

REPORT

**Sigatoka,
Fiji
29 September-
3 October
2003**

Fifteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

RPPO-2003/REPORT

**REPORT OF THE
FIFTEENTH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG
REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS**

Sigatoka, Fiji 29 September-3 October 2003

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2003**

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner. Applications for such permission, with a statement of the purpose and extent of the reproduction, should be addressed to the Director, Information Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100 Rome, Italy.

© FAO 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report of the Fifteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations	1
<i>Appendix I</i> Agenda	11
<i>Appendix II</i> List of participants	12

**Fifteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations
Sigatoka, Fiji
September 29-October 3, 2003**

1. Opening

The meeting was opened by Mr Lloyd (PPPO) who introduced Reverend Semi of the Korotgo Methodist Church for the opening prayer and dedication in the tradition of Pacific island countries. Mr Foliaki (PPPO) welcomed participants to Fiji and expressed his wishes for a productive meeting and invited everyone to take some time to enjoy Fiji and its people. Mr Jones (IPPC Secretariat) welcomed participants on behalf of FAO.

2. Election of Chairperson and rapporteurs

Mr Ivess (PPPO) was elected Chairperson for the 15th Technical Consultation (TC); Mr Foliaki (PPPO) was elected Vice-Chairperson. Mr McDonnell (NAPPO), Mr Suma (PPPO) and Ms Petter (EPPO) agreed to take on the role of rapporteurs.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda (Appendix I) was amended to match the discussion papers prepared and then adopted.

4. Actions arising from the 14th Technical Consultation

The IPPC Secretariat reviewed actions which had taken place regarding recommendations from the 14th TC, and commented that the Interim Commission for Phytosanitary Measures at its fifth session (ICPM 5) welcomed the paper developed by the 14th Technical Consultation outlining the role and functions of the TC. The IPPC Secretariat added that ICPM 5 expressed overwhelming support to continue annual Technical Consultations among RPPOs and for the IPPC Secretariat to participate. It was also agreed by the ICPM that the TC report would be considered earlier in the ICPM agenda in the future.

Regarding the ratification of NEPPO (Near East Plant Protection Organization), the IPPC Secretariat explained that the countries from the Gulf region wanted to act as a block. He informed the TC that a meeting of these countries was planned in October; it would consider the issue of ratification of the agreement and that the situation would be clarified after this meeting.

Recommendations for International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) for areas of low pest prevalence and surveillance for citrus canker have both been taken on in the program of standards by the ICPM.

Each item of the 14th TC action plan was reported on, as follows.

4.1. Funding for the IPPC

The IPPC Secretariat reported that the FAO Committee on Agriculture and FAO Council have been supportive, as has the Program Committee which met in mid September. He reminded participants that the IPPC priorities must be weighed against other FAO priorities. Developing countries for example want additional emphasis on increasing agricultural production.

The FAO Secretariat has proposed a zero real growth budget, which would mean that there will only be increases for inflation. Re-allocations have been made in that budget for \$1 million towards the IPPC Secretariat. The other \$1 million requested in the Business Plan will come from a repayment of arrears that FAO has recently received. However, the FAO Conference in November will determine the final budget level of FAO and several countries have requested a less than zero real growth budget. It is not clear what effect this would have on the IPPC Secretariat budget.

EPPO reported that its Council session in 2002 recommended that NPPOs contact their relevant authorities to support an increase of the budget for the IPPC Secretariat. This recommendation was

reiterated during the Council session in 2003 and a letter was sent by the EPPO Secretariat to EPPO member countries with the recommendation to support, at the next FAO Conference, an increase budget of the IPPC Secretariat. NAPPO reported that the NAPPO Executive Committee fully supported the initiatives and were briefing their FAO representatives accordingly. COSAVE reported that its Directive Committee was also fully supportive of increased funding for the IPPC and had contacted their diplomatic representatives to FAO to support the increase of funding. PPPO reported that regional meetings in the Pacific region have discussed the issue at phytosanitary meetings and WTO roundtable meetings. APPPC discussed the issue recently. It passed a resolution noting financial constraints of the IPPC and asked their members to support increased funding for it. The ICPM Chairperson reported that the recent Near East Technical Consultation on draft standards also made a recommendation to support increased funding for the IPPC.

PPPO stated that the IPPC needs to start thinking differently, placing higher priority on trade facilitation. NAPPO and EPPO replied that they consider trade facilitation important but the primary objective is protection of plant resources. The ICPM Chairperson referred to the Convention on Biological Diversity guiding principles which mention capacity building as a means to avoid introduction of invasive species. He suggested that member countries of the CBD might contribute to the trust fund of the IPPC for capacity building through environment ministries, where appropriate.

