

REPORT

Rome,
Italy
11-14
September
2006

Eighteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

TC RPPO-2006/REPORT

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

Rome, Italy 11-14 September 2006

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
2006**

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 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report of the Eighteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant protection Organizations

List of Appendices

I	Agenda
II	Work programme of the Technical Consultation for 2006-2007
III	Recommendations of the 18 th Technical Consultation to CPM-2
IV	IPPC Article V.2(a) Interpretation of the term “Public Officer”
V	EPPO Goals
VI	EPPO Standards Standard Setting programme
VII	Participants list

Note: The papers and power point presentations presented at the 18th Technical Consultation among RPPOs are available at www.ippc.int

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

ROME, ITALY

11-14 SEPTEMBER, 2006

Agenda item 1: Opening of the Eighteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

1 The delegates representing Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) were welcomed to FAO Headquarters by Mr Niek van der Graaff, Secretary, International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM). In welcoming the delegates, Mr van der Graaff explained that Rome had been a deliberate choice for the Technical Consultation (TC) in order to give the delegates the opportunity to liaise with the members of the IPPC Secretariat and be brought up to date with happenings at the FAO Headquarters. He noted that the Leader of the IPPC Evaluation team was also present in Rome and that the RPPOs would have the opportunity to meet and discuss issues.

2 Mr van der Graaff informed the Session that there were now 157 contracting parties to the IPPC and that it would just be a matter of time before the membership included all FAO Members. He noted that the increasing membership had associated problems in that all new (and future) members were from developing countries and as such there was an increasing pressure on the already limited IPPC budget. He looked to an increasing involvement by the RPPOs with the organisation and implementation of various CPM activities and cited the organizing and running of the annual workshop on draft international standards on phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) as a good example (with the Secretariat acting in an advisory capacity if required). Maintenance of national plant protection organisation (NPPO) official contact points was also cited as an area where RPPO assistance would greatly assist the communication flow between the Secretariat and CPM Members.

3 Mr van der Graaff commented that as he was retiring in November 2006, the Eighteenth Consultation would be the last that he would attend. He wished everyone well and reiterated his invitation to the delegates that as they were in Rome, the Secretariat would be at their disposal and to make the best use of them.

4 The Chair of the CPM, Mr Chagemu Kedera, also welcomed the delegates and reminded them of the role that the RPPOs could play in raising the profile of the IPPC, which he felt was necessary in order to attract the increased funding required to implement the CPM work programme.

Agenda Item 2: Election of Chairperson and Rapporteur

5 Mr Ralf Lopian (Vice-chair, CPM) was elected Chairperson and Mr Sidney Suma (Secretariat of the Pacific Community – Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (SPC-PPPO)) elected Vice-chair. Mr Richard Ives (FAO IPPC Secretariat) was elected Rapporteur.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of the agenda

6. An additional item, 4.4 iii) Participation by RPPOs at the TC, was added to the agenda during the meeting. It was also decided during the meeting to finish the business by midday Wednesday and devote the afternoon to discussions with the IPPC Evaluation Team.

Agenda Item 4: Actions arising from the Seventeenth Technical Consultation (TC-17)

i) Elaboration of the explanatory document prepared by EPPO on ISPM No.5 – Supplement No. 1: *Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests*

7 The European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO) requested that the particular item be postponed to a future meeting as they had just been through a major reorganization and were not able to prepare the document.

Action: The TC agreed to postpone the *Elaboration of the explanatory document prepared by EPPO on ISPM No.5 – Supplement No. 1* to the 2007 TC-RPPOs

ii) Identification of possible issues regarding ISPMs No. 12 and No. 7 (IPPC Secretariat update and RPPOs)

8 Issues surrounding the two standards had been discussed at TC-17. The Secretariat noted that the revision of the standards had been added to the work programme at CPM-1 (2006). A draft specification had been developed and sent for country consultation in May 2006. The Steward was currently revising the specification, after which it would be submitted for approval to the Standards Committee (SC). In general, the specification indicated that the expert working group (EWG) should review both International Standards on Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs), provide more guidance on re-export and transit, and decide how best to present the information.

iii) Participation by all RPPOs at the Technical Consultation

9 Concern had been expressed at TC-17 at the lack of representation from the Asian and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) and the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC). The Chair welcomed the presence of the two afore mentioned RPPOs, but expressed his regret in that there was no representation from the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) (currently undergoing staff changes), the Andean Community (CA) and the Organismo Internacional Regional De Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA). The TC applauded the efforts made by the PPPO members from Papua New Guinea and New Zealand and the APPPC member from the Republic of Korea to travel the distances to attend the meeting in Rome.

10 The representative from the Southern Cone Plant Health Committee (COSAVE) felt that it should be a permanent task of the Secretariat to encourage RPPO attendance at the Technical Consultations. RPPOs had a recognized role in the CPM structure and attendance at the TC was an important means of ensuring that any IPPC activities involving RPPOs could be coordinated. The chair suggested that the role of the RPPOs (as described at ICPM-2) be revised at the next TC (TC-19). The representative from the North American Plant Protection Organisation (NAPPO) reminded the TC of the document on the recognition of

RPPOs and suggested that the next TC may also wish to discuss the criteria required in order that an RPPO could continue to be recognized under the IPPC.

Recommendation: The role and criteria for the ongoing recognition of an RPPO be reviewed at TC-19

iv) Legal interpretation of Article V. 2a of the IPPC

11 Concern had been expressed at TC-17 over the interpretation of IPPC Article V.2 (a) pertaining to Phytosanitary Certification. A representative from the FAO Legal Office (LEGA) was invited to attend the TC in order to give a legal opinion as, while the meeting agreed that the requirements relating to activities leading up to the issuance of the certificate were very clear, some delegates required clarification as to who could actually sign the certificate.

12 LEGA explained that the person who could sign the export compliance certificate would be any person who had been given the legal authority to sign on behalf of the pertinent governmental authority (generally, the NPPO) and, in theory, could be anyone from the Minister down (assuming delegated authority). LEGA reminded the meeting that the IPPC was an agreement between Governments and that therefore, the legal responsibility was with such Governments which are parties to it. A “Public Officer”, in the sense of Article V.2(a) would be a person paid by the Government, who had the mandate to act on behalf of the Government and who would be responsible legally, technically and administratively for the issuance of the certificate.

13 With regard to federal governments, LEGA stated that the Central Government, i.e. the signatory to the IPPC, could delegate the authority to issue certificates to the state/provincial governments/authorities depending on the constitutional and/or administrative structure of the country, but the central government would in any case remain legal bound by the certificate (the stamp(s) of it being those of a public authority).

14 The meeting discussed the need to define a “Public Officer”, bearing in mind that the IPPC requires that any « official » action be undertaken by such a “Public Officer”, and that such “Public Officer” shall detain minimum skills and qualifications required to enable the issuance of phytosanitary certificates in accordance with the pertinent provisions of the IPPC. In this respect, the TC noted that there could be various interpretations of the words “Public Officer” which could vary from country to country.

