REGIONAL WORKSHOP

Regional Workshop for the Global review of the of Phytosanitary Surveillance Standard (ISPM6)
Cairo, Egypt 16 – 18 January 2012

REPORT OF THE WORKESHOP

The Regional Workshop for the Global review of phytosanitary surveillance in the context of the IPPC Standard (ISPM6) was convened in Cairo, Egypt during the period 16-18 January, 2012. The workshop was organized by the FAO Regional Office for the Near East (RNE) with support of the newly established Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

The objective of the workshop was to identify the challenges face the application of the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measure (ISPM 6) - Guidelines for Surveillance, and to come out with the recommendations for required measures and resources for improving the application of the standard. The workshop aimed as well at promoting discussion and information exchange between countries in the region on plant protection issues, as well as enhancing countries abilities to prioritize and identify the challenges and support needed to face these challenges.

The workshop was inaugurated by Mr. Saad AlOtaibi, FAO Assistant Director General and Regional Representative for the Near East.

In his opening statement, Mr. AlOtaibi welcomed the participants and highlighted the importance of understanding and applying international standards in an appropriate sense in order to benefit from the prevailing open trading regime and promote the economy of the Near East Region. These issues were reinforced by Mr. Salah Abd AlMoemen - Head of the Agriculture Research Center in Egypt in his welcoming remarks and reaffirmed by Mr. Ali Soliman - Head of Central Administration of Plant Quarantine. Mr. Ali Soliman also suggested having a common quarantine pest map of the region in his opening remarks.

The workshop was conducted through 6 sessions divided into 3 days. Each session comprised several presentations and discussions of related issues. The workshop was chaired by Mr. Imad Nahal, Lebanese Representative and Standard Committee Member for Near East.

Session 1: ***Overview of the IPPC and the ISPM 6***

In this session, Mr. Shoki AlDobai - Crop Protection Officer FAO/RNE presented two presentations. The first presentation demonstrated an overview on the IPPC outlined background information on the IPPC, mission, administration, as well the strategic planning of the convention. Furthermore, the presentation defined means and opportunities by which countries can contribute in developing the International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures, through any of stages of standard preparation as following: (i) countries can propose new phytosanitary issues that need to be addressed or propose review of an old standard, *(ii)* formulation of the standard – where the proposal by standard committee is subjected to comments by the members – then - the comments go back to the standard committee were the experts formulate draft which should be later adopted by the standard committee. *(iii)* Draft review consultation *(iv)* adoption of the standards or its review.
Finally, the presentation tackled the activities of the convention in terms of capacity building and dispute settlement.

The second presentation characterized the ISPM 6 - Guidelines for Surveillance and its importance. The presentation highlighted the definition of surveillance, the scope of the standard, type of surveillance, good surveillance practices, technical requirements for diagnostic services required for the surveillance and record keeping. Moreover, the presentation underlined the importance of applying phytosanitary surveillance as a prerequisite for application of other phytosanitary measures such as; early detection of pests, Pest Risk Analysis (PRA), establishment of Pest Free Areas (PFAs) and many other procedures that rely on the Surveillance. Lastly, the presentation demonstrated the requirements for the implementation of ISPM 6.

The participants raised their concern regarding the lack of awareness of the standards and specifically of the ISPM 6, the representative of Lebanon discussed the importance of raising the awareness of the IPPC activities and standard setting by the Standard Committee, he urged the participants to actively participate and cooperate in the different stages of setting out a standard. He added that each participant country should study the different standards and evaluate their capabilities to capture the gaps that hinders the application of the standards as well they would be able to demand the appropriate assistance that help their countries to comply with the International Standards.

Session 2: ***Review of the Best Practices for Phytosanitary Pest Surveillance: Countries Responses to Questionnaire***

In this session, a review was made on the countries responses on the questionnaire that was designed to capture the current situation and the extent of the application of ISPM 6. The questionnaire was submitted to the participating countries prior to the workshop; each country gave responses according to their own situation and the replies were

discussed. Each country clarified the reasons behind their responses and some of the participants altered their responses after the questions were further elaborated.