The TC noted that there is widespread support for increasing the IPPC funding and encouraged RPPO representatives to communicate the need for ongoing support by their member countries. The TC also expressed concern about the lack of continuity of the IPPC funding.

4.2. Implementation of ISPMs

NAPPO referred to the work underway in the organization to first take an inventory of adherence to NAPPO Regional Phytosanitary Standards by its 3 member countries. He explained the need for implementation plans for all regional standards which will make it transparent as to how long it will take for countries to be in compliance. Once this is completed, NAPPO will be able to conduct a similar review of adherence to ISPMs.

EPPO is considering using explanatory documents to assist its members to implement ISPMs. ISPMs have been translated into Russian and EPPO is also considering translating all future standards into Russian.

COSAVE regional standards are not mandatory but they nevertheless form the technical basis for the regional trade agreement known as Mercosur. Most COSAVE standards are incorporated into Mercosur legislation. The COSAVE countries are concerned about implementation of ISPMs. The legal framework is not the concern; capacity to actually comply is the real issue. Implementing the ISPMs is far off due to the need for capacity building. ISPM 15 is particularly problematic.

APPPC commented that there was so far no program to track implementation of ISPMs in the APPPC region.

PPPO concurred with COSAVE that small economy countries need capacity building and the resources to carry out the standards. In the PPPO there is consideration of centralizing the technical capacity and providing a service to its member countries. The IPPC Secretariat stated that it was impossible to have standardization and harmonization without technical assistance and capacity building to accompany it.

Issues relating to ISPMs

4.3. Lists of ISPM priorities to IPPC

This action item was completed on schedule.

4.4. Wood packaging

The issue related to the use of the mark and the symbol has been resolved.

4.5. Integrated measures for citrus canker

COSAVE informed the TC that an IPPC Working Group supported by COSAVE would be organized in 2003-10-06/10.

4.6. Areas of low pest prevalence

Specifications for a standard have been completed.

4.7. Transit

Specifications were completed for a standard on phytosanitary measures for consignments in transit.

5. **Report of the Focus Group meeting**

The ICPM Chairperson explained the two objectives of the Focus Group:

- Study the possibilities of improving the current standard setting mechanism,
- Propose a fast track mechanism for standard setting.

The TC acknowledged the excellent analysis, innovative suggestions and well-structured report of the Focus Group.

5.1. Recommendations from the TC for improvement of the current standard setting system

The ICPM Chairperson reviewed the Focus Group report for improvement of the current standard setting system in detail.

PPPO wondered whether criteria existed for experts participating to IPPC Working Groups. The ICPM Chairperson explained that a procedure for the selection of experts had been adopted at ICPM 5. PPPO asked also whether the production of explanatory documents had been considered by the Focus Group in its analysis. The ICPM Chairperson commented that it had not been considered and that it was not covered in the terms of reference of the group. PPPO suggested that this should constitute a step of the process.

COSAVE commented that the Rules of Procedures do not provide for any guidance for the replacement of members that cannot or do not attend the Standards Committee. The IPPC Secretariat suggested that such issues should be raised at the level of the ICPM. The ICPM Chairperson stated that this problem had been raised in other fora and agreed that this could be raised at the next ICPM meeting. Regarding the issue of communication of draft ISPMs for country consultation to IPPC contact points, COSAVE indicated that changes in address, email contact etc, indicated to the IPPC Secretariat should be taken into account as soon as possible.

The TC examined the recommendations proposed by the Focus Group and made the following comments. The TC agreed to most of the recommendations of the report of the Focus Group and made suggestions for the improvement in the following areas:

Recommendation 3.2 regarding the use of Technical Panels

The TC recommended that the differences between technical panels and expert working group should be more clearly stated.

Recommendation 3.3 procedures for comments on standards at ICPM

The Technical Consultation commented that parties should concentrate on comments involving substantive changes and recommended that this should be clearly stated in a new bullet point.

Most RPPOs welcomed the recommendation that editorial comments could be incorporated by the Secretariat. COSAVE wanted to have all the comments on the IPP, including editorial ones and had concerns with leaving 'editorial' revisions with the IPPC Secretariat.

Recommendation 3.4 regional technical assistance/consultation

The TC considered that regional technical consultations on draft ISPMs should be renamed capacity building workshop on draft ISPMs. The TC recommended that as many as possible FAO regions with developing country members be provided the opportunity to have a capacity building workshop on draft ISPMs.