15 The possibility of an ISPM covering the area was discussed. NAPPO and COSAVE agreed to collaborate with the development of a document on the qualifications required to enable a person to be authorized as a signing official.

16 The TC also noted in Article V 2 a) the redundant use of the word “official” before the term “national plant protection organisation”.

Outcomes:

- 1 FAO Legal Office to prepare a note on the interpretation of Article V. 2(a) particularly in relation to defining what a “public officer” is. It should be attached as an appendix to the report.**

- 2 **NAPPO and COSAVE to prepare a document for TC-19 (taking into account their regional guidelines) outlining the minimum requirements for a person to have signing authority for phytosanitary certificates, for possible consideration as a topic for an ISPM.**
- 3 **Other RPPOs to discuss the situation with their members and supply comments to NAPPO, copied to the IPPC Secretariat.**

Agenda Item 5: Review of RPPO activities

(i) Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)

17 The Executive Secretary of the APPPC, Mr Yongfan Piao, reported on the recent activities of the APPPC including harmonization of phytosanitary measures, information exchange, capacity building, multilateral/bilateral cooperation, and the implementation of the IPPC.

18 Four Regional Standards on Phytosanitary Measures (RSPMs) had been developed and two drafts were in preparation. The regional workshops on the review of draft ISPMs had been undertaken each year since 2000 with financial support from Australia, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea and the IPPC Secretariat. A number of regional activities including training workshops on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP), Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) and pest risk analysis (PRA) had been organised in collaboration with the IPPC Secretariat. Expert consultations on exotic invasive species and control measures had also been organized.

19 The current status of the implementation of ISPM No.15, PRAs and the establishment of pest free areas in the APPPC member countries was described, and the recommendations from the regional workshop on draft ISPMs relayed to the meeting. Seven member countries of the APPPC had deposited their instruments of adherence to the IPPC during 2005-2006.

20 The APPPC had successfully cooperated with the Republic of Korea in obtaining funds for the regional workshop on the review of draft ISPMs. This was the first time a contribution had been made by an Asian country. Training on plant quarantine for ASEAN member countries would also be provided by the Republic of Korea in September 2006.

(ii) Southern Cone Plant Health Committee - COSAVE

21 The COSAVE Coordination Secretary, Ms Ana Maria Peralta, informed the TC that COSAVE's Biannual Work Plan had been approved by its Council of Ministers in November 2005. This had reinforced the Ministers' interests in regionally-coordinated phytosanitary activities that looked for common positions on IPPC technical issues, as well as producing regional technical documents to support NPPO negotiations.

22 In March 2006, COSAVE's Directive Committee approved the 2006 annual work plan, which included the operation of new ad hoc working groups on issues such as fruit flies, diagnostics, phytosanitary products and the concepts of "adequate level of protection" and "not widely distributed".

23 A workshop on the Agricultural Application of Standards for Phytosanitary Products in the COSAVE Region would be held in Asunción, Paraguay on 13 - 17 November 2006. The aim of the workshop was to improve the regional capacities on phytosanitary guidelines and requirements, to develop a risk analysis system for phytosanitary products, and to look for common areas in the application of COSAVE regional standards. A workshop on PRA was also under preparation for 2006.

24 Through an agreement with the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) and the Inter- American Development Bank, COSAVE had received non-reimbursable funding to support the development of the national components of a Regional Control Project for *Anthonomus grandis* in cotton.

25 A new regional standard had been approved by the Council of Ministers. This was: RSPM 3.16, version 1.1.1, *Guidelines to establish the list of the main regulated pests for the COSAVE region*. The list should be approved in November 2006.

26 COSAVE assisted with the organisation and secretariat services at the 2006 Workshop on draft ISPMs. It was noted at the workshop that as the meeting included other RPPO regions (OIRSA and CA) that they should also have an involvement with the organisation of the 2007 workshop.

iii) Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)

27 The Executive Secretary of the CPPC, Mr Gene Pollard, reported that the Governments of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) continued to pursue their decision to establish a new organization to replace the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC). In June 2006, a final decision had been taken to formally establish the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) by 01 June 2007, following the finalization of the legal framework document which was expected by September 2006, after which it would be ready for signature and ratification by Governments. While the initial membership of CAHFSA would be the CARICOM member states, other non-CARICOM countries of the Caribbean would also be welcomed to be part of CAHFSA.

28 In August 2006, a regional workshop to review the draft ISPMs was held in the Caribbean. This was immediately following by a workshop on the implementation of ISPM No.15.

29 A regional project on the ongoing assessment of the phytosanitary capabilities in the CARIFORUM countries (CARICOM countries plus the Dominican Republic and Haiti) was being conducted using the PCE tool. The objective was to identify the weaknesses in, and constraints to, the delivery of acceptable phytosanitary action in the countries and so determine areas for technical assistance.

iv) European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organisation (EPPO)

30 The Director-General of EPPO, Mr Nico van Opstal described EPPO's Mission, Goals and Strategy for 2006-2009. EPPO had developed a series of goals (Appendix V), which pending approval by the EPPO Council would lead the phytosanitary work program

31 In view of changes in the international framework, the purposes of the EPPO pest lists had been redefined and brought in line with the objectives of the organization, i.e.:

- EPPO should maintain documentation on pests which had been evaluated through the EPPO system and that had been recommended for regulation (the list to be known as the: *Pests recommended for regulation of the EPPO region*).
- The necessity to alert EPPO members of new phytosanitary risks - the *Alert list*, *Action list* and list on *Invasive Alien Plants* were tools which would enable members to be aware of any new risks.

32 EPPO informed the meeting of the regional standards that were under development and those that had been submitted for approval to the EPPO Council in September, 2006 (Annex VI).

v) **Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)**

33 The IAPSC was unable to be represented at the TC, so the IPPC Secretariat gave the presentation on their behalf. The Inter-African Phytosanitary Commission was created in 1951 following FAO recommendations to relay its activities in Africa in the field of plant protection. In 1967 the office transferred to Yaoundé-Cameroon and in 1969 the Inter-African Phytosanitary Commission became the Inter- African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC), which was fully managed by the General Secretariat of African Union and African member countries.

34 The Organization had three governing bodies: The General Assembly, which was the supreme body of the IAPSC and was made up of the plant protection services of AU member countries; the steering Committee, which was made up of Regional Economic Committees; and the Scientific Secretariat.

35 The goal of AU-IAPSC was to coordinate plant protection procedures in the 53 member countries of the African Union, by ensuring that:

- sufficient safe and quality food was available to the entire people of Africa
- agricultural products met world market standards at competitive prices, and
- acceptable plant protection policies and practices were environmentally safe for plants and plant products, animals and human beings.

36 The activities of the institution included:

- Coordination of plant protection activities - plant pests and diseases, noxious weeds, integrated pest and weed management, certification of biodiversities, and harmonization of legislation in Africa:
- Organizing training on phytosanitary regulations, PRA, plant quarantine, pesticides management, seed pathology, pesticide plants, IPM
- Updating lists of plant pests in Africa;
- Establishing research and agricultural production networks;
- Surveillance of plant pests and noxious weeds in Africa:
- Assisting with the harmonization of inspection regulations among African countries;
- Assisting NPPOs to undertake awareness campaigns on phytosanitary issues.
- Assisting countries to build and equip quarantine laboratories for pest diagnosis;
- Organizing different meetings with partners.

