

REPORT

**Ottawa,
Canada
10-14
September
2007**

Nineteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

19th TC-RPPOs (2007) REPORT

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

Ottawa, Canada 10-14 September 2007

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
2007**

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 2007

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report of the Nineteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

List of Appendices

- I Agenda
- II Work programme of the Technical Consultation among RPPOs for 2007-2008
- III Comments by the 19th Technical Consultation among RPPOs on the Recommendations from the CABI Analysis of the Application of the PCE Tool
- IV Comments by the 19th Technical Consultation among RPPOs on the Recommendations of the Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the IPPC and its Institutional Arrangements relevant to Regional Plant Protection Organisations
- V Procedure for organising a Technical Consultation among RPPOs
- VI List of Participants

Note: The papers and power point presentations presented at the 19th Technical Consultation among RPPOs are available at www.ippc.int

Report of the Nineteenth Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations

Ottawa, Canada

10-14 September, 2007

1. OPENING OF THE NINETEENTH TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS

1. Mr. Ian McDonell, Executive Director of the North American Plant Protection Organisation (NAPPO), opened the meeting and welcomed the delegates to the 19th Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPOs). He informed the meeting that NAPPO was undergoing an independent evaluation and introduced the evaluation team of Dr. David McNamara and Mr. Robert Lahey. The evaluation team would be attending the TC-RPPOs and Mr. McDonell requested the TC-RPPOs' cooperation should the team request interviews.

2. Mr. Greg Stubbings, Director, Plant Health Division, Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) and current Chairperson of the NAPPO Executive Committee, officially welcomed the RPPO delegates to Ottawa. He explained the function of the CFIA Plant Health Division and mentioned that as a means of continuous improvement, regular reviews of activities were required and that the government of Canada was once again undertaking a review. The CFIA was among the first group of departments and agencies to be examined in the current study.

3. Mr. Stubbings outlined the scope of the NAPPO evaluation, which would include a review of the structure, strategic goals, organization and budget. The recommendations would be considered and used as the basis for an updated NAPPO strategic plan. He also mentioned that Canada was hosting the NAPPO annual meeting in October 2007, which would include a symposium on Invasive Alien Species. The Symposium would include presentations from Mexico, South America, New Zealand, Europe, USA and Canada.

4. Mr. Richard Ivess, Coordinator of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) welcomed the delegates on behalf of the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) of the United Nations and in doing so particularly thanked NAPPO for organizing the meeting. He explained that the meeting was convened under Article IX of the IPPC and as such was an official FAO meeting, which required a memorandum between the host country's Government and FAO. He reported that currently there were 164 contracting parties to the IPPC and anticipated that very soon all FAO and UN members would be contracting parties. He noted that that would have particular challenges particularly with attendance at IPPC-related meetings, as all future potential contracting parties were least developed or developing countries and funding from the FAO regular programme could not be used for that purpose.

5. The IPPC Coordinator briefly described the changing role of the TC-RPPOs. He said that prior to the review and revision of the IPPC (1997) with the subsequent formation of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM), the TC-RPPOs was the only mechanism that provided a global forum for discussions on phytosanitary issues. Following the creation of the CPM, the role of the TC-RPPOs had changed and he believed that the TC-RPPOs now had the very important function of being an operational/technical feedback mechanism. The TC-RPPOs was the opportunity for feedback from the contracting parties within the regions as how successful or otherwise the CPM programme was. He noted that the recently completed evaluation of the IPPC gave very strong support to the RPPOs and listed a number of suggestions and recommendations on their future role.

2. ELECTION OF CHAIRPERSON AND RAPPORTEUR

6. Mr. Ian McDonnell (Executive Director of NAPPO) was elected Chairperson and Ms. Ana Peralta (Coordination Secretary for the Southern Cone Plant Health Committee (COSAVE)) was elected Vice-Chair. Mr. Walther Enkerlin (Technical Director - NAPPO) was elected rapporteur.

3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. There were no additions/modifications to the agenda.

4: ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE EIGHTEENTH 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

8. The Director General of EPPO, Mr. Nico van Opstal recalled that during TC-17, EPPO had presented an explanation as to how official control was implemented in the European Union and wondered whether further elaboration was needed. The TC-RPPOs agreed that the need for a document had been superseded by events.

4.2 Legal interpretation of Article V 2a of the IPPC

4.2.1 FAO Legal Office

9. 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 TC-18 in order to give a legal opinion, as some delegates required clarification as to who could actually sign the certificate (the meeting agreed that the requirements relating to activities leading up to the issuance of the certificate were very clear). Following TC-18's request, the FAO Legal Office prepared a note on the interpretation of Article V. 2(a) particularly in relation to defining what a "public officer" was, which was attached as an appendix to the report (TC-18).

