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[1]**DRAFT CPM RECOMMENDATION: Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (2018-026)**

[2]**Status box**

|  |
| --- |
| [3]This is not an official part of the CPM recommendation and it will be modified by the IPPC Secretariat after adoption. |
| [4]**Date of this document** | [5]2019-05-19 |
| [6]**Document category** | [7]Draft CPM recommendation  |
| [8]**Current document stage** | [9]*To* Consultation (2019) |
| [10]**Major stages** | [11]2019-03 Topic proposed by Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) for inclusion in the IPPC work programme for a standard.[12]2019-04 CPM-14 added the topic to the IPPC work programme for a CPM recommendation. [13]2019-05 Adjustments made following CPM-14. |
| [14]**Notes** | [15]This is a draft document[16]2019-05 Edited  |

[17]BACKGROUND

[18]The provision of food and other aid assists areas or countries that are at risk of food and economic insecurity as a result of war and conflict, crop failures, and natural disasters including storms, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. Assistance can be urgent and short term, or ongoing over the long term. The driver for this recommendation is provision of urgent disaster relief assistance, but the principles of preparedness and response apply equally to the provision of ongoing aid.

[19]It is wise to verify with the recipient country that they are in need of aid or assistance before it is despatched, and confirm the nature of assistance required.

[20]There has been a significant increase in severe weather events, attributed to climate change, as well as man-made and natural disasters that have precipitated the urgent need for food, water and machinery to prevent or ameliorate humanitarian crises. For example, Tonga has experienced three category 4 cyclones and one category 5 (Cyclone Ian) since 2010, while the Pacific region as a whole is increasingly experiencing damaging storms and storm surges. These events are not limited to developing countries or the Pacific region, and have occurred in all regions of the world.

[21]National plant protection organizations (NPPOs) are impacted by these situations but are still bound by their role to manage effectively the phytosanitary risk posed by pests, associated with imports of aid received in the aftermath of such disasters. There are a number of examples of long-term impacts on the economy, environment and communities from pests introduced with aid that have continued long after the country has recovered from the emergency situation.

[22]It can be difficult to manage phytosanitary risk effectively during an emergency situation. Executive government may demand that the goods are cleared and provided to those in need, even when it is clear that the goods would, under normal risk-based clearance processes, pose a phytosanitary risk that would require a treatment to address it, or would otherwise be re-exported or destroyed. Mixed consignments in shipping or air containers, which have a range of goods and risks, can experience delays in clearance and release as they need to be fully unpacked to verify whether they pose a phytosanitary risk due to their pest status. Damaged infrastructure may prevent the application of phytosanitary treatments to remediate risks identified and normal procedures to manage the risk associated with diversion from intended use may be similarly impacted. Re-export may not be an option either, leaving the NPPO to deal with the phytosanitary risk that pests may pose.

[23]NPPOs acknowledge and appreciate the aid from other countries and international organizations. This Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) recommendation is intended to provide clear guidance to aid providers and recipient countries, to enable the effective management of phytosanitary risk, posed by pests, associated with commonly provided food and other aid to prevent the introduction of pests.

[24]ADDRESSED TO

[25]Contracting parties, donor agencies and organizations, food aid agencies and regional plant protection organizations.

[26]RECOMMENDATIONS

[27]The Commission notes that countries receiving food and other humanitarian aid are exposed to pests that, unless managed appropriately, may become established and have a long-term impact on the economy, environment and communities long after the country has recovered from the emergency situation. Commonly provided aid, goods and materials include food, water, building materials, planting materials (seeds), people (volunteers, human resources), vehicles, machinery and equipment.

[28]While natural disasters cannot be foreseen, the Commission *encourages* contracting parties and regional plant protection organizations (as relevant) to:

* 1. [29]*undertake* emergency response planning and preparedness activities to reduce the risk of entry of plant pests with food and other humanitarian aid that may be provided to them in the event of an emergency or disaster
	2. [30]*engage* with aid agencies, exporters, importers and regulators to raise awareness of the phytosanitary risk associated with food and other materials that are provided to assist response and recovery of countries after a natural disaster or other emergency situation, and the need to manage this risk effectively
	3. [31]*use* the general guidance in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 to identify pest risk management measures that could be applied to food and other aid goods and materials to prevent the international movement of pests that may be associated with them and manage the phytosanitary risk associated with diversion from intended use
	4. [32]*partner* with aid and donor agencies to better plan for the safe operation of their programmes, including standardizing supply and distribution operations for multiple countries to increase the efficiency of border clearance processes and potentially reduce regulatory burden
	5. [33]*encourage* the pre-treatment or pre-clearance of food and other aid to expedite clearance
	6. [34]*establish* mechanisms for providing information to potential donors, aid agencies, importers and exporters to reduce the movement, in an emergency situation, of goods posing a phytosanitary risk.