The summary results of the ISPM6 Pest Surveillance Survey and discussion during the workshop is as following:

A. Policy and Legislative Environment

Under section A, most respondents indicated that policy issues that affected their respective country's surveillance programme came down to trade policy, and free trade agreements. In the Near East all country's reported that their NPPOs have primary responsibility for pest surveillance. Also, 50% of respondents noted that other public and/or private institutions are also legally mandated (or otherwise) to perform surveillance. 70% of respondents noted that their NPPOs conduct pest surveillance activities in a coordinated manner with private, public institutions, agencies and or departments. Notably, only 60% of the regions respondents noted that the powers/authority of the NPPO staff involved specifically in pest surveillance are sufficient enough to carry out pest surveillance work effectively. For those who note insufficient power to carry out pest surveillance activities, half of those answered that survey results are indeed provided to the NPPO. When emergencies arise, 60% of the respondents noted that their NPPO could legally mandate the use of services of collaborating private, public organizations, agencies and/or institutions to undertake surveys. 50% of respondents noted that there are not written documents establishing mandate functions, and responsibilities of those organizations or government departments for the conduct of pest surveillance. Within the Near East region, 60% of respondents answered yes when asked whether their pest surveillance programme or service has a strategic and operational plan. Across the board, 90% of respondents noted that surveillance responsibilities of the NPPO focuses on types of pests listed, namely, quarantine pests, regulated non-quarantine pests, and/or regulated pests.

B. Organizational Structure, Competencies and Culture

Under section B, 60% of respondents noted that an organizational chart of pest surveillance services was in existence. 90% of respondents in the Near East region noted that NPPOs pest surveillance functions are centralized under a national manager. In terms of the formal linkages existing with external sources of information on pest surveillance (non NPPO) 60% of respondents noted that such linkages do exist, with 30% of respondents noting that such formal linkages do not exist. According to responses, most NPPOs are not engaging relevant stakeholders to support and improve the quality of their respective pest surveillance service. When there is an emergency, 40% of respondents answered that stakeholder are including in the emergency planning team . Some 25% of the respondents in the region noted that their NPPO pest surveillance programs do not have well developed and compatible data systems to collect, store and report pest

surveillance information. All respondents noted that there is no pest surveillance programme or service has put in place procedures to review its performance.

C. Documented Procedures

Under the section C: Documented Procedures, all of respondents noted that there was not a computerized retrieval system for surveillance information in use by the NPPO. Of the type of information stored by the NPPO, including scientific name of pests, hosts, pant part affected, means of collection, date and name of collector, date and name of identifier, and geographical location, were noted to be stored, most respondents (70 – 80%) noted the storing of this type of data. Respondents noted that the use of GIS coordinates to locate pests detected during pest surveys was used by 30% of respondents. Some 20% of respondents noted the use of an operational manual for pest surveillance.

D. General Surveillance

60% of respondents noted that there was a national database of plant pest records, and 60% of the respondents noted that such databases were easily accessible by the NPPO. 40% of respondents rated the sufficiency of resources required for general pest surveillance as "Sufficient", and 60% as "Intermediate". 90% of the respondents noted that there is a service in place for the public to have pests identified.

E. Specific Surveys

Under section E (Specific Surveys), 60% of respondents noted that a specific manager exists in managing overall responsibilities for surveillance activities and 40% responded that the manager responsible is trained in management. Only 1 respondent noted that there was an agreement between the NPPO and industry (private sector) to cover expenditures for surveys. 60% of respondents noted that there were agreements between the NPPO and public institutions and/or agencies to cover expenditures for surveys. Only 25% of the time are specific pest survey procedures described in an operational manual. 25% of respondents noted that the performance, efficiency, efficacy, and relevance of those manuals or plans are periodically evaluated.