10. COSAVE was concerned in that they felt that the document presented to TC-19 by the IPPC Coordinator differed from the interpretation provided by FAO legal office at the 18th TC-RPPOs and that COSAVE had not been given the opportunity to comment on the changes. In particular COSAVE was concerned about the possible authorization of non-government persons to sign phytosanitary certificates.

11. NAPPO mentioned that any person with the appropriate experience and training and authorized by the National Plant Protection Organisation (NPPO) could issue phytosanitary certificates. The ultimate responsibility for the certificate remained with the NPPO. However COSAVE persisted with their interpretation of the IPPC in that only phytosanitary procedures leading to the issuance of PCs could be conducted by persons or entities other than the NPPO but the IPPC did not state that they could sign phytosanitary certificates. COSAVE stressed the importance of first clarifying the interpretation of public officer before a modification to ISPM 12 could be made. EPPO commented that the CPM Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) would be the best place to review the interpretation if necessary.

12. The TC-RPPOs noted the legal interpretation provided by the FAO Legal Office. COSAVE would follow up directly with the FAO Legal Office, via the IPPC Secretariat regarding their concerns.

4.2.2 NAPPO and COSAVE - Minimum requirements for a person to have signing authority for phytosanitary certificates

13. COSAVE and NAPPO had prepared a document (taking into account their own regional guidelines) on the minimum requirements for a person to have signing authority for phytosanitary certificates for possible consideration as a topic for an ISPM. This was discussed under Agenda item 9. The other RPPOs had been requested to discuss the situation with their members and supply comments to NAPPO, copied to the IPPC Secretariat (Agenda item 4.2.3). No comments were received.

4.2.3 Comments from other RPPOs

14. No comments pertaining to the minimum requirements for a person to have signing authority for phytosanitary certificates the were received from other RPPOs

4.3 Databases managed by RPPOs

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

15. The follow up action from TC-18 required 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 were satisfied. There was no substantial discussion on the subject, which could be included in the information exchange discussion to be held at the next TC-RPPOs.

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

16. In the situations where erroneous data had been identified in databases maintained by RPPOs, the “offending” RPPO should be immediately notified so they could rectify the mistake.

4.3.3 RPPO Databases

17. It was agreed at TC-18 that consideration of linking various databases to the international phytosanitary portal (IPP) would be part of an in-depth information exchange discussion at TC-19, and that the Secretariat would produce papers on reporting (would request information from the RPPOs). Unfortunately, due to lack of staff resources, the IPPC Secretariat was unable to produce the paper on reporting. The IPPC Coordinator explained that it was also preferable to defer the discussion a further year as the subject had been considered by the Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the IPPC and its Institutional Arrangements and it would be useful to wait for the outcome of CPM-3 (would consider the recommendations). The TC-RPPOs agreed that consideration of linking various databases to the IPP would be part of the in-depth information exchange discussion at the next TC-RPPOs.

Action: The IPPC Secretariat to ensure that consideration of linking various databases to the IPP is part of the in-depth information exchange discussion at the next TC-RPPOs (Rome 2008)

4.4 Presentations on reference laboratories - General discussion on reference laboratories

18. EPPO had contacted the Steward of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols to discuss the possible role of the TC-RPPOs and identify areas where it could assist the Panel (was waiting for a response).

5: REVIEW OF RPPO ACTIVITIES

i. Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)

19 The Executive Secretary of the APPPC, Mr Yongfan Piao (FAO Regional Plant Protection Officer), reported on recent activities including the development of: international/regional standards on phytosanitary measures (RSPM); a pest risk analysis (PRA) for South American Leaf Blight (SALB); strategic and business plans (covered the work of the three Standing Committees - adopted by the 25th Session of APPPC) and the strengthening of information exchange among member countries. He mentioned that the main priority for the coming year would be the development of the general regional standard for SALB. Other high priority areas included the development of draft SALB annexes, draft appendices to the RSPM scale standard and draft standards on Land Border Quarantine, and Sea Containers. The APPPC would also work on a selection of RSPMs designed to support the recently developed ISPMs relating to diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments and specific fruit fly standards.

20. A regional workshop financed by the Republic of Korea was held on draft ISPMs. The workshop felt that the draft ISPM *Classification of Commodities into Phytosanitary Risk Categories* should be withdrawn and rewritten as a short Appendix to ISPM No. 11. The participants also discussed ways of strengthening collaboration on the active involvement in the development of ISPMs and issues of concern with ISPMs No.7 and No.12.