The TC also indicated that RPPOs could further assist in the organization of such capacity building workshops. The next TC could elaborate a program to determine how this can be done. It was also added that the results of these workshop should be evaluated, in particular whether it had encouraged countries to present comments to the IPPC Secretariat on the draft ISPMs.

Note 3.7 Transparency to and from SC

The TC discussed this note and opinions diverged among participants. COSAVE could not accept the conclusion of the Focus Group. It considered that it is important for countries to understand why its comments have not be taken into account and one of its member countries had presented a specific proposal at ICPM5 on that issue. It was noted that rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure of the SC specifies that detailed responses would be provided by the IPPC Secretariat, upon request. However, most RPPOs recognized that it would be impossible for all comments, agreed decisions and rationale to be documented by the SC and placed on the IPP.

Recommendation 3.11 Length of formal consultation period

Several RPPOs expressed concerns about shortening the consultation period (time necessary to get the documents, necessity to ensure proper national internal consultation process etc.). The ICPM Chairperson explained that, although ICPM-5 rejected this proposal previously, the Focus Group felt it necessary to re-visit this question. If the procedure is not modified, standards will take longer to develop as the SC will not be able to cope with the workload due to late arrival of comments. The TC finally concluded that priority would have to be set between a longer consultation period and fewer standards developed.

Recommendation 3.12 Guidelines for Standards Committee members

COSAVE commented that guidelines would be established for working groups, stewards and SC members. COSAVE was of the opinion that these documents should be presented to the ICPM for endorsement. The TC noted that rules related to Working groups exist in the basic texts of FAO.

The TC welcomed the development of these guidelines.

5.2. Recommendations on a fast-track standards adoption procedure and criteria for its use

The ICPM Chairperson presented the recommendations of the Focus Group in detail.

The following points were noted:

- All objections should be justified
- A formal objection is an objection presented by an NPPO
- If objections cannot be resolved by consultation between the country and the IPPC Secretariat or the SC, the ICPM will have to consider the standard for adoption. There should not be any discussion at the ICPM: adoption or rejection would be the sole options
- External expertise can be called upon for certain specific standards where appropriate (e.g. when developing a diagnostic protocol for a given virus)
- This new procedure should be evaluated after a certain period to decide whether to maintain it or not

The TC examined the recommendations

Recommendation 4.1 Criteria for a fast track procedure

Regarding the second paragraph of the recommendation, **the TC commented that some existing RPPO standards are complex or may be controversial and would not be appropriate for a fast-track procedure.**

Point 4.2 Elements of the fast track procedure

The TC considered numbers 1-10 of item 4.2 to be important points that should be considered as recommendations so they are not lost as just a narrative part of the report. It should be made clear that the 10 steps, the flow chart and table 1 are all considered as part of the recommendations.

The TC also highlighted the need for clarification of ‘formal objections’ versus comments, as well as the need to describe what is necessary to stop the adoption of the standard.

Step 7 needed to indicate clearly that this was an adoption process. The TC proposed to add that the standard would be considered to be adopted and published in the normal manner.

Recommendation 4.2.1

The TC had difficulties to understand how the recommendation relates to the previous text, and **suggested that the SPTA re-consider 4.2.1 recommendation with a view to incorporating all issues under 4.2.1.**

Recommendation 4.2.5

The TC supported the recommendation but noted that consistency between table 1 and the 10 steps of the procedure described in 4.2. should be checked

Recommendation 5

Regarding the financial implication, the TC took note that a document was being prepared by the IPPC Secretariat for the SPTA working group **and supported the need of such an analysis.**

6. Issues for the RPPO meeting (IPPC Secretariat)

6.1. Guidelines for the composition and organization of expert working groups from ICPM

The IPPC Secretariat reviewed the background paper provided by the IPPC Secretariat, highlighting the shortcomings of the current process.

The TC considered that it was premature to change the procedure recently adopted by the ICPM and acknowledged that it had resulted in greater transparency.

6.2. Update on the status of ISPM 15 - Guidelines

The IPPC Secretariat reviewed the background paper which it provided on ISPM No. 15.

COSAVE commented that the countries chosen for the registration of the logo had been selected on the basis of their membership in the Madrid Protocol. COSAVE felt that countries adhering to the NRT of the IPPC should also have been given priority. COSAVE also added that every country would need a letter from FAO informing them that they can use the certification mark and recommended that FAO sends a formal statement to all FAO members allowing the use of the mark. It still may be necessary for countries to register the mark. The IPPC Secretariat indicated that there were some major trading countries that had not adhered to the NRT. Further individual country registration would have important financial implications for the Secretariat.

