Review of the status of plant protection in the world

*(Prepared by the Secretariat)*

IPPC ARTICLE XI “Commission on Phytosanitary Measures”, which establishes the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures within the framework of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), describes as one of the functions of the Commission to promote the full implementation of the objectives of the Convention. One of the first steps to do so is to review the state of plant protection in the world and the need for action to control the international spread of pests and their introduction into endangered areas.

In an effort to address the mandate under IPPC Article XI, CPM-1 (2007) agreed to add Goal 7 - Review of the status of plant protection in the world in the IPPC Business Plan 2007 - 2011 (including the Strategic Plan).

CPM-3 to CPM-7 included an agenda point on the Review of the status of plant protection in the world that included sessions focusing on science topics of interest to contracting parties. Annex 1 outlines the various topics and themes addressed under the agenda point over the five year period.

The CPM Bureau, which met in June 2010, discussed the potential for a focused effort based on status studies to create baseline data and indicated, that this might also be useful for the CPM. The Secretariat proposed adding this topic to the IPPC Secretariat’s operational plan, but warned that the work would be intensive and would need to be comprehensive. This was not included in the Secretariat work plan due to lack of resources.

From CPM 8 (2013) to the present, the agenda point was replaced with: (i) an agenda point called Contracting Parties Reports of Successes and Challenges of Implementation and (ii) the Special Topics Session.

The idea of a focused effort to prepare a “Review of the status of plant protection in the world” has been taken up in several papers drafted since for the Finance Committee, the IYPH, capacity development and others.

The most recent effort was undertaken at the SPG October 2016 meeting, which discussed the review of the **global plant health** situation. The discussion focused on the Kenya proposal for an international phytosanitary conference. The SPG agreed that having such a conference and publishing the proceedings may be the best approach, but recognized that the details need to be worked out.

The SPG requested that Kenya further develop its proposal for an international phytosanitary conference for discussion at the next SPG.

The TC-RPPO is asked to consider the topic and review the Kenya Paper and to:

1. *propose* ideas that could be submitted to Kenya for assisting in the preparation of the proposal for the SPG.

*brainstorm* other mechanisms that could be used to support efforts of the Secretariat to prepare the ***Review of the status of plant protection in the world*.**