21. Regional standards for phytosanitary measures included RSPM No.5: *Guidelines for Phytosanitary Emergency Measures*, and RSPM No.6: *Guidelines for Assessing the Phytosanitary Risks Associated with Scale Insects*. At the Review of Draft RSPMs held in Bangkok (21-24 November 2006), the criteria for the selection of priority pests for the development of protocols was discussed. A number of factors such as economic damage, distribution, and difficulties with identification were identified.

22. The APPPC organized a regional workshop in Bangkok (18-19 July 2007) to review and examine the PRA for SALB. It was recommended that the APPPC consider and accept the SALB PRA at its 25th Session (duly adopted) as well as considering the development of a general standard on SALB prevention in the region.

23. In order to strengthen the APPPC's role in information exchange, a standard format (Country Profile of Plant Protection) was developed for essential information, describing the organization and state of development of the different plant protection functions in member countries. The initiative promoted collection, collation and dissemination of crucial plant protection information and allowed a more systematic assessment of the state of plant protection in the region.

24. The 3rd Information Exchange IPP Training Workshop for the Asia Region was held in Malaysia from 14-17 Nov. 2006. It was attended by nominated officials responsible for entering the relevant information in the IPP. Participants received training in national information exchange obligations under the IPPC, the retrieval and dissemination of relevant official phytosanitary information and the entry of official information on behalf of their respective NPPO into the IPP.

ii. Andean Community (CA)

25. The representative of the Andean Community, Mr. Juan A. Palomino, Phytosanitary consultant, summarized the activities for 2007, which included updates of the implementation of ISPMs, pest lists (A1 and A2), and requirements for trading agricultural commodities. He described the implementation of the Andean System for Surveillance and Control of Phytosanitary and Zoosanitary Measures database, and the adoption of a Plant Quarantine Regulation for Andean Countries. Pesticide regulations were being established for the Andean region (Decision 436 and Resolution 630) and a workshop was being prepared for November 2007, with FAO support. A Phytosanitary Risk Category regulation for trade facilitation was underway.

iii. Southern Cone Plant Health Committee (COSAVE)

26. Ms. Ana Peralta, Coordination Secretary of COSAVE, informed the TC-RPPOs that the COSAVE Council of Ministers had reinforced their interests in regional, coordinated phytosanitary actions and work performed to look for common positions on IPPC technical issues as well as the production of regional technical documents to support NPPO negotiations. In November 2007 the Council of Ministers would consider and approve its biennial work plan

27. A workshop on the Agricultural Application of Standards for Phytosanitary Products in the COSAVE region was held in Asunción, Paraguay (13 - 17 November 2006). The intention of the workshop was to improve the regional capacities on 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. More than 100 participants, from both the private and public sectors, discussed the issue and a set of recommendations was produced.

28. A Regional Workshop on pest risk analysis was organized jointly with USDA/APHIS, on PRA and held in Santiago, Chile (April 9 -13, 2007). Thirty five participants from South America attended. Positive impacts on PRA processes in the region had been experienced as a result.

29. Two regional standards had been approved by the Council of Ministers, these being: RSPM 3.16, version 1.1.1, *Guidelines to establish the list of the main regulated pests for the COSAVE region* and RSPM 1.4, version 1.1, *Organization and Operation of Ad hoc Working Groups*

30. As from 01 March 2008, Paraguay would preside over COSAVE's Directive Committee.

iv. Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)

31. The representative from the Caribbean, Ms Shelia Harvey, Chief Plant Quarantine/Produce Officer, Jamaica, gave an update on the activities that had taken place in the Caribbean during the past year. She said that the decision to establish the Caribbean Agricultural Health Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) had been made by the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Governments in June 2006 but was yet to be implemented, the major difficulty being finance (the CARICOM Secretariat would be presenting various funding options to the Heads of Government at their Council for Trade and Economic Development (COTED) meeting in October 2007).

32. At the last meeting of COTED, the CARICOM Secretariat had been mandated to coordinate Plant Health activities pending the establishment of CAHFSA. The CARICOM Secretariat was planning a regional meeting of the managers of NPPOs for the first quarter of 2008.

33. Three regional Workshops were held during the year:
- i) WTO/SPS workshop was held in Jamaica, July 14 to 17, 2007. Thirteen countries from the region participated. The workshop was held jointly with the Codex Alimentarius Commission, IPPC and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE).
 - ii) Regional workshop to review the draft ISPMs (August 2007)
 - iii) Regional workshop for Plant Quarantine Officers in Jamaica (August 13-17 2007), on inspection procedures.

v. European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)

34. The Director-General of EPPO, Mr Nico van Opstal reported that in addition to EPPO's current role of developing tools for PRA, it was now also undertaking PRAs for specific pests (two in 2006 and three in 2007). Several national PRAs were reviewed as well, which had resulted in EPPO recommendations.