The IPPC Secretariat requested the participants to comment on possible difficulties encountered in their region with the adoption of this standard. EPPO commented that programmes were being put in place in the EPPO region to treat wood in accordance with ISPM 15, and added that a difficulty might arise with used pallets not marked which are already moving around the world. Reporting of non-compliance back to the exporting country was very important in order to take corrective measures. APPPC indicated that Australia was also implementing the standard and that \$4 million dollars

funding had been provided to help exporters adapt to the standard. COSAVE mentioned that COSAVE countries have a real problem with the implementation of ISPM No. 15, e.g. for export certification sufficient heat treatment facilities are lacking.

The TC recommended that the IPPC Secretariat organize a side meeting during the next ICPM to discuss problems with implementation of ISPM 15

6.3. Status of action on methyl bromide

The IPPC Secretariat read the report of ICPM-5 on this topic. PPPO regretted that methyl bromide had not been given a higher priority at ICPM-5 and stressed the importance of methyl bromide for small island economies and the importance of the IPPC-Montreal Protocol contacts. **The TC stressed the importance of ongoing contacts between the IPPC Secretariat and the Montreal Protocol. The TC also noted the positive statements regarding quarantine uses in the report of the 23rd meeting of the Technical and Economic Assessment Panel of the Montreal Protocol.**

7. Discussion papers

7.1. EPPO Regional Consultation Process for draft ISPMs

EPPO reviewed a discussion paper previously sent to participants. From 1994 on, as an increasing number of ISPMs began developing, the EPPO Panel on Phytosanitary Measures became overloaded with work. As a result, EPPO created a Committee of Experts on Phytosanitary Measures Panel, which was subsequently re-named "Panel on ICPM Affairs" in 1997. Seventeen countries and the EC are represented in this Panel. The Panel on ICPM Affairs meets twice a year. Its objective is to review all topics on the ICPM agenda. One of the main duties is to draft comments for use of EPPO countries in developing their responses on draft ISPMs and other ICPM-related matters. The Panel also selects and prepares European experts for the IPPC Working Groups. EPPO has also implemented a system of European stewards to coordinate the review of draft ISPMs. The steward, normally a member of the Panel on ICPM Affairs, summarizes country comments, checks on clarity of language and prepares recommendations for the Panel on ICPM Affairs.

COSAVE asked how many other RPPOs are coordinating responses on draft ISPMs. COSAVE has ad-hoc groups but it was concerned about possible overlapping between an RPPO coordination mechanism and the regional technical consultations on draft ISPMs.

NAPPO does not coordinate harmonized responses but there is an agreement that the countries will share their comments in advance of sending them to the IPPC. The IPPC Secretariat confirmed that countries still need to communicate formally their comments on draft ISPMs; the comments expressed at regional technical consultations on draft ISPMs are not considered to be an official response of a country.

PPPO queried whether it could comment on behalf of its member countries. The IPPC Secretariat suggested that letters from the countries agreeing to this arrangement would be necessary.

In conclusion, the TC noted the EPPO system of regional stewards for draft ISPMs and agreed that other RPPOs might wish to consider a similar system, as appropriate.

7.2. COSAVE standard for setting up regional pest lists and Risk Analysis Database

COSAVE referred to a Directive Committee decision made four years ago, not to manage the COSAVE pest lists because its member countries were conducting a review of their national lists. Recently COSAVE decided to set up regional regulated pest lists. A database concerning regulated pests has been established and each COSAVE NPPO will enter its own pest lists in the database. In a first stage, pests that are absent from the COSAVE region will be inserted in the database and a list of pests absent in the five COSAVE countries will be generated. In following stages, it is planned to insert pests present in the COSAVE countries and subject to official control as well as regulated non-quarantine pests. For each new pest included in the database, PRA data should also be included. It

consists of a brief report of a pest risk assessment along with emergency measures. The database also includes a mechanism for automatic notification of the other COSAVE countries, which can send within 30 days, any comments to the member which has proposed the inclusion of the pest. The system will be tested in November 2003.

Other RPPOs will be provided a password for access to the database, based on reciprocity. The IPPC Secretariat suggested that a link be made with the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP). The Chairperson questioned whether COSAVE had considered the opposite approach; i.e. preparing a list of non-regulated pests. COSAVE replied they had not. The ICPM Chairperson reminded participants that the IPPC calls for lists of regulated pests.