- 37 Challenges facing the IAPSC included:
- Number of members (53) and the range of phytosanitary expertise
 - Language – English, French, Arabic and Portuguese.
 - Resources – varied within countries. Expertise was scattered.

vi) North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)

38 Mr Ian McDonnell, Executive Director of NAPPO outlined NAPPO's organizational structure. He acknowledged the collaboration of EPPO and COSAVE in the recent process to staff the position of the NAPPO Technical Director.

39 The current year's activities of the NAPPO panels were presented. Of particular note was that the NAPPO regional standard on transgenic plants would add a chapter on importation for non-propagative uses, i.e. food, feed and processing. In addition, there was an expert working group which had begun work on a regional standard for transgenic arthropods.

40 The NAPPO dispute settlement mechanism had been initiated for the first time. An independent expert was hired to study the issue and make recommendations and a report had been received. The two parties involved in the dispute would use the report to re-consider their positions and seek resolution.

41 NAPPO was providing technical assistance to the Andean Community through the organization of a workshop on the implementation of ISPM 15 on Wood Packaging, to be held in November 2006 in Lima, Peru. NAPPO was very willing to collaborate with other RPPOs as the need was identified.

vii) Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)

42 The PPPO Executive Secretary, Mr Sidney Suma, gave a summary of activities undertaken during the past 12 months, which were implemented by the Biosecurity and Trade Support Component of the SPC Land Resources Division.

43 The brief included updates on the membership to the IPPC, implementation of international phytosanitary standards, participation in international standard setting process, pest list database, biosecurity law harmonization, trade facilitation, biosecurity help desk, pest surveys, pest surveillance, outbreak investigation and pest incursion responses, and public awareness. A brief summary on the outcomes of the Fifth Triennial PPPO Regional Technical Board meeting held in June 2006 was given.

viii) Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA)

44 The representative from IICA, Ms. Maria de Lourdes Fonalleras, was invited to make a presentation on the Institution. She explained that the purpose of IICA was to encourage and support the efforts of its Member States to foster agricultural development and rural well-being in their territories.

45 IICA was established in 1942 and currently had 34 Country Members and 34 IICA Offices. The Governing bodies were the Inter-American Board of Agriculture, the Executive Committee and the General Directorate. The Thematic Areas of IICA were described, these being:

- Trade and Agribusiness Development
- Technology and Innovation
- Agricultural Health and Food Safety
- Sustainable Rural Development
- Education and Training
- Information and Communication

The regional and national Agendas of the Institute were also briefly described.

Agenda Item 6: Secretariat update

i) Standards setting programme

46 The Secretariat gave an update of the standard setting activities since CPM-1. The importance of collaboration with RPPOs in relation to expert drafting groups was stressed, especially for nominations and participation of experts in meetings, organization of meetings, and submission of discussion documents. The Secretariat was facing some difficulties with regard to the participation of nominated experts in meetings, and RPPOs could help resolve some of these issues, especially in liaising with governments from the countries concerned with regard to time commitments, and the importance and benefits of participation.

47 Regional workshops on draft ISPMs were identified as being very important by countries, and RPPOs should continue to become increasingly involved. The Secretariat reminded the RPPOs of some deadlines such as those for country comments on draft ISPMs (30 September) and treatments submissions (15 October).

48 The TC noted that timeframes were sometimes too short for experts to arrange for their participation (COSAVE noted that three of their member countries required a minimum of one month for confirmation to attend an official meeting). It was also noted that, in the case of an expert not being selected for a particular group, the RPPO could contact the IPPC Secretariat and ask for details. This would help RPPOs assist their experts in improving the quality of their applications.

49 COSAVE informed the meeting that its member countries intended to propose at the next CPM that the current application of the standard setting process be revisited with the requirement to establish and approve criteria for financial support for the participation of delegates to the Standards Committee, Expert Working Groups and Technical Panels, and would encourage the IPPC Secretariat to follow the approved Rules and Procedures for each of the meetings.

ii) Information Exchange

50 The Secretariat presented the statistics for general IPP usage and NPPO utilization of the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/id/35187>). Usage had stabilized and feedback was generally favourable for both navigation and stability.

51 The regional IPP Workshops had played a major role in creating NPPO awareness of national information exchange obligations and ensuring countries began meeting them through the IPP. Contracting parties had increasingly utilized the IPP after the regional workshops to discuss information exchange and more specifically training of IPP editors.

52 Concern was expressed in that if there was no follow-up to the initial workshops, countries would not continue their efforts with updating their information. There was already evidence that countries in general had undertaken little work in the IPP after the workshops and if the trend continued, the Secretariat feared that utilization of the IPP would be minimal in 18 months and the CPM information exchange initiative would fail. The Secretariat believed that the RPPOs could play a central role in promoting the use of the IPP and ensure countries increased their use of it and maintained the data already loaded.

53 The Secretariat wished to work more closely with RPPOs to ensure synergy between the IPP and current and future RPPO information systems, particularly in the areas of pest reporting (including emergency action/measures), diagnostic information, and the general availability of RPPO information. The Secretariat noted that some RPPOs (e.g. APPPC, PPPO and EPPO) already utilized the IPP but it was felt that more could be done by other RPPOs. In addition, the Secretariat expressed the fear that uncoordinated developments in regional and national information systems could in fact negate some of the IPP initiatives.

54 The meeting agreed that a more in-depth discussion on the IPP and information exchange needed to take place during the 19th Technical Consultation. Appropriate background documentation should be provided and a half day session needed to be put aside to hold the discussions.

Recommendation: That cooperation between the Secretariat and RPPOs on information exchange be an in-depth subject for TC-19

iii) Dispute Settlement

55 There had been no disputes under the IPPC in the past 12 months. However, the Subsidiary Body for Dispute Settlement (SBDS) had been active and the "IPPC Dispute Settlement Manual" had been finalised and posted on the IPP. In addition, the text for a dispute settlement advocacy document had been finalised by the SBDS and submitted to the FAO publishing department for formatting and production. As agreed by the CPM, until further resources were available, the documents would only be available in English, and then only electronically.

iv) Technical Assistance (incl. Commonwealth Agricultural Bureau - International (CAB-International) review)

56 The Secretariat reported on its Technical Assistance Programme. It presented the technical Cooperation Unilateral Trust Fund and GCP projects being managed by the Secretariat and the strategies for their implementation. It highlighted regional workshops to be held during the next year. The Informal Working Group on the PCE was scheduled to meet in Nairobi for the period December 4-8 to consider in particular, CAB-International's report on the assessment of the PCE as a technical assistance tool.