35. Activity was ongoing in support of diagnostics. A database on diagnostic expertise had been developed and more than 120 diagnostic laboratories had entered data. It was intended that there be unrestricted access to the database. Interpretation of the ISO standard 17025 for diagnostic laboratories was in progress. The interpretation was verified with the European accreditation body.

36. Substantial work was being done on invasive alien plants. Pest risk analyses had been conducted, a workshop on *Solanum eleagnifolium* had been held and a specific section in the EPPO Reporting Service was dedicated to Invasive Alien Plants.

37. EPPO anticipated a tremendous increase of the use of its Website and the EPPO Secretariat had invested much time and resources to provide better access to information through its Website.

38. A short overview was presented of the standards recommended for adoption by the EPPO Council, which included several diagnostic protocols, several standards on pathogen-tested production of plant material, quality assurance for diagnostic laboratories and inspection procedure for potatoes.

vi. Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)

39. There was no representative from the IAPSC at the TC-RPPOs.

vii. North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)

40. Mr Ian McDonnell, NAPPO Executive Director, presented the mission and strategic objectives of NAPPO and described its organizational structure, including the Secretariat, the Executive Committee, Working Groups, Industry Advisory Groups and Technical Panels. He welcomed Walther Enkerlin to NAPPO as NAPPO's Technical Director.

41. Two current high priority issues were highlighted. The first was a draft NAPPO standard on transgenic arthropods, which had completed country consultation and was in the final revision prior to presentation for approval by the NAPPO Executive Committee in October, 2007. The draft standard reacted to the fact that transgenic arthropods were already used in some pest control programmes (e.g. pink bollworm) in North America and there was increasing interest in that technology. The purpose of the standard was to harmonize the regulatory approach taken by the NPPOs in the NAPPO region because of the potential for cross-border movement of the organisms.

42. The second priority issue was presented by Mr Walther Enkerlin and concerned slowing and stopping the spread of *Cactoblastis cactorum*, a pest of cactus (*Opuntia* spp). A cooperative program between the United States and Mexico was in place with NAPPO playing a coordination role. *C. cactorum* was brought from its native Argentina many years ago as a biological control agent to clear rangeland in Australia. It had been used successfully in other countries but had entered the US and had spread from Florida to Georgia, South Carolina and Alabama. It was a threat to the arid ecosystems in southwest USA and Mexico as well as being a social and economic threat to Mexico, given its potential damage to the prickly pear industry. This problem could potentially affect other regions in the world where *Opuntia* cactus was a valuable resource.

viii. Regional International Organization for Agricultural Health (OIRSA)

43. The OIRSA report was given by Mr Plutarco Echogoyen. He explained that since its creation, OIRSA had accomplished countless activities regarding plant protection, some of which were within the framework of the IPPC. During the past few years the following activities were *inter alia* undertaken:

- Annual meetings of the Technical Regional Group for revision of proposed ISPMs posted for member consultation by the IPPC Secretariat (from 2002 to 2007)
- Regional pest detection surveys
- Maintenance of pest databases to support Pest Risk Analysis Units of the NPPOs of the Member Countries
- Training in phytosanitary measures and pest risk analysis
- Assistance to national programmes for surveillance, control and eradication of pests of economic importance.
- Development of contingency plans against pests of regional interest
- Financial support for a laboratory for the production of biological control agents to control the pink hibiscus mealybug (*Maconellicoccus hirsutus*)
- Two regional standards were approved by the Council of Ministers – one was a guideline on preparing regional plant protection standards and the other was related to the preparation of regulated plant pest lists
- Development of databases including pest information, phytosanitary requirements, phytosanitary regulations, etc.

ix. Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO)

44. The PPPO presentation was made by Mr Sydney Suma, Executive Secretary, Land Resources Division, Secretariat of the Pacific Community. Since the last TC-RPPOs, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Vanuatu had become contracting parties to the IPPC. The PPPO Members continued to participate actively in the international standard setting process including hosting a regional workshop to discuss the draft ISPMs and participation in the meetings of CPM subsidiary bodies.

45. Other major activities included harmonization of biosecurity laws in the region, training, maintenance of various databases and trade facilitation. Mr Suma highlighted the major activities planned for the future.

6: IPPC SECRETARIAT UPDATE

46. The Coordinator of the IPPC Secretariat gave a brief presentation on the 2007 activities of the IPPC Secretariat, which included updates on the Standards Setting programme, Information Exchange, Dispute Settlement, Technical Assistance and certain activities associated with the implementation of the Convention. With regard to the 2007 standards setting programme, one expert working group (plants for planting) and four technical panels had been held (the technical panel on fruit flies was cancelled due to lack of funding). Seven regional workshops on draft ISPMs were held. The IPPC Coordinator acknowledged the financial and in-kind contributions from the US and Republic of Korea that enabled three of the workshops to take place.