Annex 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * 1. CPM-3
 | * 1. 2008
 | * 1. A scientific presentation on “Climate Change and Plant Pests: Preparing the Contracting Parties” was given by Mr Ian Campbell of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency.
	2. Argentina, reported on the “Expert Meeting on Climate-related transboundary pests and diseases, including relevant aquatic species” organized by FAO as part of the preparations for the “High-Level Conference on World Food Security: The Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy”, which was to be held on 3-5 June 2008. The Expert Meeting had discussed potential impacts on food security, international trade, and the environment. It considered inter alia the role of NPPOs and the IPPC in preparing for changing risks such as modification to existing PRAs and the relationship of phytosanitary matters to food safety.
 |  |
|  |  | * 1. Programme for the Development of the “Implementation Review and Support System” (IRSS)
 | * 1. CPM-3, 2008) adopted the programme and requested that it be implemented as soon as practically possible.
 |
| * 1. CPM-4
 | * 1. 2009
 | * 1. Scientific Session: pest movement through food aid shipments
	2. The CPM was provided with two presentations on pest movement through food aid shipments.
	3. Indonesia spoke on “Pest movement by food aid shipment: Indonesia’s Experience”.
	4. Mr Rick Hodges of the Natural Resources Institute at the University of Greenwich, UK, on behalf of the World Food Programme (WFP) “Insect Infestation in Food Aid – Phytosanitary Risks and Responses”
 | * 1. The CPM:
	2. 1. Agreed that an open-ended workshop on the international movement of grain be convened depending on the availability of extrabudgetary resources.
 |
|  |  | The Secretariat presented an update on international developments with regard to electronic certification, which was based on a background paper on the status of electronic certification provided by the Netherlands. | The Secretariat informed the CPM that it will participate in the International E-Cert Workshop in Ottawa, Canada, from 19-21 May 2009, and report back to CPM-5. |
|  |  | The Secretariat introduced the report of the Open-ended Working Group on pest free areas (OEWG-PFAs). | * 1. The CPM: Agreed that members could submit information on established PFAs to be posted on the IPP.
 |
|  |  | Update on the Implementation Review and Support System: The Programme for the Development of the IRSS provides a three-year work plan for the implementation of the system. | * 1. Requested members to provide project funds to staff and implement this project.
 |
| * 1. CPM-5
 | * 1. 2010
 | * 1. 15.1 Electronic certification: The Secretariat reported on the “Electronic Phytosanitary Certification International Workshop” that was held in Ottawa, Canada, on 19-21 May 2009. The meeting had been organized by NAPPO and Canada.
 | * 1. The outcome proposed was a global standard for phytosanitary electronic certification.
 |
|  |  | * 1. Update on reporting on pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence: The Secretariat notified the CPM that a form for national reporting of Pest Free Areas (PFAs) and Areas of Low Pest Prevalence (ALPPs) is available on the new IPPC website (IPP) (www.ippc.int). So far only one member (Mexico) had made use of the system for reporting.
 | * 1. Encouraged contracting parties to use this system to improve communication and transparency on this subject.
 |
|  |  | * 1. 15.2 Update on the open-ended workshop on the international movement of grain planned for early- or mid-May 2011.
 | * 1. Terms of reference was noted and Canada offered to organize the workshop
 |
|  |  | * 1. 15.3 Scientific session: threats to biosecurity and biodiversity as a result of international trade
	2. Mr Brasier (International Union of Forest Research Organizations, UK) talked on scientific and operational flaws in the current system to prevent entry and spread of damaging plant pathogens. He presented many examples of forest pathogens. He stressed the growing threat due to the globalized trade in plants, and to insufficient consideration of the risk caused by uncharacterized species, e.g. Phytophthora spp.
	3. Mr Howard (Global Invasive Species Coordinator of IUCN, Kenya) talked on the threats to and by aquatic plants and the role of IPPC. He emphasized the importance of aquatic plants for human societies, fisheries and the environment.
 |  |
| * 1. CPM-6
 | * 1. 2011
 | * 1. 15.1 Electronic certification: The Secretariat presented an update on progress in 2010 regarding electronic certification.
 |  |
|  |  | * 1. 15.2 Consideration of aquatic plants within the IPPC: The Secretariat presented a paper which introduced the concept of aquatic plants. The issue of aquatic plants within the IPPC had been discussed for a number of years within the IPPC and also by the CBD. An international gap analysis identified aquatic plants as an area that needed further clarity and the IPPC was requested to investigate whether the scope of the IPPC covered aquatic plants.
 | * 1. *Agreed* that the issue of aquatic plants within the IPPC be considered by the Bureau and SPTA and then reported back to CPM-7 (2012)
 |
|  |  | * 1. 15.3 Scientific Session: The Scientific Session included approaches for addressing pests risks associated with grain and wood.
	2. 15.3.1. An essential partnership: international grain trade and plant protection. The presentation by Mr Gary Martin, President of the North American Export Grain Association, highlighted the importance of partnerships between the grain industry and governments. He said that the world bulk grain systems that were fungible, efficient, sustainable and flexible would lead to sound plant protection as well as meet global food and energy needs. Pressure was increasing, and had never been greater, for food and energy security.
	3. 15.3.2. Mountain pine beetle: Pest-free wood products from a devastated forest
	4. Mr Eric Allen of the Canadian Forest Service presented on the mountain pine beetle, Dendroctonus ponderosae which is the most devastating forestry pest in the history of Canada. Sixteen million hectares of pine had died. This is a bark beetle native to western North America which flourished as forests became older and climatic temperatures rose over time. The beetle population has now stopped expanding and the forests are growing back as the beetle does not attack young trees. The beetle lives symbiotically with, and vectors, a fungus that contributes to killing the tree.
 |  |
| * 1. CPM-7
 | * 1. 2012
 | * 1. 13.1 ePhyto
	2. The Secretariat presented on the issue on electronic phytosanitary certification. A successful meeting was held in the Republic of Korea during which the activities of the IPPC ePhyto work programme were established. Three working groups were established to develop standardised IPPC ePhyto protocols: 1. XML schema, 2. Harmonisation of ISPM 12:2011 code lists (with 4 sub-groups A: Botanical names and pest names, B: Treatments, C: Additional Declarations, and D: Product Description), and 3. Security.
	3. 157. The draft Appendix to ISPM 12: 2011 has been drafted and is now entering the IPPC standard setting process. The actual ePhyto protocols will be stored on the IPP and referenced in the Appendix.
 | * 1. CPM:
	2. agreed that the ePhyto Steering Committee would manage this work to ensure the Secretariat had adequate support and the programme could move forward quickly
	3. agreed that a second ePhyto workshop is desirable should additional extra-budgetary resources become available to host this workshop
 |
|  |  | * 1. 13.2 IPPC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)
	2. 161. The Secretariat presented the document on the recent developments, gave a brief overview of the IRSS programme and highlighted a number of achievements by the IRSS programme.
 | The CPM:* 1. noted the recent developments of the IRSS programme
 |
|  |  | * 1. 13.3 IPPC Symposium:
	2. The Symposium was inaugurated with opening messages from the CPM Chair, Agriculture Ministers from Peru, Republic of Korea, the United States, and a representative from the Argentinean Health Service and Food Quality (SENASA) provided video messages to the symposium. The IPPC history mission, achievements and future challenges were highlighted in a speech by Mr Niek van der Graaff, followed by a presentation by the IPPC Secretary underlining the current situation of the IPPC as one of the three standard setting bodies of the WTO SPS agreement.
 | Adopted The IPPCDeclaration, contained inAppendix 11 of the report.  |
|  |  | * 1. Dr Ryan Wersal from the Mississippi State University, Department of Agriculture and Applied Science, made a presentation on the joint IPPC project on aquatic plants risks conducted under the framework of the IRSS. Many members presented questions and shared experiences with invasive aquatic plants from their countries.
 |  |
|  |  | Dr Jens-Georg Unger, of the Julius Kuhn Institute in Germany, made a presentation on internet trade of plants for planting. Mr Washington Otieno, of the IPPC Secretariat, followed up on the issue of internet trade from the perspective of the IPPC Secretariat. |  |