57 The Secretariat requested the RPPOs to encourage their members to complete and respond to the questionnaires sent to them by CAB-International. A short questionnaire had also been given to the RPPOs to solicit their views on aspects of the PCE tool.

v) **Administration (incl. alignment of RPPO work programme, financial, IPPC work programme, staff)**

58 The IPPC Secretariat presented the latest financial report for the Secretariat. If all expenditure went to plan the year would end with an approximate surplus for the FAO Regular programme contribution of about \$10,000. However the budget was currently showing a positive variance of approximately \$0.5m, so letters of agreement were being prepared in case there was a large surplus at the end of the year.

59 A short presentation was also made to the meeting regarding the “planned” activities for 2007 with the associated budget. The Secretariat explained that the document would be considered in more detail at the meeting of the Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance group who would advise on prioritization.

Agenda Item 7: Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the IPPC and its Institutional Arrangements

60 The Leader of the IPPC Evaluation team, Mr Lukas Brader, and Ms Rachel Bedouin, FAO Senior Evaluation Officer, attended the meeting in order to meet the RPPO representatives and outline the type of information for which they would be interested in getting RPPO opinions. It was recognized that the group would be meeting on Wednesday afternoon for a more detailed discussion. Opportunity was also taken to explain the use of resource persons and the rationale used in selecting the 17 countries to be visited.

Agenda Item 8: Discussions on, and databases managed by RPPOs

i) **Discussions on mechanisms to improve non-compliance information provided by RPPOs, including alert systems**

61 The discussion was lead by COSAVE who expressed the concern of its members about RPPOs making available information received from NPPOs relating to interceptions or pest alerts. An example of an erroneous publication of a pest that was absent from the COSAVE region was quoted and the negative effect that that had had on trade. COSAVE reminded the meeting of the obligations under ISPM No.13 *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*, and made several suggestions (Appendix VII), which were presented to the meeting. The TC discussed the issue and concluded that RPPOs should remind their members that notifications of compliance should follow the requirements of ISPM no. 13.

Outcome: RPPOs to remind their members that notification of non-compliances may have a negative effect on trade and before publishing such notifications should ensure that the requirements of ISPM No. 13 were satisfied.

ii) Discussions on mechanisms to improve information provided in databases managed by RPPOs

62 COSAVE mentioned that at least 14 internationally important pests had been erroneously quoted in various databases as being present in COSAVE countries. This was naturally of concern to COSAVE and there was a short discussion how this may have happened and of the need and stated willingness to correct such erroneous information rapidly.

Outcome: In the situations where erroneous data has been identified in databases maintained by RPPOs, the RPPO should be immediately notified so they can expeditiously correct mistake

iii) COSAVE databases

63 COSAVE had a series of databases which included:

- Inspectors authorized to sign phytosanitary certificates: - includes 3 signatures for each inspector.
- PRA database: - contains over 500 PRAs and supports the list of the main regulated pests for the COSAVE region.
- Interceptions database for non-compliances related to wood packing material: - from countries outside the COSAVE area.
- Database on traceability for import, export and domestic production of phytosanitary products

iv) EPPO databases

64 **EPPO Alert list:** Ms Françoise Petter, Assistant Director, EPPO presented the Alert List which was intended to draw the attention of EPPO member countries to certain pests that could possibly present a risk to them and hence achieve an early warning. It was not a quarantine pest list, and did not constitute a recommendation for phytosanitary action. The pests were selected by the EPPO Secretariat, mainly from the literature but also from suggestions of NPPOs of member countries. There were various reasons for considering including pests on the Alert List, including: pests which were new to science, new outbreaks, and reports of spread. Short paragraphs were included for each pest to explain why it was selected, to summarize geographical distribution, hosts, damage, and pathway, and to assess possible risks in Europe.

65 EPPO stressed that the section 'possible risk' on the Alert List was not the result of a full PRA according to EPPO Standard PM 5/3(2) but rather a preliminary attempt by the EPPO Secretariat to identify the main elements of risk. Some of the pests could later be selected by relevant EPPO Panels and submitted to a full PRA. As a result, they may then be added to the lists of pests recommended for regulation or, if the PRA showed the risk to be low, removed from the Alert List. The Alert List, including the text on each pest, was reviewed critically every year by the Panel on Phytosanitary Measures. To keep the Alert List reasonably short, entries would not be kept for more than 3 years if no new information was received.

66 **The EPPO Plant Protection Thesaurus (EPPT)** - Covered organisms important in agriculture and crop protection (version 4.0 was released in March 2006), and contained approximately 28,000 species of plants (cultivated plants, wild plants and weeds), 19,200 species of animals (especially insects, mites and nematodes) and 4,300 species of micro-organisms, including viruses. For each organism it provided:

- preferred scientific name
- EPPO codes
- Synonyms
- common names in many languages
- taxonomic relationships and other classifications (e.g. a new EPPO classification for the uses of plant protection products was under way, and it was intended to be included into EPPT)

67 **PQR** - The EPPO database system on regulated pests. It provided information on the geographical distribution and host plants for:

- all the pests of the EPPO list of pests recommended for regulation and of EU Directive 2000/29
- pests of the EPPO Alert List
- plants of the EPPO List of invasive alien plants
- many other quarantine pests and invasive plants of interest to other regions of the world.

The last version of PQR (4.5) was released in May 2006.

68 The EPPO Secretariat intended to move the databases to a web-based interface

v) **PPPO Pest List Database**

69 The PPPO pest list database was developed by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and was used by PPPO member countries. It was needed for the establishment of trade agreements and to facilitate trade of fresh produce. The database was developed in Microsoft Access and was an information system that:

- recorded pest occurrences within a country
- provided a list of all pests found on a crop, and
- recorded and reported interceptions at ports

70 The database could provide a list of hosts for any given pest and a list of all weeds found in a country (supplied bibliographic references and survey data). Data update was the responsibility of the member countries (had the facility for data upload - password protected). It was audited on a six-monthly basis by SPC technical staff.

vi) **NAPPO Pest Alert system**

71 NAPPO took the meeting, via the web, through its database to its pest alert system, which had two main sections:

a) Alerts – unofficial records, and constituted different pest reports from sources such as scientific papers, news stories, press releases, etc.

b) Official pest reports – included the official notifications sent in by the NAPPO member NPPOs that would also be sent to the IPPC. Publication of the official pest report had to be agreed to by the NPPO concerned.