47. Information exchange activities included; general maintenance of contact information (NPPO/RPPO contact points), modification to the International Phytosanitary Portal (e.g. layout changes, more efficient code, improved Secretariat management options), non-official information (e.g. international organizations, discussion groups, treatment and diagnostic data bases), IPP data entry, statistics and the Information Exchange manual.

48. Technical assistance activities covered an update of the FAO Technical Cooperation Programmes, activities associated with the Standards and Trade Development Facility (e.g. the use of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool for the Pacific) and IPPC funded activities such as the working group on the PCE and the regional workshop on capacity building in pest risk assessment, PCE and ISPMs.

49. The IPPC Coordinator described various activities supporting the implementation of the IPPC. Mr Peter Kenmore had replaced Mr Niek Van der Graaff as Chief of the FAO Plant Protection Service (AGPP). The position of Chief involved *inter alia* fulfilling the role of Secretary of the IPPC. The USA had contributed funding for two Associate Professional Officers. The two positions had been filled (Information Exchange and Standards Setting) and both were making a major contribution to the Secretariat.

50. The Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the IPPC and its Institutional Arrangements was completed in July and presented to the FAO Programme Committee in September. An extraordinary meeting of the SPTA had been held to consider and comment on the FAO-related recommendations from a CPM point of view. The comments were forwarded to the FAO Programme Committee for consideration.

51. A Focus Group on the Standard Setting Process had been held in Rome (July 2007) and the October meeting of the SPTA would consider and recommend on both the IPPC Evaluation (recommendations for CPM-3) and the Focus Group findings (to the Standards Committee).

52. The IPPC Coordinator concluded his presentation by reporting on the status of the Trust Fund for the IPPC. USD 338,140 had been carried over from 2006 and additional contributions of USD 125,000 (for RWSs on draft ISPMs) and USD 37,000 had been received from the US and New Zealand respectively. It was estimated that there should be a carryover of funds into 2008 of about USD 50,000 (which would probably be used to assist attendance at the CPM meeting).

7: PCE TOOL - CABI RECOMMENDATIONS

53. Ms. Megan Quinlan, CABI Associate, presented a summary of the findings of the Analysis of the Application of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation tool by CABI Africa. The Second Session of the CPM had agreed that the recommendations provided by CABI and the comments of the IWG-PCE should be further considered by the 19th Technical Consultation among RPPOs and then by the SPTA for final presentation to CPM-3.

54. Ms. Quinlan reported on the potential value of the tool for national planning, new or improved legislation and justification for budgetary allocation. Use of the PCE had raised national awareness of the IPPC and ISPMs, and the role and obligations of the NPPOs. She reported that the PCE had been a very important component of technical assistance under the IPPC. However, it was noted that few, if any, of the countries who had applied the PCE had presented the results externally to successfully leverage additional resources for plant protection programs from donor organizations. There was reluctance to share the results following the application of the PCE tool and there was no system for collating results centrally, therefore global analysis of the impact of the PCE tool was difficult.

General Comments by the 19th TC-RPPOs on the CABI analysis of the Application of the PCE tool and recommendations of PCE evaluation

55. The TC-RPPOs proposed that as a first step, the contracting parties should reach agreement on the concept of technical capacity and whether the IPPC should address capacity required by the Convention and ISPMs, or capacity in the broader sense of an entire plant health system. The TC-RPPOs noted that the PCE was not intended to assess the credibility of an NPPO for trade purposes (as was done under OIE).

56. It was agreed that the SPTA should make decisions about “national phytosanitary capacity” and the appropriate role of the IPPC, for presentation to the CPM. In order to do this, the SPTA should have a concept paper laying out the issues. The TC-RPPOs agreed that the PCE needed to be considered within a larger package of technical assistance tools and should not be expected to solve all technical assistance problems. See **Appendix III** for specific comments on the CABI recommendations.

Action: Comments from the TC-RPPOs to be forwarded to the SPTA meeting for consideration

8: STRENGTHENING CAPACITY BUILDING (IAPSC)

57. The paper was not presented as there was no representative from IAPSC at the meeting.

9: INSPECTORS APPROVED TO ISSUE PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATES (NAPPO/COSAVE)

58. The Eighteenth TC-RPPOs (2006) discussed as part of the legal interpretation of IPPC Article V 2 a, the need to define a “Public Officer”, bearing in mind that the IPPC required that any “official” action be undertaken by such a “Public Officer”, and that such “Public Officer” shall have the minimum skills and qualifications required to enable the issuance of phytosanitary certificates in accordance with the pertinent provisions of the IPPC. The TC-RPPOs noted that there could be various interpretations of the words “Public Officer” which could vary from country to country. The possibility of an ISPM covering the area was discussed. NAPPO and COSAVE agreed to collaborate with the development of a document (based on their two individual regional standards) on the qualifications required to enable a person to be authorized as a signing official.