F. Pest Diagnostics

To note, 1 of the respondent did not fill out Section F of the questionnaire. 30% of respondent in this region noted that their NPPO was the sole provider of pest diagnostic services in the country. 60% of respondents to this section noted that their pest diagnostic laboratory was optimally situated in their country to take into account the geographic demand for laboratory services. 40% respondents noted that other additional NPPO laboratories are managed centrally at the national level. 60% of the respondents noted that those NPPO laboratories cooperate through formal arrangements with other non-NPPO laboratories or institutions inside the country for pest diagnostics. 60% of NPPOs

have formal arrangements with other laboratories or institutions outside the country for pest diagnostics. 20% of respondents noted that their NPPO uses virtual diagnostics, ie. transmission of images of pests to a central diagnostic service inside or outside the country. 60% of respondents noted that their laboratories verify their performance/results with other pest diagnostic laboratories inside or outside the country. 75% of respondents noted that their staff are sufficiently qualified and trained to perform pest diagnostics and use relevant laboratory equipment, analytical methods, etc. necessary to support the pest surveillance activities. 40% of respondents noted that is to a certain extent there are documented procedures in place for sampling, sampling delivery, intermediate storage, and disposal as well as documented procedures for: diagnostics, traceability, reporting. 50% of the respondents noted that their NPPOs phytosanitary surveillance plans take into account the required laboratory support and in 75% of cases the respondents noted that the laboratory staff participate in the preparation of the NPPOs pest surveillance plans. Notably, when asked how frequent training programs for staff involved in pest diagnostics, 75% respondents to this section answered "None".

G. Resources

For those respondents who answered the questions "What is the total annual investment being currently made by the NPPO to conduct Pest Surveillance, the maximum investment was recorded at 590,000USD and the minimum investment was recorded at 15,000USD. When asked to rate the sufficiency of other resources (vehicles, traps, lures, samplers, GPS) required to operate the pest surveillance programme, 60% of respondents answered with an "Intermediate" ranking, and 30% answered with a "Sufficiently" ranking. When asked to rate the current NPPOs pest surveillance programs current human resources capacity in terms of numbers, 46% responded "Weak – Very Weak", 30% responded "Good" and 25% responded "Average". 40% of respondents rated their NPPOs pest surveillance program current human resources capacity in terms of qualifications and skills as "Good", 45% rated theirs as "Average" and 20% rated theirs as "Weak". In almost all cases (80%) of respondents noted that their governments pay for specific surveys to be conducted. In terms of frequency of training programs for staff involved in pest surveillance, 50% of respondents report that there is no programmed training, with other respondents noting training either once per year, once every 2 years and once every three years.

H. Open-ended Feedback

Overall, most respondents listed budgetary constraints, lack of a strategic and operational plan, a lack of operational guidelines and instructions for carrying out surveillance for pests, lack of properly trained staff, lack of human resources, and no operational budget within the top 5 things that affect country in the region's ability to conduct effective pest surveillance. Above all, lack of training and poor budgetary resources were reported by all survey respondents. In terms of the second part of section H, namely, three things the respondent would like to see improved on, the main areas for improvement reported

were, information exchange between members, monitoring and evaluation of surveillance programmes, the inclusion of more statistical aspects of surveys, and best practices in pest surveillance.

Session 3: ***Review of the Best Practices for Phytosanitary Pest Surveillance: Countries Presentation***

Each country presented their experience in the field of pest surveillance, some countries presented a specific case on specific pests and/or crop and others just highlighted the case in generic terms.

Countries presentation in order of the presentations:

Morocco: *presentation by Abderrahmane Fatni- Head of Department of Plant Protection of the Regional Directorate of ONSSA*

The presentation of Morocco distinguished their national surveillance system by two particular periods; period before 2006 where there was no legal framework regulating the implementation of pest surveillance, and the period after 2006 upon the actual establishment of the plant protection framework. The new system provided a new institutional structure reflecting the importance of enhancing cooperative efforts to develop plant protection infrastructure by establishing specialized agencies covering the whole area of Morocco. As well, a module to monitor plant pests was developed by the new plant protection agency.

The Moroccan responsible authorities carried out a comprehensive study to identify the phytosanitary priorities based on risk assessment evaluation undertaken to identify the risk associated with the plant pests, plants, and imported consignments. One of the important measures applied during the study was pest surveillance which resulted in the determination of 428 pests in the Moroccan territories.