7.3. Evolution of the concept of EPPO Pest Lists

EPPO explained that the EPPO A1 and A2 lists of quarantine pests include the pests which EPPO recommends should be listed in the national phytosanitary regulations of EPPO member countries. Since the revision of the International Plant Protection Convention, pests mentioned on EPPO lists cannot be considered as quarantine pests as such, because they are not regulated. They only become regulated when they are included in a country pest lists. This issue is being discussed in EPPO and it was recognized that EPPO lists should rather be lists of pests recommended for regulation and would have a temporary character. The Working Party also considered that the procedure for addition to the list could be revised to allow for more flexibility as well as more reactivity. EPPO should also maintain in parallel lists of pests which are regulated in EPPO countries. EPPO members supported that EPPO should continue with an alert system (with one main concern being to identify new pests to be recommended for regulation) and that the distinction between pests present and absent from the region in the EPPO lists of pest recommended for regulation should be maintained.

NAPPO questioned how a country could justify regulating a pest present on its territory if no measures are taken against it. EPPO commented that the Organization recommends that all A1 pests should be listed in the national legislation of its member countries whereas, for A2 pests, it is recommended that member countries may list the pests. For A2 pests, the member country will have to judge whether regulation would be justified.

The IPPC Secretariat inquired how the EPPO pest lists were produced. EPPO explained that the addition of pests to the lists is subject to approval by Council. Listing is based on pest risk analysis and on appropriate documentation. The Panel on Phytosanitary Measures has so far had the task of studying pests and proposing additions to the A1 and A2 lists. The IPPC Secretariat also wondered why the recommendations for regulation would have a temporary character. EPPO commented that in the last years organisms were added to the EPPO lists but the pests concerned were mostly not included in the regulations of the member countries. As a consequence, it was proposed that the lists should have a temporary character.

7.4. NAPPO Pest Reporting System

NAPPO reviewed the discussion paper on the topic and referred to the IPPC obligation to report on the occurrence, outbreak and spread of pests with the purpose of communicating immediate or potential danger. These obligations are elaborated on in ISPM No. 17 (*Pest reporting*). NAPPO noted that ISPM No. 17 refers to pest reporting to neighboring countries and trading partners. With this in mind, each NAPPO country will identify the list of contact points that it will notify of official pest reports, on a case-by-case basis. Each NAPPO country will have secure access to a portion of the NAPPO website to record information on pest reports. This link will be provided to neighboring countries and trading partners to provide further information on the pest status. NAPPO countries will adopt their own internal procedure for making the official notifications.

There was a subsequent discussion on the sensitivity of pest reports and the reactions of some countries. The Chairperson stated that some countries are quick to put restrictions in place; however, they are much slower to remove them after the pest has been eradicated. COSAVE expressed concerns over 'official' notification and wondered whether this would represent a screening of pest reports from

other sources, for example universities. COSAVE felt it was important to know the country's internal process for evaluating pest reports. The IPPC Secretariat suggested that a link of the NAPPO site to the IPP would be beneficial.

The TC agreed with the importance of encouraging pest reporting by NPPOs or in some cases by an RPPO, where authority has been delegated by a member country of that RPPO

7.5. EPPO Phytosanitary Alert List – principles for its operation

EPPO explained that the purpose of the EPPO Alert list is to draw the attention of EPPO member countries to certain pests and achieve early warning. These pests are selected by EPPO members and the EPPO Secretariat, mainly from the literature and from various websites. Some of the pests may later be selected by relevant EPPO Panels and submitted to a PRA. As a result, they may be added to the EPPO pest lists of recommended regulated pests. The Alert list is available on the EPPO website. The Alert list is reviewed critically and consolidated every year by the Panel on Phytosanitary Measures. Entries are not kept for more than 3 years if no new information is found and if no EPPO member country has indicated an interest for a pest risk analysis.

PPPO asked why pests were deleted after three years. EPPO explained that the purpose of the Alert list was early warning and that if no interest or new information had been found on the pest, the alert had been given. PPPO also mentioned the targeted pest lists established in the Pacific to help in conducting surveillance and wondered if the EPPO Alert list had the same objective. EPPO answered that the objectives of the alert list was broader than surveillance. PPPO added that there would be a need to have a definition of pest alert. The ICPM Chairperson commented that definitions should not be elaborated for terms which are not used in the standards.

7.6. Capacity building identification to implement ISPMs

COSAVE referred to Article 9 of the SPS Agreement detailing specific support for developing countries with the aim of adopting and applying phytosanitary measures necessary to achieve the appropriate level of protection in their export markets. COSAVE regretted that this has not been implemented. Developing countries continue to suffer from a lack of resources to implement IPPC Standards. COSAVE also indicated that the differences between developed and developing countries is widening and felt that the ICPM must take some action. It estimated that only 50% of ISPMs were being fully implemented in South America. It suggested that this should be a permanent discussion point on the agenda of the ICPM and requested that a recommendation go forward from this TC.