59. NAPPO presented the document and identified a number of differences in approach between the two regional standards, in particular whether or not a university degree was necessary in order to be able to issue/sign phytosanitary certificates (the TC-RPPOs agreed that ultimately the level of education would be established by the NPPO based on their own specific requirements).

60. The following comments were made by the various RPPOs.

- EPPO - situations differed in member countries and therefore no attempts had been made to prepare a regional standard.
- PPPO - the document had already been useful in the Pacific in developing some regional guidelines.
- OIRSA – suggested that the document could possibly form the basis of an ISPM.
- APPPC - the document should not be too prescriptive and agreed with a suggestion by EPPO that guidelines for best practices would be a more appropriate document c.f. an international standard.

61. Mr Steve Cote, CFIA, described the NAPPO audit system which measured NPPO compliance with the regional standard. The NAPPO Accreditation Panel conducted audits (on a rotating basis) in its member countries to ascertain if the RSPM was being implemented correctly. A check list of items was used to evaluate the system and in the past two years audits in Canada and the US had shown full compliance with the NAPPO regional phytosanitary standard (No. 8.). Mexico would be audited in 2008. The accreditation process used in Canada involved a modular training course, which required the candidate to receive a minimum 80% mark. The candidate must also have the required level of education and experience in order to become an authorized certification official. Interest was expressed by a number of RPPOs in having access to the manuals used for the training course.

62. COSAVE indicated that the issue of not having international agreement on the minimum requirements for a person to sign a phytosanitary certificate, linked with the interpretation by the FAO Legal Office on the term “public officer”, was very relevant to the confidence level placed on a phytosanitary certificate by an importing country. COSAVE felt that even if the TC-RPPOs could not reach agreement on the qualifications needed to sign a phytosanitary certificate, parts of the document would still be presented by COSAVE member countries for consideration when ISPMs No. 7 and 12 were being reviewed, with the intention that they be included in the revised versions of the ISPMs.

63. Ms Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde, Vice-Chair of the CPM suggested that a document could be forwarded to the Expert Working Group on the Revision of ISPMs 7 and 12.

64. The following was recommended:

Action:

- i) NAPPO (CFIA - Mr Steve Cote) to check to see if the course manuals were available for public distribution and advise the other RPPOs accordingly.
- ii) The NAPPO/COSAVE document to be revised as “Guidelines for best practices for officials issuing/signing phytosanitary certificates”
- iii) NAPPO to re-draft and circulate the document for feedback from other RPPOs (by the end of November, 2007). Comments to be sent to NAPPO by the end of the first week of January 2008.
- iv) NAPPO to make a final revision and forward it to the IPPC Secretariat as a document from the TC-RPPOs, prior to the Expert Working Group meeting (during the first week of February 2008).

Agenda item 10: Role and criteria for the ongoing recognition of an RPPO

65. The IPPC Secretariat Coordinator reported that concern had been expressed in that some RPPOs were not very active and should there be criteria to be met in order to maintain ongoing recognition as an RPPO under the IPPC. He recalled that an RPPO was an intergovernmental organization providing coordination on a regional level for the activities and objectives of the IPPC as laid down in Article IX. The 1997 revision to the Convention extended the responsibility of RPPOs to specify their cooperation with the IPPC Secretariat and the CPM.

66. The IPPC Coordinator explained that not all contracting parties to the IPPC were members of an RPPO (Japan being a notable example) and that not all members of RPPOs were contracting parties to IPPC, which was a problem as under the IPPC it was only the contracting parties who could agree to form RPPOs. The presence of non-contracting parties, assuming they had a say, could for example, influence selection of representatives on various IPPC-related bodies. It was also noted, out of interest, that a number of contracting parties to the IPPC belonged to more than one RPPO.

67. The IPPC Procedures Manual outlined the criteria for the recognition of RPPOs and listed the roles and functions. If an entity that wished to be recognized as an RPPO complied with the technical requirements (assessed by the TC-RPPOs), the TC-RPPOs would submit a recommendation for consideration by the CPM. With regard to “ongoing status”, COSAVE pointed out that there were at least five functions approved by the CPM that RPPOs should follow.