Outcome: The TC:

- i) **Acknowledged the very useful information (official and otherwise) available in the RPPO databases**
- ii) **Agreed that consideration of linking various databases to the IPP would be part of the in-depth information exchange discussion at the next TC.**

[The Secretariat is to produce the papers on reporting (will request information from the RPPOs). This will be done several months before the TC-19]

Agenda Item 9: Presentations on reference laboratories

72 The value of reference laboratories was briefly discussed at TC-17 where it was recommended that a symposium on this subject be organized for TC-18. It was recommended that the symposium address four distinct areas:

- the rationale for reference laboratories
- technical requirements and capabilities of the reference laboratories
- organizational structure
- analysis of the economic viability.

i) NAPPO

73 NAPPO was unable to give its presentation due to the unavailability of the intended presenter.

ii) PPPO (New Zealand) – Opportunities and Challenges

74 The representative from New Zealand, Ms Veronica Herrera, gave a presentation on the developments of the New Zealand reference lab. She described the possible functional roles (proposed by the Australian Subcommittee of Plant Health Diagnostic standards), based on the World Animal Health Organisation (OIE) criteria that could define a reference laboratory. These included being a centre:

- of expertise that facilitated the standardisation of identification/diagnostic techniques relevant to the specified pest(s);
- for the storage and distribution of biological reference material or products and any other reagents used in the diagnosis and control of the specified plant pest(s);
- for the development of new procedures for the diagnosis, control and exclusion testing of the specified pest (s);
- for gathering, processing, analysing, and disseminating epidemiological data relevant to the specified pest (s);
- that participated in scientific and technical studies in collaboration with other laboratories or organisations;
- that published and disseminated information on laboratory testing for the specified pest (s); and/or
- that provided scientific and technical training for laboratory personnel in other laboratories.

75 Challenges that had been identified by the Sub-committee of Plant Health Diagnostic Standards (the sub-committee is part of the Plant Health Committee - New Zealand is a member) facing reference laboratories included:

- Accreditation challenges - Accreditation to ISO 17025
 - Resource intensive and a real challenge for scientists
 - Management systems plus technical aspects
 - Scope of accreditation, generic vs. specific (e.g. morphological identification of fungi vs. a specific family of fungi)
 - Test methods, and acceptable controls for PCR & ELISA
 - Calibration of equipment
 - Establishment of inter-laboratory (proficiency) programs
- International capability gaps
- Deficiencies in taxonomic descriptions/keys
- New challenges of matching the molecular & morphological identity
- More complete datasets
- Culture & reference collections
 - space is at a premium
 - living cultures are expensive to maintain
 - research interests change
 - staff members move on
- Funding of Diagnostic Services - who pays for identifications?
- Collaboration with other organisations (may not be easy to establish, particularly in other countries/regions)

76 In New Zealand, a reference lab would have to be accredited to ISO 17025 and would be the supplier of last resort. It could however sub-contract under its responsibility (the sub-contractor would not be required to be ISO accredited).

iii) EPPO – Presentation of the system of reference labs as developed by the World Animal Health Organisation (OIE)

77 EPPO gave a short presentation on the system of reference labs used by the OIE. The meeting was reminded that the OIE only dealt with approximately 30 animal diseases compared with the thousands dealt with in the plants area. The primary mandate of the OIE reference laboratories was to:

- function as a centre of expertise and standardisation for a designated disease(s) or topics
- store and distribute to national laboratories biological reference products and any other reagents used in the diagnosis and control of the designated disease(s) or topics
- develop new procedures for diagnosis and control of the designated disease(s) or topics
- gather, process, analyse and disseminate epizootiological data relevant to their speciality and to
- place expert consultants at the disposal of the Office International des Epizooties.

78 Applications for the title of Reference Laboratory of the OIE would be submitted to the Director General by the Delegate of the Member Country to which the laboratory belonged or by the corresponding Regional Commission. Applications received would be presented, after consultation with the Biological Standards Commission or the Aquatic

Animal Health Standards Commission, as appropriate, to the Administrative Commission at its annual meetings. Applications would be selected solely on the basis of scientific and technical competence of the candidate establishment.

iv) Update by the Netherlands on the discussion in the EU on reference laboratories

79 In 2005 two meetings were held on this topic, a Council working party on plant health and a working party of Chief Plant Health Officers. The conclusion of the meetings was that there was agreement on the need to move gradually towards more formal cooperation through the establishment of a network of National Reference Laboratories.

v) Italy

80 Ms Marina Barba, Istituto Sperimentale per la Patologia Vegetale (ISPaVe), Roma, gave a presentation on the functions of the Italian laboratory. The ISPaVe was a research Institute dealing with different diseases of economically important crops. It had well equipped specialized laboratories and was officially recognized at the national level. The laboratory was routinely used to cover the following two aspects:

- Identification, characterization and diagnosis of economically important pathogens: fungi, bacteria, viruses, viroids, phytoplasmas
- Pesticide residue problems:
 - optimization of analysis protocols,
 - monitoring in harvested crops

81 In Italy there was the Central National Plant Protection service and the Regional Plant Protection Units. The Institute acted as a scientific reference for the Ministry of Agriculture for main phytopathological aspects. It also collaborated with Regional Plant Protection Units. Examples (Grapevine yellows, *Tilletia indica* and Plum pox virus) were given to demonstrate how the Institute was involved in the diagnosis of quarantine pests.

vi) General discussion on reference laboratories

82 A general discussion was held on reference plant health laboratories. The conclusion was that establishing an international recognition system for reference laboratories as for the OIE was premature.

83 The need for national reference laboratories was recognized by some RPPOs but it was also stressed that it should not be an obligation for NPPOs to establish such reference laboratories. The TC recognized that it could be useful to have further investigations on national reference laboratories but agreed that before initiating any activity on the topic, it should liaise with the IPPC Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols in order to discuss their possible role and identify areas where the TC could assist the Panel. It was suggested that EPPO should contact the Steward of the Technical Panel.

84 The representatives of the PPPO stressed the need for developing countries to be able to access a list of laboratories which could provide reliable diagnostic services in particular in the case of dispute settlement. The TC noted this need but stressed that criteria were needed before such a list of laboratories could be established.

85 EPPO and the New Zealand representative reported that some laboratories in their regions were seeking accreditation by national accreditation bodies on the basis of ISO 17025 standard, "*General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories*". The interpretation of the standard had proved to vary significantly among accreditation bodies in different parts of the world. Requirements of the standard were easier to meet for laboratories performing chemical analysis than by laboratories in the plant health sector. It was stressed that it would be beneficial if a common interpretation of the standard for plant pest diagnostics could be elaborated.

Action: EPPO to contact the Steward of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols to discuss possible role of the TC-RPPOs and identify areas where it could assist the Panel.

Agenda Item 10: Workshop on case studies for Pest Free Areas

i) PPPO – Fruit fly surveillance

86 The PPPO case study was from a regional point of view covering over 20 countries and a major part of the Pacific. The major reasons for the fruit fly activities in the Pacific Region included the loss of the use of ethylene dibromide (EDB) as a post harvest fumigant and hence the loss of access to major overseas markets (New Zealand and Australia) for export produce, and the threat of invasion from further species of exotic fruit flies.