[35]RECOMMENDATION(S) SUPERSEDED BY THE ABOVE

[36]None.

[37]This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the CPM recommendation.

[38]APPENDIX 1: Examples of commodities or materials provided as food or other aid that are not capable of being infested with quarantine pests

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [39]**COMMODITY** | [40]**END USE** | [41]**ASSOCIATED PHYTOSANITARY RISK** | [42]**RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURE OR MEASURES TO ADDRESS RISK** | [43]**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION** |
| [44]Bottled water | [45]Human consumption | [46]Nil – if fit for purpose | [47]Commercially prepared; sealed and pasteurized; clean; new packaging | [48] |
| [49]Medical supplies | [50]Medical use | [51]Nil – if fit for purpose | [52]Sterilized; clean; new packaging | [53] |
| [54]Cement components, except sand and gravel | [55]Construction | [56]Nil – if in clean packaging | [57]Clean packaging | [58] |
| [59]Processed foods | [60]Human consumption | [61]Nil – if subject to processing methods that address phytosanitary risk | [62]Methods in Annex 1 of ISPM 32 | [63]ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) |
| [64]Tents  | [65]Shelter | [66]Nil – if clean and new | [67]Absence of soil and other contaminants on tents including poles and pegs | [68] |
| [69]ADD OTHERS | [70] | [71] | [72] | [73] |
| [74] | [75] | [76] | [77] | [78] |
| [79] | [80] | [81] | [82] | [83] |
| [84] | [85] | [86] | [87] | [88] |

[89]

[90]This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of the CPM recommendation.

[91]APPENDIX 2: Examples of commodities or materials provided as food or other aid that are capable of being infested with quarantine pests

| [92]**COMMODITY** | [93]**END USE** | [94]**ASSOCIATED PHYTOSANITARY RISK** | [95]**RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURE OR MEASURES TO ADDRESS RISK** | [96]**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [97]Fresh fruits and vegetables | [98]Human consumption | [99]Crop production pests | [100]Adopted treatments under ISPM 28 ( *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) | [101]ISPM 28 ( *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) |
| [102]Soil | [103]Landfill | [104] | [105] | [106]CPM Recommendation 3 (*Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure*) |
| [107]Earth-moving machinery | [108] | [109] | [110] | [111]ISPM 41 (*International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment*) |
| [112]Timber, lumber | [113]e.g. Construction | [114]Timber pests | [115]Kiln drying; application of effective fumigation or preservative treatment appropriate to use of the timber | [116]Some preservatives are toxic and should not be used where they impact human health |
| [117]Processed foods | [118]Human consumption | [119]Phytosanitary risk may remain if products can be reinfested (e.g. by storage pests) or processing is insufficient to address all factors contributing to the risk  | [120]Methods in Annex 2 of ISPM 32 | [121]ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) |
| [122]Dried food (e.g. rice, grains) | [123]Human consumption | [124]Stored product pests (e.g. *Trogoderma granarium* Everts (khapra beetle)) | [125]Fumigation; sourced from countries free from the pests | [126] |
| [127]Wood packaging material | [128]e.g. Secure transport of food and aid; animal crates; packaging for vehicles | [129]Timber pests | [130]Approved treatment or ISPM 15 compliant | [131]ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) |
| [132]Seeds  | [133]Planting material | [134]Seed borne pathogen | [135]Treatment with fungicides, although difficult to achieve 100 percent mitigation; complete risk can be ascertained through pest risk assessment | [136]ISPM 38 (*International movement of seeds*) |
| [140]Sourced from pre-approved, accredited sources |
| [142]Plant products that may contain or be contaminated with animal health risk materials | [143]Human consumption | [144]Animal diseases | [145]Sourced from pest free areas; properly vacuum packed and labelled | [146]See World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) restrictions; diseases include several zoonoses (e.g. avian influenza (bird flu), bovine spongiform encephalopathy (mad cow disease)) |
| [147]Used clothing or used clothing material | [148]Human use | [149]Pest carrier (e.g. *Wasmannia auropunctata* (Roger)(little fire ant), beetles) | [150]Clean and fumigate | [151] |
| [152]All expired processed food products of plant and animal origin | [153]Human consumption | [154]Human health risks, storage pests | [155]Products are fit for purpose | [156] |
| [157]Regulated living modified organism products | [158]Human consumption | [159]Subject to the laws of the receiving country | [160] |
| [161]ADD OTHERS | [162] | [163] | [164] | [165] |
| [166] | [167] | [168] | [169] | [170] |