68. COSAVE noted the need to define collective actions/coordination in order to be able to address the RPPO obligations/expectations under the CPM business plan. NAPPO reminded the TC-RPPOs that relationships between RPPOs were voluntary; with the formal relationship being directly with the IPPC. NAPPO collaborated with other RPPOs based on common good and interests rather than obligation.

69. Rather than develop a check list that RPPO’s would have to meet to continue to be recognised by the CPM as an RPPO, the TC-RPPOs decided to take a positive approach and use the criteria for recognition to identify areas where some RPPOs may require assistance in order to meet the expectations under the IPPC.

Action The TC-RPPOs agreed to use the criteria for recognition of an RPPO to identify areas where some RPPOs may require assistance in order to meet the ongoing expectations/requirements under the IPPC.

11: CPM-2 FOLLOW-UP

70. The Second Session of the CPM (2007) identified three areas where input/assistance was requested from RPPOs, namely within the IPPC Standard Setting Programme and Acceptance of Documents in Electronic Format, i.e.

- i) **IPPC Standard Setting Work Programme** - The TC-RPPOs noted the deadline of September 15, 2007 for nominations for Expert Working Groups.
- ii) **10.3.4 Acceptance of Documents in Electronic Format** - The TC-RPPOs was reminded that the IPPC was waiting for responses to its request for NPPOs and RPPOs to accept electronic documents rather than by regular mail. RPPOs were asked to communicate with their member countries and encourage them to respond positively.
- iii) **ISPM No. 28: Phytosanitary Treatments for Regulated Pests (2007)** - RPPOs were identified as a means of channeling information to the Secretariat.

12: CPM-3: TOPICS FOR AN EXTERNAL PRESENTATION

71. At the Second Session of the CPM (2007), it was noted that other standard setting organizations, e.g. the OIE, included sessions to consider scientific issues within their annual meetings. The CPM was asked to consider instituting a half- or one-day session to consider issues such as new technology or new pest threats. The CPM requested the SPTA to examine the idea at a future meeting.

72. The issue was discussed at the June meeting of the CPM Bureau where it was felt that it would be very useful if the 19th TC-RPPOs could discuss cross cutting issues, i.e., new ideas/innovations that would assist with/improve the efficiency of the implementation of the IPPC, or “new” emerging potential pest problems. Ideas agreed/developed at the TC-RPPOs could be presented to the October meeting of the SPTA, with the view that two presentations be given on the Thursday afternoon of the Third Session of the CPM.

73. The following topics were suggested to be forwarded to the SPTA for consideration:
- The impact of climate change on plant protection
 - Implementation and the practice of using PRA Standards
 - Databases of diagnostic laboratories in terms of where experts are located and their expertise
 - Implementation of Systems Approaches
 - PIPE – Pest Information Platform for Extension and Education
 - Aquatic plants

Action: IPPC Coordinator to forward to the suggested list of topics to the SPTA for consideration.

13: PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS WITH ISPM NO. 7 AND ISPM NO. 12

74. NAPPO (Canada) presented a discussion paper on the need to revise ISPM 7 (Export Certification System) and ISPM 12 (Guidelines for Phytosanitary Certificates). The main problems experienced by Canada with the implementation of the two standards were:

- a lack of guidance on certain aspects relating to phytosanitary certification,
- the need to consult different sections in ISPMs 7 and 12 seeking guidance on phytosanitary certification and
- certain problems with the implementation of the standards by trading partners.

75. Some specific problems identified included the lack of guidance in relation to details for the treatment section of the phytosanitary certificate and insufficient guidance on the use of re-export phytosanitary certificates. The guidance provided in the standards was not being applied by some member countries, for example, some members attached treatment certificates to the phytosanitary certificate rather than completing the appropriate section.

76. EPPO noted that in particular cases where imported consignments were not released by an NPPO and could be split, combined, stored and repacked, further elaboration of the re-certification process was required. EPPO noted that the issuance of phytosanitary certificates for re-export was preferred but that it was important to ascertain the identity of the consignment and its phytosanitary status (including risks of contamination during storage) and to verify that the requirements of the final importing country were met.

77. COSAVE noted the lack of guidelines on the authorization of inspectors and how to assess the qualifications of the inspectors. In addition, as there was CPM approval on the use of the terms “should” “shall”, “may” and “must”, when ISPMs were reviewed they should be done so with the terminology in mind. Other points raised by COSAVE included:

- The ISPMs did not present guidelines on how to proceed when a re-exported consignment was rejected at destination.
- The need to declare quarantine treatments on the export certificate.
- The need to review information on phytosanitary certificates regarding human health and the environment, e.g. when an importing country did not require a specific treatment but a treatment was applied, should it be declared on the certificate (i.e. safety of inspectors).