87 The objectives of the regional project were to

- Improve the knowledge on fruit flies (confirm species and determine host ranges)
- Develop and transfer field control technology for fruit flies
- Formulate quarantine treatments to replace EDB fumigation
- Establish quarantine surveillance systems nationally and regionally
- Improve emergency response preparedness nationally and regionally, and
- Upgrade technical skills of national staff

88 The PPPO representative described the history of the programme (started in 1990) and the three major development phases (moving from four original countries to activities in 22 Pacific Island Countries and Territories). Surveillance, trade facilitation and public awareness activities were described. As the movement and introduction of fruit flies across the Pacific was mainly through human activities and the Pacific was still free from many harmful species of fruit flies found in other parts of the world, concern and care was taken with the import of host material into the Pacific.

ii) NAPPO – Pest Free Areas (PFA) for fruit flies in Mexico

89 The NAPPO representative presented an example of a PFA in Mexico which described the measures taken for the establishment and maintenance of fruit fly free areas. The presentation highlighted the cooperation required among producers, exporters and government to ensure success. In addition, a series of phytosanitary measures were described that could be included in a work plan, such as appropriate legislation, controls, surveillance, trapping density, emergency actions etc.

90 The case study demonstrated that the establishment of a PFA took a significant amount of work, commitment and resources. The Mexican case however, demonstrated the returns to producers from increased market access for a wider range of fruit.

iii) COSAVE – Fruit fly pest free areas within the region

91 Three of the 6 COSAVE member countries (Argentina, Brazil and Chile) had established and maintained PFAs for fruit flies. The presentation given by the COSAVE representative covered Argentina and Chile.

92 The objectives of the Argentina programme were to decrease the impacts of the fruit flies (*Anastrepha fraterculus* and *Ceratitis capitata*) on fruit and vegetable production at national level, and to certify and protect fruit fly pest free or low pest prevalence areas (within the country) with the aim of getting national and international recognition. The detection systems (trapping and fruit sampling), control systems (chemical, cultural and sterile insect technique) and internal quarantine systems were described. Public awareness was also recognized as an important component in the system to maintain fruit fly free areas (five PFAs and four areas of low pest prevalence).

93 In the case of Chile, Chile was recognized as having country freedom. Chile had excellent natural boundaries (mountains, ocean, deserts and subantarctic in the South) that effectively gave it an “island status”. Because of the natural boundaries and few points of entry into the country, Chile could effectively maintain its country freedom status. The only tool internationally accepted to ascertain the presence or absence of fruit flies was the use of a specific detection system, i.e. traps baited with specific attractants (trimedlure) for adult detection, supplemented with fruit sampling for immature stages (eggs/larvae). Chile has had a specific project, covering the detection and response issues in place since 1980. The programme was maintained by extensive border control, fruit fly surveillance (trapping and fruit sampling) and emergency response programmes.

Agenda Item 11: IPPC Evaluation

94 An “in-camera” session, limited to RPPO representatives only was held with the IPPC evaluation team.

Agenda Item 12: Other business

95 There was no other business

Agenda Item 13: Venue and date of the Nineteenth TC-RPPOs

96 It was agreed that NAPPO would host the 19th TC in North America, 10-14 September 2007. An informal meeting would be held during the 2007 CPM meeting in Rome where agenda items and other arrangements would be discussed.

Agenda Item 14: Closure

97 The meeting proposed a vote of thanks to the Chair and members of the Secretariat for organizing and running the meeting.

ANNOTATED AGENDA

Monday 11 September

- 1 Opening of the Consultation (Niek Van der Graaff, Secretary, IPPC)**
- 2 Election of the Chairperson, Vice-chair and Rapporteur**
- 3 Adoption of the agenda**
- 4 Actions arising from the Seventeenth Technical Consultation**
 - 4.1 Elaboration of the explanatory document prepared by EPPO on ISPM No.5 – Supplement No. 1: *Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests* (**Request from EPPO that this be postponed to a future meeting**)
 - 4.2 Identification of possible issues regarding ISPMs No. 12 and No. 7 (IPPC Secretariat update and RPPOs)
 - 4.3 Legal interpretation of Article V 2a of the IPPC (FAO Legal Section)
- 5 Review of RPPO activities (incl. organisation, regional standards, and workshops)**
 - 5.1 APPPC – Yongfan Piao
 - 5.2 CA – Not represented
 - 5.3 COSAVE – Ana Peralta
 - 5.4 CPPC – Gene Pollard (update on the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) - the new body which is expected to serve as the RPPO for the English-speaking Caribbean sub-region)
 - 5.5 EPPO – Nico van Opstal
 - 5.6 IAPSC – Not represented
 - 5.7 NAPPO – Ian McDonell
 - 5.8 OIRSA – Not represented
 - 5.9 PPPO – Sidney Suma (SPC)
- 6 Secretariat update**
 - 6.1 Standards setting programme
 - 6.2 Information Exchange
 - 6.3 Dispute Settlement
 - 6.4 Technical Assistance (incl. CAB-International review)
 - 6.5 Administration (incl. alignment of RPPO work programme, financial, IPPC work programme, staff)
- 7 Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the IPPC and its Institutional Arrangements (Lukas Brader – Evaluation Team Leader & Rachel Bedouin, FAO Senior Evaluation Officer PBEE)**

Tuesday 12 September**8 Discussion on databases in general, and databases managed by RPPOs**

- 8.1 Discussions on mechanisms to improve non-compliance information provided by RPPOs, including alert systems (lead by COSAVE)
- 8.2 Discussions on mechanisms to improve information provided in databases managed by RPPOs (lead by COSAVE)
- 8.3 EPPO databases -
 - EPPO alert list
 - EPPO data bases (PQR, EPPT)
 - New Database in development on diagnostic facilities and expertise in the EPPO region
 - Demonstrate PRA decision support scheme
- 8.4 PPPO Pest List Database (developed by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and is used by PPPO Member Countries)
- 8.5 NAPPO Pest Alert system

9 Presentations on reference laboratories

- 9.1 NAPPO – Ian McDonell
- 9.2 PPPO – Veronica Herrera (New Zealand) – Opportunities and Challenges
- 9.3 EPPO – Presentation of the system of reference labs as developed by the OIE.

Wednesday 13 September**10 Workshop on case studies for Pest Free Areas**

- 10.1 PPPO – Fruit fly surveillance
- 10.2 NAPPO – PFA for fruit flies in Mexico
- 10.3 COSAVE – PFA – fruit flies

11 IPPC Evaluation – Lukas Brader and Rachel Bedouin
(RPPO representatives only)**12 Other business****13 Venue and date of the Nineteenth TC-RPPOs****14 Closure****Thursday 14 September**

Field trip to the Istituto Sperimentale per la Patologia Vegetale reference laboratory (Via C. G. Bertero 22, Roma)