Egypt: *presented by Mr. Magdy Salem Professor Doctor - Plant Protection Research Institute*

A comprehensive pest survey was carried out through a national project. For the purpose of the survey the country was divided into seven regions. The necessity for the survey was raised at national level with the increasing impacts and damages caused by the plant pests reflected by the decreasing agriculture productivity. The project determined the types of crops which is appropriate to each area based on pest distribution. Each divided area had a geographical description and crop make up structure. Procedures of surveys were as follows; the pests gathered in the surveillance were sorted into species and if any pest was not identified by Egyptian expertise the specimens were send to the

Entomological Museum in Great Britain, then were classified according to the diverse categories "predators, pests, omnivores …etc.". According to the obtained results the responsible authorities were able to develop and apply programs for pest control and monitor. The surveys operations resulted in recording 450 insects.

Palestine: *presented by Abdallah H. Dahla - Deputy Director of Plant Pest Control Department Ministry of Agriculture Palestine*

The presentation highlighted the case of survey for the Olive Fruit Fly. The responsible authority "General Directorate of Plant Protection" conducted specific survey on the Olive Fruit Fly. The representative underlined the difficulty of having a general comprehensive survey due to the occupation. Survey of Olive Fruit Fly procedures was using different types of traps. Farmers send the readings from the traps on weekly basis for 3 years and then record of the results were kept and pest status was determined accordingly.

Oman: *presented by Ahmed Ali Sulaiman Al'Isaee - Directorate of Agriculture and Animal Wealth*

The presentation demonstrated the regulations applied for surveying Stem Rust - "Ug.99" disease on wheat. The presentation included description of the symptoms of the Stem Rust that was shown on different hosts in Oman especially wheat. The efforts were made to control the disease efforts and limit its spread. Accordingly, monitoring and surveys were undertaken to determine the statuses of infected areas and potential infected areas. The mechanism of the surveillance initiated by conducting one day training to farmers to introduce the monitoring and survey methods to be used.
The survey covered whole country Oman. The record were updated for 3 successive years and kept for references.

Bahrain: *presented by Isa Ahmed Ghanem*

The presentation underlined the survey conducted in Bahrain on date palm trees. The purpose of survey targeted the pests infesting the date palm trees with focus on the Red Palm Weevil. There were no sufficient studies on insect pests and risk associated and the spread of the pests within the country. Therefore, conducting a survey program was essential demand to improve the production of dates through implementing pest management programmes to control date palm pests. The program conducted aimed at identifying the type of pests infesting palm trees, classifying pests according to their economic importance and determining invasive species. The survey was conducted through using different traps and checking and marking the suspected trees by labeling them. The collected insects were identified and mounted in the insects boxes, some samples of the insects were sent to King Saud University at Saudi Arabia for identification.

Lebanon: *presented by Imad Nahal - Head of Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture*

Lebanon has conducted pest surveillance to comply with the ISPM 6 for the purposes of updating the list of pests present in country to develop a list of regulated pests, to facilitate the development of integrated pest management programmes and to assist in identifying potential pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence.
The surveillance was conducted mainly on the predominate crops in Lebanon stone fruits and citrus fruits. The system followed in surveillance was the same in both crops. The surveillance was conducted with the assistance of a New Zealand expert. The operation of surveillance took place on 12 steps; *step1*: Record the title and authors/contributors of the survey, *step2*: Determine the reasons for surveying, *step3*: Identifying target pests; *step 4*: assemble detailed information on the target host(s) to be surveyed; *step5*: detail the alternative hosts; *step6*: Making a pest list gathered from previous studies and researches, s*teps 7-10*: Determining the area to be surveyed. *Step 11*: in part Number of sites to be sampled – suggested statistical approach The proportion of infested sites follows a binomial distribution, and thus the number of sites to be surveyed can be calculated as: $N = \log (1 - p_1) / \log (1 - p_2 p_{3)}$; *Step 12* : Timing of the survey ; *Step 13 :*Identifying the requisite sites and accessing sites; *Step 14* & *Step 15* : Data to be collected from each site and specimens to be taken ; finally *Step 16*:Database creation and maintenance.