APPPC responded that the IPPC was not structured to do capacity building; it focused on setting standards. If a sufficient number of countries want to change the approach towards providing aid, then it would have to go through the ICPM. **The IPPC Secretariat suggested that international aid budgets of developing countries should look at the possibility of directing funds toward capacity building.** The ICPM Chairperson added that the issue regarding the role of RPPOs is on the agenda of the Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance Working Group.

The issue of use of simple language in ISPMs was raised and the ICPM Chairperson informed the TC that the terms of reference of the Standards Committee had been revised at ICPM-5 and that the use of simple language has been added to them. The TC welcomed this reaction from the ICPM. APPPC commented that ISPMs resulted from complex negotiations and that it was not always possible to have a simple standard. The ICPM Chairperson felt that explanatory texts for standards would be beneficial. His experience in regional technical consultations on draft ISPMs is that the understanding of standards is a major obstacle to implementing them. COSAVE regretted that valuable documents prepared in the standard setting process are lost and felt that background documents used in the development of standards could be used in developing explanatory texts.

The TC agreed that it is important for countries to identify their own problems in implementing ISPMs related to the standards themselves, so that these can be improved/corrected. It was further agreed that the consideration of problems associated with the implementation of ISPMs should be a regular agenda item of the TC. Results would be compared, collated and conveyed to the ICPM.

7.7. Activities of PPPO

PPPO presented the organization and main activities of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community Plant Protection Service/PPPO Programme.

7.8. NAPPO dispute settlement

NAPPO presented the draft NAPPO dispute settlement procedure. This was developed in response to the request of industry groups in North America, as a means to resolve bilateral disagreements. The main reason for developing a regional dispute settlement mechanism was to try to resolve problems within the region and avoid a high profile of an international/trade forum. The objective is to obtain rapid science-based resolution. It was not anticipated to use the process for dispute outside of NAPPO countries. NAPPO may seek assistance from other RPPOs to identify independent experts. COSAVE also indicated that they have a dispute settlement mechanism and agreed to provide other RPPOs with a copy of relevant documents. COSAVE experience has shown that the results of dispute settlements are sometimes difficult to enforce.

7.9. Risk mitigation associated with the importation of propagative plant material into NAPPO member countries

NAPPO summarized a concept paper which had been developed this year by a new NAPPO panel. The panel had documented the pest problems which had been introduced to North America via propagative material. These introductions continue despite the application of additional phytosanitary measures. The traditional tools of visual inspection and post-entry quarantine have not been effective. In some cases the requirements are stricter for fresh fruits and vegetables than they are for propagative material. The concept paper suggests moving to a systems approach with emphasis on offshore certification programs.

The Chairperson agreed that New Zealand also had paid a lot of attention to fruits and vegetables but that the focus was shifting. The ICPM Chairperson questioned whether there would be a prohibition pending the results of PRA. NAPPO responded that national legislation would need to be amended in accordance to each countries rule-making system and following WTO-SPS notification requirements.

7.10. EPPO -Regional cooperation on PRA

EPPO presented a document on the cooperation on PRA in the EPPO region. EPPO has been involved in the development of regional standards for PRA and these standards are being revised to match more closely ISPM No. 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*). EPPO was also developing a collection of PRAs performed by EPPO members countries, the EPPO Secretariat or EPPO Panels. EPPO also informed the TC that the future role of EPPO in performing PRA was being discussed in the Organization. NAPPO explained that the Organization anticipates devoting a portion of its Pest Alert website to PRA. This would be available for contributions by other countries and access would be limited to contributing countries. The ICPM Chairperson suggested that since EPPO, NAPPO and COSAVE have similar PRA initiatives, this could be a subject for cooperation and an ongoing agenda item for the TC.

8. **Next years agenda and venue of next meeting**

The TC identified the following agenda items for the next TC, linked to the roles identified for RPPOs in appendix XVII of the report of ICPM-5.

- PRAs information sharing and RPPO activities on PRA
- Identification of regional standards as possible candidates for the fast-track procedure.

- Problems associated with implementation of ISPMs (canvassing of member countries in advance of the meeting; results would be compared, collated and conveyed to the ICPM)
- Regional dispute settlement processes/experiences
- Information systems - links to IPP - databases
- Electronic certification
- Activities of RPPOs on invasive alien species
- New/developing regional standards and other important activities by each RPPO
- TC as a source of documents in a fast-track procedure for ISPMs, e.g. diagnostic protocols
- Development of a work programme for the preparation of explanatory documents for approved ISPMs
- Involvement in the regional technical consultations on draft ISPMs

It was noted that IAPSC offered to host the 16th TC. The Secretariat was asked to confirm their interest to host the meeting in late August/early September of 2004. The IPPC Secretariat will confirm the dates with participants by the 20th of October 2003.