**WORK PROGRAMME OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION
AMONG RPPOS FOR 2006/2007**

	Activity	Responsible body
1	Elaboration of the explanatory doc. prepared by EPPO on ISPM No. 5-Supplement No. 1: Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests (<i>para. 7</i>)	EPPO
2	<p>Legal interpretation of Article V 2a of the IPPC (<i>Para. 11-16</i>)</p> <p>1. FAO Legal Office to prepare a summary statement on their considered opinion of Article IPPC V 2 (a), particularly in relation to defining what a “public officer” was and that this be attached as an appendix to the report.</p> <p>2. NAPPO and COSAVE to prepare a document for TC -19 (taking into account their regional guidelines) outlining the minimum requirements for a person to have signing authority for phytosanitary certificates, for possible consideration as a topic for an ISPM.</p> <p>3. Other RPPOs to discuss the situation with their members and supply comments to NAPPO, copied to the IPPC Secretariat.</p>	<p>1. FAO Legal Office</p> <p>2. NAPPO and COSAVE</p> <p>3. Other RPPOs</p>
3	<p>Databases managed by RPPOs</p> <p>Discussions on mechanisms to improve non-compliance information provided by RPPOs, including alert systems</p> <p>RPPOs to remind their members that notification of non-compliances may have a negative effect on trade and before publishing such notifications they should ensure that the requirements of ISPM No. 13 are satisfied.</p> <p>Discussions on mechanisms to improve information provided in databases managed by RPPOs</p> <p>In the situations where erroneous data has been identified in databases maintained by RPPOs, the RPPO should be immediately notified so they can expeditiously rectify the mistake</p> <p>RPPO Databases</p> <p>1. Agreed that consideration of linking various databases to the IPP will be part of the in-depth information exchange discussion at the next TC.</p> <p>2. The Secretariat to produce the papers on reporting (will request information from the RPPOs). To be done several months before the TC -19</p>	<p>RPPOs</p> <p>RPPOs</p> <p>1. TC-19 RPPOs/IPPC Secretariat</p> <p>2. IPPC Secretariat</p>
4	<p>Presentations of reference laboratories</p> <p>General discussion on reference laboratories</p> <p>EPPO to contact the Steward of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols to discuss possible role of the TC-RPPOs and identify areas where it could assist the Panel.</p>	EPPO

APPENDIX III

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 18TH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOs

Actions arising from the Seventeenth Technical Consultation

iii) Participation by all RPPOs at the Technical Consultation

Recommendation: The role and criteria for the ongoing recognition of an RPPO be reviewed at TC-19 (*Paragraph 10*)

Secretariat update

ii) Information Exchange

Recommendation: That cooperation between the Secretariat and RPPOs on information exchange be an in-depth subject for TC-19

IPPC Article V.2(a)

Interpretation of the term “Public Officer”

1. Article V.2 of the international Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) provides that:

“Each contracting party shall make arrangements for the issuance of phytosanitary certificates in conformity with the following provisions:

- (a) Inspection and other related activities leading to issuance of phytosanitary certificates shall be carried out only by or under the authority of the official national plant protection organization. The issuance of phytosanitary certificates shall be carried out by public officers who are technically qualified and duly authorized by the official NPPO to act on its behalf and under its control with such knowledge and information available to those officers that the authorities of importing contracting parties may accept the phytosanitary certificates with confidence as dependable documents.*
- (b) ...”*

2. This article attributes to two different entities the successive responsibilities leading to the granting of phytosanitary certificates:

(i) *“inspection and other related activities leading to the issuance...”* are mandatorily granted to the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO), i.e. an official institution designated to that effect by each contracting party to the Convention, pursuant to its Article IV.1; nevertheless, required activities might be implemented either by the NPPO itself or by another entity or a legal or physical person under its authority.

(ii) the *“issuance of the certificate...”*, i.e. signature and stamping, is to be made by *“public officers who are technically qualified and duly authorized by the official NPPO to act on its behalf and under its control ...”*.

3. In other words, on the one hand, technical activities required for the establishment of the certificate are conducted either by the NPPO or by any other person/entity designated to that effect by the NPPO.

4. On the other hand, the issuance of the certificate, its “officialization”, shall exclusively be made by a person who has been given the legal authority to sign on behalf of the NPPO. Depending on the various administrative systems of the Parties to the Convention, it could be anyone from the Minister responsible for plant quarantine down (through delegated authority) or, in some other cases, either routinely or where the NPPO is understaffed or during a phytosanitary emergency, any other administrative agency, or a legal or physical person. When an administrative agency other than the NPPO, or a legal or physical person, execute any activity that, according to the IPPC, is normally undertaken by the NPPO, the final responsibility i.e. the legal liability rests in any case with the Government of the concerned Party to the IPPC. This is the case in many countries where the Government may need to outsource some phytosanitary activities. Outsourced entities, or legal or physical persons will be acting on behalf of the NPPO but the Government, the Party to the IPPC, will continue in

any case to be responsible legally, technically and administratively on any action taken by the former. Besides the fact that such agencies, or legal or physical persons acting on behalf of a “*public officer*” shall be “*duly authorized*”, they shall also be “*technically qualified*”. Obviously, the said qualification is evaluated by and/or under the responsibility of the NPPO concerned.

EPPO GOALS

EPPO had developed a series of goals, which pending the approval by the EPPO Council would lead the phytosanitary work program:

New tasks

1. EPPO will take a lead in the region in its support of members by using its risk-based approach in justifying phytosanitary management and regulation.
2. EPPO will expand its role in addressing diagnostic needs by supporting diagnostic laboratories, leading to the introduction of quality assurance systems and/or accreditation.
3. EPPO will support members in their need to sustain a diagnostic basis to support the plant health responsibilities of NPPOs, by developing and maintaining a database of diagnostic abilities in the member countries.

Existing output to increase

4. EPPO will assist members in the prevention of introduction, establishment and spread of Invasive Alien Plants by providing documentation, recommending action and providing guidance on measures. The increase is already taking shape with the appointment in 2005 of a scientific staff officer dealing with Invasive Alien Species of plants.
5. EPPO will provide guidance on eradication and containment (elaborate official controls for major quarantine pests). EPPO will accelerate and prioritize work on the Standard series PM 9 'National regulatory control systems' and develop guidance for contingency planning. Work on harmonized phytosanitary procedures will continue.
6. EPPO will help members with implementation of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) by organizing practical workshops for NPPO heads, based on reported implementation difficulties.

Existing output to be consolidated

7. EPPO is providing selected, reviewed or validated documentation on pests to members, supporting them in assuring plant health. EPPO recommends actions based on Pest Risk Analysis (PRAs) for new phytosanitary risks.
8. EPPO is assisting members in establishing collective views on issues discussed at a global level in relation to the IPPC and to the SPS agreement.

The following panels will be instrumental to achieve these goals: phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary procedures, PRA development, Invasive Alien Plants, Diagnostic protocols, Laboratory Requirements, Bacterial Diseases, Nematodes, European mycology network, CPM-affairs. In additions there will be one-off meetings of Expert working groups concerning PRAs for specific pests, National Regulatory Control Systems, Specific phytosanitary procedures and proficiency testing. Other areas of work will slow down or stop like certification, quarantine pests for forestry, composted organic waste and *Diabrotica virgifera*.