Yemen: *presented by: Fuad Bahakim - Vice Director of Plant Protection Directorate General Directorate for Plant Protection*

The presentation addressed the National Plant Pest Surveillance applied in Yemen. The General Directorate of Plant Protection adopted a project to conduct surveillance. The project purposes were to update the lists of quarantine and non-quarantine pests, as well to update phytosanitary requirement needed for plant and plant products imports, to provide information required for Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) and to develop a contingency plan to face the danger caused by exotic plant pests. The project also deemed to recommend the types and required pesticide and quantities needed for pest control operations, and improve the implementation of efficiently planned IPM programs for some economically important crops, most importantly to identify areas and sites free of pests or those with low prevalence of pests and decelerate it. To achieve the purposes of the project several steps were taken accordingly such as; collecting information on the last surveys results, reviewing the procedures in place for pest listing and initiating an effective approach to updating and managing surveillance data, as well training senior plant protection personnel in pest surveillance procedures.
Among the impacts of the surveillance project were; improving of the plant protection services in Yemen with reduced risk of pesticides on human health and environment, having early response system to control the plant pests that can damage the income

source of farmers and also their food as part of food security net and enabling Yemen to meet the requirements to fulfill the obligations set out in international conventions related to plant protection.

Mauritania: *presented by: Cheikh Ould Ahmed El Mokhtar Director of Agriculture Plant Protection Service*

The features of the presentation were mainly a description of the structure of the responsible authorities in Mauritania and the regulatory framework of the plant protection agency. In addition, the presentation indicated the list of regulated quarantine pets and list of laws regulating the quarantine work in the country.

UAE: *presented by: Jamal Alnaqbi Head of Plant Health Section – Central Region Ministry of Environment and Water*

The experience of the UAE in the application of the ISPM 6 was in the surveillance of the Red Palm Weevil infesting the palm trees that highly affect the date production in the country. The presentation included information on the pest, its geographical distribution, life cycle, damages and economic impact on the cultivation of palm trees in the country. The surveillance sources of information were divided on the four zones in UAE each of which provided with technical personnel including plant protection specialists and agriculture extension specialist. Information regarding of the pest is collected through field visits, sample of plants and exchange of information between with Ministry and the specialist at the zones. The information gathered from the survey are mostly used to support the Plant Health Department to declare pest free areas, help early detection of new pests, to communicate with other organizations and to build plant quarantine pest lists and distribution records.

Syria: *presented by: Lina Srewey - Head of Biological Control Section - The Plant Protection Directorate Ministry of Agriculture*

The presentation outlined Integrated Pest Management programs applied in Syria. Applying IPM programs require a strict system for monitoring insect pests. Monitoring can effectively be used for the detection of different pest present on specific crop or in an area. The IPM programs depend on using several methodologies in controlling insects in order to eliminate as much as possible the usage of pesticide as to make it the last alternative in the controlling methodologies. In some instances, these methods can be used to detect the presence of pests e.g., traps in general as well pheromone traps, cartoon ring for the pupation of larvae and other control methods.

Session 4: ***The use of ISPM 6 in the Region***

In this session, the discussions were based on the countries presentations regarding their experience in the use of ISPM 6 in terms of the advantaged of the use of the standard and the difficulties faced by the countries while they implemented the standard. For the countries that didn't implement the standard it was not with relevance to discuss the advantages of applying the standard as the case was not applicable to them; or countries that applied surveillance but it was not according to the ISPM 6. However, these countries were able to indicate the difficulties that hindered their application of the standard.

The advantages that countries achieved by applying the standard can be summarized as follows:

- The standard provided a broad outlined guidelines for conducting surveys, therefore the result of the survey would be recognized and accepted by other member countries,
- The standard emphasized methodologies assisting in the application of national surveys,
- Promote the free trade between trading countries due to the compliance with international standards

The difficulties faced the countries upon the implementation of ISPM 6 can be summarized as follows:

- The standard required trained staff to be implemented, therefore, lack of the qualified staff could create an obstacle for the implementation of the standard
- The implementation of the standard is very limited in countries with poor infrastructure such as qualified labs, poor logistics and other resources
- In most countries, the standard is not included in the national framework or regulations, or included but not enforced
- Standard doesn't include monitoring and evaluation aspects,
- Standard doesn't provide clear and comprehensive guidance regarding the design of survey,
- There must be an adequate number of qualified staff to implement the standard, which is not the case in most of the countries of the region.

