the Thirty-Fifth TC-RPPOs. The latter agenda could include consideration of issues that some RPPOs have experienced and can share with other RPPOs, and issues such as khapra beetle where the TC-RPPOs need to consider how best to advance together.

Selection of RPPO representative for the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems Steering Group

- [93] This matter was not discussed in the meeting, but was considered by email correspondence after it. The outcome will be reported in the report of the fourth session of this meeting.
- [94] The TC-RPPOs:
- (1) *invited* Stephanie BLOEM (NAPPO) to prepare a paper on the RPPO responses to the roles of RPPOs described in the recommendations on Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS), and *agreed* that:
 - the paper would comprise a summary plus an annex containing the collated RPPO responses, and
 - the paper would be submitted to the SPG simultaneously with circulation to the TC-RPPOs;
 - (2) *highlighted*, for the attention of the ePhyto Steering Group, the need for capacity development to support the infrastructure for ePhyto implementation in developing countries and for a two-way channel of communication between ePhyto users and the steering group;
 - (3) *agreed* to reconvene for a fourth session, to be held in virtual mode (possibly in November), to finalize the paper on POARS ready for submission to the POARS Focus Group and to develop the agenda for the Thirty-Fifth TC-RPPOs, drawing upon the suggestions made at this meeting (see also the decisions under agenda item 5).

5. Election of new chairperson and date for Thirty-Fifth TC-RPPOs

- [95] Given the TC-RPPOs decision to reconvene for a fourth session, they agreed to defer the election of a new chairperson and the selection of a date for the Thirty-Fifth TC-RPPOs until the fourth session.
- [96] The TC-RPPOs noted that the ECOWAS representative was currently taking part as an observer. The observer from ECOWAS thanked the TC-RPPOs for their support and guidance regarding the application process for ECOWAS to become an RPPO, and recalled his comments during the first session about ECOWAS member countries still wishing to proceed with the application because they believe that there are phytosanitary issues that are specific to the ECOWAS region. The secretariat recalled the update from the IPPC secretary during the first session, regarding a vision for a phytosanitary programme that would be inclusive for all of Africa and regarding the forthcoming meetings between the secretary and the African Union Commissioner and between the secretary and ECOWAS.
- [97] The APPPC representative requested that invitations to face-to-face TC-RPPOs meetings be sent, in the first instance, to the appropriate managers of RPPO representatives, with a few weeks advance notice, to ensure that the necessary authorizations can be given. The TC-RPPOs chairperson proposed that this be discussed at their fourth session.
- [98] The TC-RPPOs recalled that the general practice before the pandemic had been for the TC-RPPOs to meet once during the CPM session to discuss the agenda for the next TC-RPPOs meeting and the host country, and then that meeting would be held in person later in the year, with all TC-RPPO meetings being convened by the secretariat. The secretariat noted that there was a possibility to meet in person during CPM-17, 27–31 March 2023.
- [99] The TC-RPPOs:
- (4) *agreed* to defer the election of a chairperson for the Thirty-Fifth TC-RPPOs, and the selection of a date for the Thirty-Fifth TC-RPPOs, to their fourth session; and

6. Any other business

- [100] Kyu-Ock YIM (APPPC), in her capacity as a member of the CPM Focus Group on the Implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020–2030 Development Agenda Items, gave an update on the work of the focus group. She explained that the group had drafted a substantial document outlining the key milestones, achievements, time frame and budget for each of the eight development agenda items, but the document had not yet been completed. The aim was that it would be submitted to CPM-17 (2023) for approval, but also that it would be a living document so that it could be kept up-to-date. Ms YIM alerted the TC-RPPOs to the fact that each development agenda item, not just the one on POARS, may require a substantial amount of activity by RPPOs. The implementation plans for the IPPC ePhyto Solution and for POARS are well advanced, but others (e.g. for the diagnostic laboratory network) are at a much earlier stage of development. She suggested that, as it is quite a complicated plan and RPPOs are key players in its implementation, the TC-RPPOs will need to have a serious discussion on the document, for all development agenda items, once it is completed.

7. Welcome to the new chairperson

- [101] This item was deferred to the fourth session of the TC-RPPOs.

8. Introduction by new chairperson

- [102] This item was deferred to the fourth session of the TC-RPPOs.