EPPO STANDARD SETTING PROGRAMME**The following regional standards are under development:**

- Production of pathogen-tested herbaceous ornamentals
- General crop inspection of potatoes
- Phytosanitary procedure of field sampling for *Globodera rostochiensis* and *G. pallida*
- Management and technical requirements for laboratories conduction pest diagnosis (based on ISO 17025)
- Standards on phytosanitary treatments
- Healthy plants for planting of fruit crops (*Ribes*, *Sambucus*, *Populus*, *Salix*)
- Commodity standards for Conifers, *Castanea*, *Quercus*
- NRCS for *Bactrocera zonata*, *Heterodera glycines*
- Phytosanitary procedures for consignment inspection (strawberry, grains & seeds, Chrysanthemum, plants for planting)
- Revision of biological control agents

The following standards are submitted for approval to the EPPO Council (September, 2006)
:

- Phytosanitary procedure on *Meloidogyne chitwoodii* and *M. fallax*
- Export certification and import compliance checking for potato tubers
- Testing of potato cultivars to assess resistance to *Globodera rostochiensis* and *G. pallida*
- Disinfection procedures in potato production
- Guidelines for the management of Invasive Alien Species or potentially IAS which are intended for import or have been intentionally imported
- Use of EPPO diagnostic protocols
- Documentation and reporting on a diagnosis
- Diagnostic protocols:
 - Insects: *Popillia japonica*, *Toxoptera citricida*
 - Fungi: *Gymnosporangium* spp
 - Virus: Beet Necrotic Yellow Vein Virus
- National Regulatory control system for *Synchytrium endobioticum*

APPENDIX VII

SUGGESTIONS FROM COSAVE FOR RPPOs PROVIDING INFORMATION ON NON-COMPLIANCE

RPPOs that provide information on non-compliances should:

- check that the procedures stated in ISPM No.13 have been totally fulfilled before publishing an occurrence of non-compliance.
- ensure that the information has been received from the correct authority, i.e. the authority responsible (e.g. NPPO) for managing the non-compliance issue.
- state clearly the date of the non-compliance (interception).
- in the case of a mistake (e.g. an incorrect identification), make the information that had been received by the RPPO available to the affected NPPO
- ensure that when a mistake is corrected that this is published on the website/database in such a manner that other users are made fully aware
- if after receiving a complaint from an NPPO that a mistake has been made, then after authentication and correction, formally inform the affected NPPO

APPENDIX VIII

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<p>ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION</p> <p>Mr. Yongfan PIAO Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission c/o FAO Regional Office for Asia and Pacific Maliwan Mansion 39, Phra Atit Road Bangkoko 10200 THAILAND Tel. 66 2 697 4268 Fax. 66 2 697 4400 Yongfan.Piao@fao.org</p> <p>Mr. Young-chul JEONG Deputy Director of International Plant Quarantine Cooperation Division National Plant Quarantine Service Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry 433-1, Anyang6-Dong, Anyang-Si, Gyeonggi-Do REPUBLIC OF KOREA Tel. 82-31-446-1926 Fax. 82-31-445-6934 ycjeong@npqs.go.kr</p> <p>CARBBEAN PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION</p> <p>Mr. Gene V. POLLARD Technical Secretary Caribbean Plant Protection Commission c/o FAO Sub-Regional Office for the Caribbean FAO Representation P.O. Box. 631-C, Bridgetown BARBADOS Tel. (246) 4267110; 1 Fax. (246) 4276075 Gene.Pollard@fao.org</p> <p>COMITE DE SANIDAD VEGETAL DEL CONO SUR</p> <p>Ms. Ana PERALTA Coordination Secretary Avda. Presidente Bulnes no.107, piso 2, Depto 24 Santiago CHILE Tel. (56 2) 6710722; 6714459; 6713371 Fax. (56 2) 6712947 ana.peralta@sag.gob.cl cosave@sag.gob.cl</p>	<p>EUROPEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION (EPPO)</p> <p>Mr Nico van Opstal Director-General EPPO, 1 rue Le Nôtre, 75016 Paris FRANCE Tel. : 33/1 45 20 77 94 Fax : 33/1 42 24 89 43 hq@epo.fr</p> <p>Ms Françoise PETTER Assistant Director EPPO 1 rue le Nôtre 75016 Paris FRANCE Tel: +33 1 45 20 77 94 Fax: +33 1 42 24 89 43 E-mail: hq@epo.fr</p> <p>Ms. Louisa Tan Policy maker Phytosanitary affairs Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality Bezuidenhoutseweg 73, P.O.Box 20401, 2500 EK The Hague Tel. 31-70-378.4389 Fax. 31-70-378.6156 l.c.f.tan@minlnv.nl</p> <p>NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION</p> <p>Mr Ian R. MCDONELL Executive Director - NAPPO 1431 Merivale Road, 3rd. Floor Ottawa Ontario CANADA K1A 0Y9 Tel: +613 2282535 Fax: +613 2282540 E-mail: imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION

Mr. Sidney SUMA
Biosecurity & Trade Facilitation Adviser
Land Resources Division
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
Private Mail Bag Service, Suva
Fiji Islands
Tel. (679) 337 0733
Fax. (679) 337 0021
Ph D/L: (679) 337 9231
sidneys@spc.int

Mr Tony GUNUA
Acting Chief Plant Protection Officer
National Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection Authority
P O Box 741
Port Moresby
PAPUA NEW GUINEA
Tel. (675) 311 2100/ 325 9977;
Fax. (675) 325 1674/ 9310;
naqia@dg.com.pg

Mr Andrew YAMANE
Managing Director
National Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection Authority
P O Box 741
Port Moresby
PAPUA NEW GUINEA
Tel: (675) 311 2100/ 325 9977
Fax: +675 325 1674/ 9310
naqia@dg.com.pg

Ms. Veronica E. HERRERA
Plant Health & Environment Laboratory Manager
Investigation and Diagnostic Centre
Biosecurity New Zealand
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
231 Morrin Rd.
Tamaki
Auckland
NEW ZEALAND
DDI 649574 4190
Tel. 021 890 160
Fax. 6495705573
veronica.herrera@maf.govt.nz

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Mr. Chagama KEDERA (CPM Chairperson)
Managing Director
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service
Ministry of Agriculture
PO Box 49592
Nairobi
KENYA
Tel. (254) 20 884545; 882340
Fax. (245) 20 882265
director@kephis.org

Mr. Ralf LOPIAN (CPM Vice-Chairperson)
Senior Advisor
International Affairs
Food and Health Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
P.O.Box. 30 (Mariankatu 23)
00023 Helsinki
FINLAND
Tel. (358) 9 16052449
Fax. (358) 9 16052443
Ralf.Lopian@mmm.fi

INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE (IICA)

Ms. Maria de LOURDES FONALLERAS
Plant Health and Food Safety Specialist
Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
HQ, P.O.Box 55-2200 Coronado
COSTA RICA
Tel. (54 11) 4345 1210 int. 240
mlfonalleras@iica.org.ar

IPPC SECRETARIAT

Mr Richard IVESS
Coordinator
IPPC Secretariat
Plant Production and Protection Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
ITALY
Tel: +39 34 08561580
Fax: +39 06 5705 6347
E-mail: richard.ivess@fao.org

Mr Jeffrey JONES
Plant Quarantine Officer
IPPC Secretariat
Tel: +39 06 5705 2040
Fax: +39 06 5705 6347
E-mail: jeffrey.jones@fao.org