[171]

[172]**This attachment is for reference purposes only and will be removed upon adoption of the CPM recommendation.**

[173]ATTACHMENT 1: Background to draft CPM recommendation on *Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation* (2018-026)

[174]The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) requires contracting parties to manage phytosanitary risk to prevent the international movement of pests.

[175]The Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) submitted a proposal for a concept standard on the safe import of food and other aid in the 2018 Call for topics. The PPPO recognised that the increasing number of extreme weather events occurring around the world, as a consequence of climate change and other natural or man-made disasters, is necessitating the movement of humanitarian aid to affected areas. Countries within the Pacific region are vulnerable to climate change and related extreme weather events, and many have received food and other humanitarian aid in the wake of natural disasters.

[176]They also recognized that they are exposed to pests and other phytosanitary risks associated with the aid that, unless managed appropriately, may become established and have a long-term impact on the economy, environment and communities, long after the country has recovered from the emergency situation.

[177]Several countries noted that their national plant protection organization (NPPO) had come under intense pressure from political leaders and other parts of government to allow the entry of relief aid even where there was a significant risk of introducing non-indigenous plant pests.

[178]The PPPO proposed an International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) that would provide guidance to aid agencies, private donors, exporters, importers and regulators on the management of phytosanitary risk posed by food and other materials provided to assist response and recovery of countries after a natural disaster or other emergency situation. The standard would identify goods that pose little or no phytosanitary risk and which are permitted to be moved freely. It could also provide examples of goods that pose a phytosanitary risk requiring management measures in order to prevent the introduction of regulated pests, as well as risk management options that may reduce the risk to an acceptable level.

[179]The submission presented other benefits, including:

* [180]An ISPM would provide recognition that natural and man-made emergencies and disasters occur in all regions of the world.
* [181]Donor agencies and recipient countries would benefit from clear guidance not only on the types of food aid which can move freely without the need for further phytosanitary intervention, but also on other types of food that pose a phytosanitary risk and require specific intervention to render them safe as food aid.
* [182]The development of guidance that is both practical and effective would help address the issues identified.
* [183]There are a limited number of global aid agencies. Risk management measures that render food and other aid safe to many countries offer opportunities for efficiencies in sourcing materials that are assured of rapid border clearance and subsequent distribution.
* [184]Guidance would help aid providers plan to address the phytosanitary risk associated with aid before it is called on, thereby facilitating the safe movement of urgently needed humanitarian aid into areas impacted by disasters or other emergency situations. This is particularly beneficial where normal regulatory risk management operations in the affected area are compromised or impacted by the situation.
* [185]Aid providers could create efficiencies in their procurement, storage, treatment and shipping processes to integrate safe practices.
* [186]Much of this aid is consolidated and shipped to areas that need it through processes and distribution networks that are outside of the normal commercial trading pathways. Guidance would help promote awareness of phytosanitary risk and the need to meet importing countries’ conditions, which otherwise may not be well known or understood by aid providers.
* [187]Many countries have experience in managing phytosanitary risk during emergencies and could help to formulate practical guidance.

[188]The action to prevent the international movement of pests to countries requiring immediate or long-term humanitarian aid aligns with all the IPPC strategic objectives relevant to food security, environmental protection and facilitation of safe trade. Pests entering with donated goods when normal phytosanitary risk management operations are compromised are more likely to result in pest establishment and spread in the affected area.

[189]The Pacific experience

[190]Several countries noted the difficulties they had faced in managing in-country demands for rapid clearance with little regard for the potential medium- and long-term impacts of pests that become established as a result of inadequate phytosanitary risk management. These impacts might include the need for additional chemicals in crop production to reduce yield and quality losses, additional phytosanitary measures for existing markets and the loss of an industry.

[191]They noted that the impact of pests is not limited to production agriculture. The weed known as giant mimosa (*Mimosa diplotricha*) was introduced into the Vava’u Islands (Tonga) with sand from Tahiti as part of French Aid reconstruction assistance following Cyclone Waqa in 2002.