The meeting should allow 3 days for discussions and adoption of the report, 1-day workshop, 1 day for a field trip. Working documents and discussion papers are due to IPPC by July 1, 2004. The host RPPO is expected to provide a chairperson and a rapporteur to assist the IPPC Secretariat to prepare the report. The IPPC Secretariat will coordinate with RPPO to ensure full participation (including an ad hoc meeting of RPPOs at ICPM-6).

COSAVE offered to host a future TC which could be held in Brazil. COSAVE proposed a visit to Sao Paulo State to observe the citrus canker eradication program.

9. Close

Mr Ivess, on behalf of all participants thanked the RPPO and the SPC for organizing and hosting the meeting, a field day, a symposium and the social events, and for the wonderful hospitality extended to participants. The Chairperson thanked the rapporteurs for their work.

APPENDIX I**AGENDA**

- 1. Opening**
- 2. Election of Chairperson, Vice Chair and Rapporteurs**
- 3. Adoption of the Agenda**
- 4. Actions Arising from the 14th Consultation**
- 5. Discussion Papers**
 - EPPO Regional Consultations Process on Draft ISPMs (EPPO)
 - Standard for Setting up Regional Pest Lists and COSAVE Risk Analysis Database. (COSAVE)
 - Regional Cooperation in PRA (EPPO)
 - Pest Reporting by NAPPO Countries (NAPPO)
 - EPPO Phytosanitary Alert List: Principles for the Operation (EPPO)
 - Report of the Focus Group Meeting on the Standard Setting Process (IPPC Secretariat)
 - Evolution of the Concept of EPPO Pest Lists (EPPO)
 - Capacity Building Identification to Implement ISPMs (COSAVE)
 - NAPPO Dispute Settlement Procedure (NAPPO)
 - Issues for the RPPO Technical Consultation (IPPC Secretariat)
 - Risk mitigation associated with the importation of propagative plant material into NAPPO countries (NAPPO)
- 6. Coordinated activities**
- 7. Other business**
- 8. Venue and date of 16th TC**

APPENDIX II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

COMITE DE SANIDAD VEGETAL DEL CONO SUR (COSAVE)

Ing. Agr. M. Sc. Ana Maria PERALTA
 Technical Secretary
 Comite de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE)
 Millán 4703 CP 12900
 Montevideo
 URUGUAY
 Tel. (598 2) 309 2219 / 308 3094
 Fax. (598 2) 309 2074
 Email: lbbimgap@adinet.com.uy
cosave@mgap.gub.uy

EUROPEAN & MEDITERRANEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANISATION (EPPO)

Mme Françoise PETTER
 European and Mediterranean Plant Protection
 Organization (EPPO)
 1 rue Le Nôtre
 75016 Paris
 FRANCE
 Tel. (33 1) 45207794
 Fax. (33 1) 42248943
 Email: hq@epo.fr

INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES (ICPM)

Mr Ralf LOPIAN
 ICPM Chairman,
 Senior Advisor, International Affairs
 Food and Health Department
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 P O Box 30 (Mariankatu 23)
 FIN-00023 Government
 Helsinki
 FINLAND
 Tel. (358) 9 1605 2449
 Fax. (358) 9 1605 2443
 Email: ralf.lopian@mmm.fi

NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANISATION (NAPPO)

Mr Ian R McDONELL
 Executive Director
 North American Plant Protection Organisation
 (NAPPO)
 Observatory Crescent, Bldg 3
 Ottawa, Ontario
 CANADA KIAOC6
 Tel. (613) 759 6132
 Fax. (613) 759 6141
 Email: imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca
www.nappo.org

PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANISATION (PPPO)

Mr David LETHAM
 Plant Biosecurity
 Market Access and Biosecurity
 Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
 Canberra
 AUSTRALIA
 Tel. (61 2) 6272 5205
 Fax. (61 2) 6272 3307
 Email: David.Letham@affa.gov.au

Mr Robert DUTHIE
 Plant Biosecurity
 Market Access and Biosecurity
 Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
 Canberra
 AUSTRALIA
 Tel. (61 2) 6272 5564
 Fax. (61 2) 6272 3307
 Email: robert.j.duthie@affa.gov.au

Mr Ishmael LEBEHN
 Deputy Assistant Secretary, Agriculture Unit
 P O Box PS12
 Palikir
 Pohnpei FM 96941
 FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA
 Tel. (691) 320 2646 / 320 5133
 Fax. (691) 320 5854
 Email: fsmagri@mail.fm
dea@mail.fm