Session 5: ***Requirements for improving national pest surveillance and Overview on the ISPMs 4***

This session discussed the requirements that are needed to improve the implementation of ISPM 6 on national level. These requirements can be determined through identifying the

tools and technical resources that are needed to implement the standards and recommendations for improving ISPM 6, they can be summarized as follows:

A. Tools and technical resources needed to implement ISPM6:

- Manual on applying the ISPM6 includes case studies by crop categories (Fruit trees, field crops, …etc) taking in to consideration statistical aspects applied in pest surveillance, details on survey planning and implementation (detailed procedures on all steps of the survey) including an indicative list of equipments for the all steps of implementation.
- Training tool kit for optimal application of the ISPM6
- Developing of training programmes

B. Recommendations for improving the ISPM6:

- Rising awareness among the member countries on the importance and content of ISPM6 and other ISPMs,
- Provide technical assistance to member countries to build their capacities in applying of pest surveillance including specific program training,
- Encourage applying preliminary general surveillance in member countries to prepare/update official national pest lists and submit them to the IPPC and NEPPO,
- To encourage countries to establish crop pest list data base to facilitate information exchange and trade within the region,
- To make list of accredited labs and institutes for pest identification available,
- To assist countries in establishing of pest maps,
- Countries should secure relevant and sufficient staff and other resources needed for implementation of ISPM6.

The second presentation Mr. Shoki, presented an outline on ISPM 4 - Requirements for the Establishment of Pest Free Areas. This standard is relevant to ISPM 6, hence one of the prerequisites of establishing PFA is to have pest surveillance to the area that is deemed to be established as a Pest Free Area. The presentation demonstrated the scope of the standard, general requirements for pest free areas (PFAs), definitions, phytosanitary measures to maintain freedom, checks to verify freedom has been maintained and record keeping. Finally the presentation addressed the issue of systems approach which is a combination of phytosanitary measures applied in an integrated manner to minimize the risks that might be associated with international trade and impose hazards to importing country and the issue of equivalence which is the recognition and acceptance of different phytosanitary measure provided that achieve the required level of protection.

Session 6: ***An Overview on ISPM8 and introductory presentation on the publication Save & Grow***

The presentation by Mr. Shoki also highlighted main features of ISPM 8 – Determination of Pest Status in an Area another relevant standard to ISPM 6. The presentation discussed the scope of the standard, objectives of determining pest status in an area, the use of pest presence information by importing and exporting countries, pest recording, reliability of pest recording, determination of pest status in an area and finally recommended reporting practices.

The following presentation was about Save & Grow approach, demonstrated the save and grow book publication published by FAO in May 2011. The book is a policymaker's guide to the sustainable intensification of smallholder crop production. The presentation highlighted the challenge that was the motive of publishing the book which require agriculture farmers and stakeholder must learn to save in order to grow and thus feeding the growing world population through intensifying crop production. The presentation outlines the methodology of saving and growing, the farming system that should be adopted in terms of soil health, cultivating genetically diverse portfolio of improved crop varieties, water management and conservation, plant protection and adequate use of pesticides that kills both the pest and the natural enemies causing distortion in the environmental balance. Furthermore, polices and institutional context must reflect the needs of the population and encourage the saving and growth of the agriculture production.

Annex 1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

BAHRAI N
Isa Ahmed Ghanem
Ministry of Municipalities
& Urban Planning Affairs
Bahrain
Tel: 00 973 177 966 88
00 973 398 903 01
E-mail: Isa.ghanem@gmail.com

EGYPT
Magdy Salem
Professor Doctor
Plant Protection Research Institute
Cairo, Egypt
Mob: 002 0100 937 2218
E-mail: dr.Magdy.salem@gmail.com

Ahmed Abdellah
SPS Specialist
Central Administration of Plant Quarantine
Cairo, Egypt
Tel: 002 0122 428 9112
E-mail: bidoeng@yahoo.com

Ahmed Fawzy
Phytosanitary Specialist
Central Administration of Plant Quarantine
Cairo, Egypt
Tel: 002 111 442 7344
E-mail: ahmedfawzy_84@yahoo.com