9. Close of the meeting

- [103] The TC-RPPOs chairperson thanked all participants for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
Wednesday 21 September (Face-to-face meeting) - 07:30 to 09:30 Abbey room			
	Collecting badges	7:45 am Registration Desk	
1.	Opening of the meeting	8:00 am Abbey room 10 Minutes	
1.1	Welcome by the TC-RPPO Chairperson		Chair - Diego Quiroga
2.	Meeting arrangements	5 minutes	
2.1	Election of the rapporteur		IPPC Secretariat
2.2	Adoption of the agenda	VM01_01_TC-RPPO_2022_Sep	Chair - Diego Quiroga
3.	Administrative matters	5 minutes	
3.1	Documents list	VM01_02_TC-RPPO_2022_Sep	Chair - Diego Quiroga
3.2	Participants list	VM01_03_TC-RPPO_2022_Sep	Chair - Diego Quiroga
4.	Presentation of regional challenges	Doc by each RPPO (10 minutes each)	
4.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	IPPC Presentation	Osama El-Lissy
4.2	APPPC	VM01_08_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	APPPC - Yubak
4.3	CAHFSA		CAHFSA - Goldsmith
4.4	CAN	VM01_12_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	CAN - Rojas
4.5	COSAVE	VM01_10_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	COSAVE - Quiroga
4.6	EPPO	VM01_09_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	EPPO - Horn
4.7	Discussion – based on the RPPO reports, identify where RPPOs can cooperate and consider RPPO rep. for the POARS Steering Group	VM01_05_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept VM01_06_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	All
Thursday September 22th (Face-to-face meeting) - 07:45 to 09:30			
4.	Presentation of regional challenges (continued)	Doc by each RPPO (10 minutes each)	
4.8	IAPSC		IAPSC - Mezui M'ella
4.9	NAPPO	VM01_04_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	NAPPO - Bloem
4.10	NEPPO	VM01_07_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	NEPPO - Chouibani
4.11	OIRSA	VM01_13_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	OIRSA - Rodas
4.12	PPPO	VM01_11_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	PPPO - Timote

Agenda Item		Document No.	Presenter
4.13	Discussion – based on the RPPO reports, identify where RPPOs can cooperate		All
5.	Election of new Chair and dates (virtual?) for 35th TC-RPPOs		Chair - Diego Quiroga/All
6.	Any other business		Chair - Diego Quiroga/Gilmore
7.	Welcome to the new chair		Chair - Diego Quiroga
8.	Introduction by new chair		
9.	Closing of the meeting		Chair - Diego Quiroga

Appendix 2: Documents list

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
VM01_01_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	2.2	Agenda	2022-06-24
VM01_02_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	3.1	Documents List	2022-06-24
VM01_03_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	3.2	Participants List	
VM01_04_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.9	NAPPO	2022—9-05
VM01_05_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.13	POARS recommendations (PDF)	2022—9-13
VM01_06_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.13	Opinions for RPPOs (word)	2022—9-13
VM01_07_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.10	NEPPO	2022—9-12
VM01_08_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.2	APPPC	2022—9-12
VM01_09_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.6	EPPO	2022—9-13
VM01_10_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.5	COSAVE	2022—9-15
VM01_11_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.12	PPPO	2022—9-19
VM01_12_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.4	CAN	2022—9-20
VM01_13_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.11	OIRSA	2022—9-20
VM01_14_TC-RPPO_2022_Sept	4.3	CAHFSA	2022—9-21

Appendix 2: Participants list

A tick (✓) indicates attendance at the meeting.

	Region/Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
	RPPO representatives		
✓	Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)	Mr Yubak Dhoj G. C. Senior Agricultural Officer (Plant Protection) FAO Regional Office for Asia (RAP) 39 Phra Atit Road Bangkok 10200, Thailand Tel: (+66) 2974268 Mobile: (+66) 858758784 Fax: (+66) 2 6974445	yubak.gc@fao.org; yubak.gc@yahoo.com
✓	APPPC	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM Senior Researcher- Export Management Division Dept. of Plant Quarantine Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs Republic of Korea Tel: (+82) 82-54-912-0627	koyim@korea.kr
✓ Virtually 1st Day	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA)	Ms Juliet GOLDSMITH Plant Health Specialist Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) Letitia Vriesdelaan #10 Paramaribo, Suriname Tel: (+597) 422 546 Mobile: (+597) 725 2922	juliet.goldsmith@cahfsa.org; rppo.secretariat@cahfsa.org
	Comunidad Andina (CAN)	Katty Rojas Quiroga RESPONSABLE ESPECIALISTA EN SANIDAD VEGETAL	krojas@comunidadandina.org
	CAN	Ronald Becerra Corredor ESPECIALISTA EN SANIDAD VEGETAL	rbecerra@comunidadandina.org
✓	Comite de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE)COSAVE	Ms Melisa NEDILSKYJ Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA) -Secretaria de Coordinación del COSAVE 2022-2024 Venezuela 162, CABA, Buenos Aires Tel:(+54) 011 4121 5000 (int 6040)	secretaria_coordinacion@cosave.org ; cosave@cosave.org