Mr Hiagi FORAETE
 Acting Director (Quarantine)
 Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection Division
 Ministry of Agriculture, Sugar and Land
 Resettlement
 P O Box 18360
 Suva
 FIJI ISLANDS
 Tel. (679) 331 2512
 Fax. (679) 330 5043

Mr Phillip C. SANTOS
 Plant Protection and Quarantine Officer I
 Department of Agriculture
 192 Dairy Road
 Mangilao
 GUAM 96913
 Tel. (1 671) 472 5812
 Fax. (1 671) 477 9487
 Email: phillip_santos@hotmail.com

Dr John HEDLEY
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 101-103 The Terrace
 P O Box 2526
 Wellington
 NEW ZEALAND
 Tel. (64 4) 474 4170
 Fax. (64 4) 470 2730
 Email: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz

Mr Kirifi POUONO
 Acting Chief Executive Officer – Quarantine
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forest, Fisheries and
 Meteorology
 P O Box 1874
 Apia
 SAMOA
 Tel. (685) 20 103
 Fax. (685) 20 103
 Email: kpouono@lesamoa.net
 (Apologies)

Mr Sione FOLIAKI
 Chairman PPPO,
 Head, Quarantine & Quality Management Division
 Deputy Director of Agriculture, Forestry & Food
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food
 P O Box 14
 Nuku'alofa
 TONGA
 Tel. (676) 24 257
 Fax. (676) 24 922
 Email: maf-qgmd@kalianet.to
sionefoliaki@msn.com

Dr Mick LLOYD
 Secretariat PPPO
 Head SPC Plant Protection Service
 Secretariat of the Pacific Community
 Private Mail Bag
 Suva
 FIJI ISLANDS
 Tel. (679) 3370733
 Fax. (679) 3386326
 Email: mickl@spc.int

Dr Richard IVESS
 Director, Plants Biosecurity
 Biosecurity Authority
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 P O Box 2526
 Wellington
 NEW ZEALAND
 Tel: (64 4) 474 4127
 Fax: (64 4) 498 9888
 Email: ivessr@maf.govt.nz

Mr Elijah Cassie PHILEMON
 Acting Managing Director
 National Agriculture & Quarantine Inspection
 Authority (NAQIA)
 P O Box 741
 Port Moresby
 PAPUA NEW GUINEA
 Tel. (675) 311 2100 / 325 9977
 Fax. (675) 325 1673 / 325 1674
 Email: naqia@dg.com.pg

Mr Cameron ETA
 Director, Quarantine/Biosecurity
 Department of Agriculture and Livestock
 P O Box G13
 Honiara
 SOLOMON ISLANDS
 Tel. (677) 28 926 / 27 987 (HQ)
 Fax. (677) 28 759
 Email: etac@agriculture.gov.sb

Mr Atoloto MALAU
 Head of Plant Protection and Quarantine
 Services Territoriaux de l'Economie Rurale et de la
 Pêche
 BP 19 Mata-utu
 98600 UVEA
 WALLIS & FUTUNA
 Tel. (681) 72 04 00
 Fax. (681) 72 04 04
 Email: devagri@wallis.co.nc

Mr Sidney SUMA
 Biosecurity Officer
 Plant Protection Service
 Secretariat of the Pacific Community
 Private Mail Bag
 Suva
 FIJI ISLANDS
 Tel. (679) 3370733
 Fax. (679) 3386326
 Email: sidneys@spc.int

Mr Konrad ENGLBERGER
Coordinator Plant Protection Micronesia
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
P O Box 2299, Kolonia
Pohnpei 96941
FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA
Tel. (691) 320 7523
Fax. (691) 320 4647
Email: ppmicronesia@mail.fm

Mr Dennis HANNAPEL
US Embassy – Moonah place
Yarralumla, ACT 2600
Canberra
AUSTRALIA
Tel. (61 2) 6214 5820
Fax. (61 2) 6273 3334
Email: aphis@ozemail.com.au

**INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION SECRETARIAT
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANISATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)**

Mr Niek Van der GRAAFF
Chief, Plant Protection Service
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
Nations (FAO)
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
ITALY
Tel. (39) 06 570 53 441
Fax. (39) 06 570 56 347
Email: Niek.VanDerGraaff@fao.org

Mr Jeff JONES
Plant Quarantine Officer
IPPC Secretariat
Plant Production and Protection Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United
Nations (FAO)
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
ITALY
Tel. (39) 06 5705 2040
Fax. (39) 06 5705 6347
Email: jeffrey.jones@fao.org