[192]In one situation, seeds for planting were provided as aid. These seeds came in 100–500 g seed lots as relief starter seed packs. Vegetable seeds may be sourced, however, from countries for which no pest risk analysis has been completed. Since it comes as aid, most countries accept the seeds and distribute them to farmers as relief packs. There is potential for viruses and other seed-borne pathogens associated with these types of seed imports to become established.

[193]In a recent response to a natural disaster, one NPPO requested a food aid item to be frozen to ensure that it was not diverted to planting, knowing that the source area had a disease of quarantine concern. This was done and safe import occurred.

[194]Outside of the Pacific region, the introduction of *Prostephanus truncatus* (Horn) (great grain borer) into Africa via food aid grain shipments is one of the more powerful examples of well-intentioned food aid resulting in a catastrophic and enduring establishment of a stored product pest.

[195]Analysis by the Task Force on Topics

[196]The Task Force on Topics (TFT) analysed the PPPO proposal for a concept standard on the safe import of food and other aid, and concluded that the proposal was not suited to a concept standard but was an increasingly important issue that would benefit from guidance. The TFT recommended that this guidance might appropriately take the form of a Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) recommendation and that it be developed as a high priority for adoption at the CPM-15 Ministerial Conference in 2020. Respective meetings of the Standards Committee (SC) and the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) considered the TFT recommendations on submitted topics.

[197]The SC acknowledged that this is an important but challenging topic. The SC agreed that the TFT recommendation to develop a CPM recommendation for adoption during CPM-15 in 2020 would be a good way to address the issue.

[198]The IC also agreed to the TFT recommendation and noted that not only plants and plant products, but also non-plant products including machinery and vehicles should be included in the scope.

[199]A revised proposal as a draft CPM recommendation was considered by CPM-14 (2019).

[200]CPM-14 considerations

[201]Some contracting parties supported the proposal that the issue be submitted for consultation after minor modification (the modifications including the addition of food aid agencies to the list of addressees; the need to correspond with the contracting party that would receive the aid to ensure that there is a genuine emergency and to distinguish between urgent intervention and the less urgent emergencies, which would allow for better planning and following of protocols; and lastly to include in the text “diversion from intended use”) and that these modifications be considered prior to holding the envisaged consultation.

[202]One contracting party indicated support in line with the normal procedure for adopting CPM recommendations, adding that this was an important topic that could be highlighted during the CPM-15 (202) Ministerial meeting. Some contracting parties indicated that phytosanitary safeguards, when either sending or receiving food aid, were critical. Another indicated that careful consideration be given to measures and treatment options, which should be extended to cover the potential risk to human and animal health.

[203]The Secretariat indicated that it would assist the authors of the proposal before it goes for consultation and requested that comments in this regard be sent to the Secretariat before 30 April 2019.

[204]Recommendations (these were adjusted from the CPM-14 report and are for information only):

[205]CPM-14:

1. [206]*noted* the background to this recommendation
2. [207]*agreed* to the inclusion of this topic “Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (2018-026)” in the CPM work programme
3. [208]*considered* the need for a CPM recommendation to encourage contracting parties to prepare for managing the phytosanitary risk posed by pests associated with the export and import of food and other aid during an emergency situation, in order to reduce the introduction of plant pests in these circumstances
4. [209]*agreed* that the draft recommendation is circulated for country consultation between 1 July and 30 September 2019 using the online comment system, with a view to presenting a final version for adoption at CPM-15 (2020)
5. [210]*noted* that the CPM-15 Ministerial Conference provides a potentially useful forum for raising awareness of the importance of managing pests on food and other aid including non-plant products such as packaging, equipment, machinery and vehicles
6. [211]*requested* that contracting parties provide additional information in their comments that may assist others manage the phytosanitary risk associated with food and other aid, by:
* [212]identifying frequently accessed goods and materials provided as humanitarian aid, from their experience as aid recipients in the last five years and adding these to the lists in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2
* [213]identifying, from their experience, the phytosanitary risk associated with the import of these goods
* [214]adding risk management options to manage these risks, including widely available commercial manufacturing processes that are recognized as effective in addressing phytosanitary risk
* [215]sharing information and experiences on the risk associated with food and other aid, and its management, at the 2019 IPPC regional workshops and through their online comment system response.