Shaza Roushdy
Phytosaintary Specialist
Ministry of Agriculture & Land Reclamation
Tel : 011 10 70 634
E-mail:shaza.roshdy@gmail.com

LEBANON
Imad Nahal
Head of Plant Protection Department
Ministry of Agriculture
Beirut, Lebanon
Tel: 00 961 1 849 639
E-mail: imadn@terra.net.lb

LIBYA
Salem Abdel Kader Haroun
Researcher – Agricultural Research Center
Tripoli, Libya
Tel: 00 218 91 763 6015
00 218 92 502 2977
E.mail: slmharoun@yahoo.com

MAURITANIA
Cheikh Ould Ahmed El Mokhtar
Director of Agriculture in Mauritania
Plant Protection Service
Nouakchott, Mauritania
Tel: 00 222 22 35 10 74
00 222 33 01 88 55
E-mail: biosidina@yahoo.fr

MOROCCO
Abderrahmane Fatni
Head of Department of Plant Protection of the
Regional Directorate of ONSSA
Region of Meknes-Tafilalet
Tel.: 00 212 646 740 80
E-mail : Afatni@yahoo.fr

OMAN
Ahmed Ali Sulaiman Al'Isaee
Directorate of Agriculture and Animal Wealth
Alburaimi Governorate
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Tel.: 00 96 895 403 740
Fax: 00 96 825 650 766
E-mail: Oman_200@hotmail.com

PALESTINE
Abdallah H. Dahla
Deputy Director of
Plant Pest Control Department
Ministry of Agriculture/Palestine
Tel.: 00 970 224 073 61
Mob. 00 970 599 313 984
E-mail: abdalladahla@yahoo.com

QATAR
Mohamed Qaad Nagi Saeed
Biological Researcher
Ministry of Environment
Doha, Qatar
Tel: 00 974 555 574 55
E-mail: Qatar_net2002@hotmail.com

SAUDI ARABIA
Fayez Suliman Ziyadi
Director of Plant Protection section
Agriculture Technical Supervisor
Riyadh, Saudi Arabia
Tel:00966 01 40 12 777
Mob: 00966 054 009 8998
Fax: 00966 01 40 32 791
E-mail: fz20092009@hotmail.com

SYRIA
Lina Srewey
Head of Biological Control Section
The Plant Protection Directorate
Ministry of Agriculture
Damascus, Syria
Tel: 00-963-955-256-326
E-mail: Lsrewey@gmail.com

UAE
Jamal Alnaqbi
Head of Plant Health Section – Central Region
Ministry of Environment and Water
United Arab Emirates
Tel.: 0097 1688 22228
Fax : 0097 168822777
E-mail: jmhassan@moew.gov.ae

YEMEN
Fuad Bahakim
Vice Director of Plant Protection Directorate
General Directorate for Plant Protection
Sana'a, Yemen
Tel : 00-967-1250-256
Mobile : 00 967 777 3344 26
E-mail: fuadbahakim@gmail.com

NEPPO
Mekki Chouibani
Executive Director
NEPPO
Agdal. Rabat
Tel: 00 212 0 537 766 536
Tel/Fax: 00 212 0 537 776 598
GSM: 00 212 673 997 808
E-mail: hq.neppo@gmail.com
chouibani@gmail.com

OPENNING SESSION
Salah Abdel Moemen
Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation
Cairo, Egypt

Ali Soliman
Head of Central Administration of Plant
Quarantine
Cairo, Egypt
Tel: 002 0111 780 0037
E-mail: capqoffice@gmail.com

FAO RNE
Shoki Al-Dobai
Plant Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Near East (RNE)
P.O. Box 2223, Dokki, Cairo, Egypt
Tel: 00 202 333 16000-7 Ext. 2812
Cell: 00 201 066 978 25
E-mail: Shoki.AlDobai@fao.org

Heba Tokali
Programme Clerk
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Regional Office for the Near East, Cairo, Egypt

Tel: 00 202 333 160 00
Mobile : 02 010 141 0366
E-mail: Heba.Tokali@fao.org