	Region/Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	COSAVE	Mr Diego QUIROGA Director Nacional de Protección Vegetal Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad Agroalimentaria (SENASA) Presidente del Comité Directivo del COSAVE 2022-2024 Venezuela 162, CABA, Buenos Aires Tel:(+54) 011 4121 5000 (int 6040)	dquiroga@senasa.gob.ar; cosave@cosave.org
✓	European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)	Mr Nico M. HORN Director-General European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO/OEPP) 21 boulevard Richard Lenoir 75011 PARIS FRANCE Tel: (+33) 1 45 20 77 94	nico.horn@eppo.int
	Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)	Mr Jean Gérard MEZUI M'ELLA Director of Interafrican Phytosanitary Council of African Union African-Union Interafrican Phytosanitary Council / Conseil Phytosanitaire Interafricain de l'Union Africaine P.O.Box 4170 Nlongkak, Yaoundé, Cameroon Tel: (+237) 222 21 19 69, (+237) 694 89 93 40, +237 673275853 Fax: (+237) 222 21 19 67	MezuiJG@africa-union.org; jeangerardmezuimella@gmail.com
	IAPSC	Mr Luiza MUNYUA Senior Scientific Officer African Union Inter-African Phytosanitary Council P.O.Box 4170 Nlongkak, Yaoundé, Cameroon Tel: (+237) 222 21 19 69, (+237) 678010935, (+254) 733802041 Fax: (+237) 222 21 19 67	MunyuaL@africa-union.org
✓	North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)	Ms Stephanie BLOEM Executive Director North American Plant Protection Organization Secretariat 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 145,	stephanie.bloem@nappo.org; tita.bloem@gmail.com

	Region/Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
		Raleigh, North Carolina 27606 United States of America Tel: (+1) 919 617 4040 Mobile: (+1) 919 480 4761	
✓	Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO)	Mr Mekki CHOUIBANI Executive Director Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO) NEPPO Batiment C de l'INRA, Angle des Avenues Ibn Al Ouazzani et Hassan II. Rabat. Morocco Tel: (+212) 537 704 810 Mobile: (+212) 673 997 808 Fax: (+212) 537 7087 63	hq.neppo@gmail.com; chouibani@gmail.com
✓	Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)	Mr Raul RODAS Director Regional de Servicios Cuarentenarios OIRSA Edificio OIRSA Calle Ramón Belloso, final pasaje Isolda Colonia Escalón, San Salvador Apdo. Postal (01) 61, San Salvador, El Salvador Tel: (+503) 6000 1680	Rodas Suazo, Raúl Antonio rrodas@oirsa.org
✓	Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)	Ms Sophie Alexia PETERSON Director, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health Australian Chief Plant Protection Office Department of Agriculture Fisheries and Forestry Australia Tel: (+61) 2 6272 3769 Mobile: (+61) 466 867 519	Sophie.Peterson@awe.gov.au
✓ Virtually 1 st Day	PPPO	Mr Visoni TIMOTE Executive Secretary Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) Pacific Community (SPC) Pacific Community, Land Resources Division, Private Mail Bag ,Suva, Fiji Tel: (+679) 337 9220 or (+679) 337 0733 Ext:35220 Mobile:(+679) 863 3542 Fax: (+679) 337 0021	visonit@spc.int; timotev@gmail.com
	Others		
✓	Observer	Mr Benoît GNOLONFIN Résidence Moustapha	bgnonlonfin74@gmail.com ;

	Region/Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
	Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)	Mbacké Dakar-Almadies – Zone 6 Parcelle N° 9, Senegal 496 Abogo Largema St, Central Business District 900103, Abuja, Nigeria	
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Osama El-Lissy IPPC Secretary	Osama.Elissy@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Arop Deng Agricultural Officer	Arop.Deng@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr John Gilmore Agricultural Officer	John.Gilmore@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Natalie Nicora Integration and Support Team Assistant	Natalie.Nicora@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Karen Rouen Report writer	karen@karenrouen.com