78. Other points raised during the discussions included:

- PPPO - mentioned that an important challenge was to ensure there was full transparency in the implementation of phytosanitary procedures.
- In ISPM 12, section 1.3 was poorly worded.

Action: The TC-RPPOs recommended that:

- i) Canada’s document be forwarded as a discussion paper to the Expert Working Group reviewing the standards.
- ii) The observations presented by the RPPOs also to be forwarded to the EWG

14: PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH RE-EXPORT – NAPPO (USDA – APHIS)

79. NAPPO (USDA-APHIS) gave a presentation relating to the Revision of ISPMs 7 and 12; in particular on some of the issues facing re-exports, particularly with seeds for sowing. APHIS felt that ISPMs 7 and 12 did not adequately reflect the realities of the re-export trade or the capabilities of NPPOs, particularly in the situation of seed for sowing. The guidelines for certifying re-exports appeared to have been developed to address situations where a consignment was imported and then re-exported in its entirety, which was rarely the case in the trade of seed for sowing where importers often imported seed without knowing which countries the seed may ultimately be re-exported to.

80. APHIS reiterated that a re-export certificate should not be issued unless the consignment met the requirements of the 3rd country. However, it was recognized that the original phytosanitary certificate may not always be available (in some countries the certificate was taken by other agencies e.g. Customs) and if it was, in most cases it would not be able to verify that the requirements of a 3rd country were also met (the supply country would need to know that the seed was going to be re-exported and the requirements of the second importing country). To compound the problem, in the case of seed, consignments were often split and re-exported to more than one country.

81. In order to meet the above concerns, APHIS proposed a new document, a “Plant Health Passport (PHP).” Essentially the NPPO in the country of production would prepare the PHP based on the fact that the importer had conveyed their intention to re-export to named countries. Any special requirements to be met by the 3rd importing countries would be added to those of the primary importing country. Assuming this could be done, the PHP could then be used by the NPPO of the country of re-export to certify that the re-exported product met the importing country’s/countries’ phytosanitary requirements.

82. The TC-RPPOs was of the opinion that an additional document may not necessarily solve the problem. Issues discussed included:

- Ability to meet the requirements of a third country, i.e. the requirements of the country/ies of final destination would need to be known by the NPPOs of both the supply country and the country of re-export in order that any required measures could be implemented to enable appropriate certification.
- Official communication would be needed between the NPPO of the supply country and the NPPO of the country of re-export in cases where the requirements of the 3rd country were more difficult to meet than those of the country of re-export.
- It would require a commitment from the industry (export and import) to identify potential countries of destination, their specific phytosanitary requirements (confirmed by the NPPOs) and to assure that issued documents were kept and were available.
- The IPPC may have to be modified in order to adopt the concept of a PHP.
- Would cause an increase in workload for the NPPO in the country of production (not such a problem if activities were cost recovered from the supplier/exporter).

15: IPPC EVALUATION REPORT

83. At the Second Session of the CPM, the draft report of the Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the IPPC and its Institutional Arrangements was presented and the main findings described. The CPM discussed the need for further consideration of the report prior to its presentation to the FAO Programme Committee in September 2007 and agreed that an extraordinary meeting of the SPTA should be convened to review the recommendations of the final evaluation report that were FAO-relevant and generate CPM positions and other input for the Programme Committee.

84. As the SPTA would be considering all the recommendations of the Evaluation Report at its October 2007 meeting, it was considered opportune for the TC-RPPOs to comment on those recommendations and suggestions within the report that pertained to RPPO involvement in order to give the RPPO viewpoint. A table containing the relevant recommendations and responses by the TC-RPPOs is attached as **Appendix IV**. The IPPC Coordinator said that any assistance that could be provided by RPPOs to expedite the establishment of the Near East Plant Protection Organization would be appreciated.

Action: IPPC Coordinator to forward the TC-RPPOs comments on the recommendations and suggestions within the report that pertained to RPPO involvement to the SPTA for information/consideration.

16: CPM BUSINESS PLAN – ROLE/ACTIVITIES OF RPPOS

85. A revised business plan describing seven strategic 5-year goals was presented to the Second Session of the CPM in 2007. The important role undertaken by RPPOs was recognised and activities involving RPPOs were listed under all the Goals. The TC-RPPOs considered the goals and associated activities in order to determine whether any recommended modifications needed to be made (none), and how RPPOs could optimise their input. Comments were made as per the following paragraphs.

Action: A review of the Business Plan and RPPO involvement/implementation should be a standing agenda item for Technical Consultations among RPPOs.

Goal 1: A robust international standard setting and implementation programme.

86. Some RPPOs such as CA, COSAVE and EPPO were already placing emphasis on the implementation of ISPMs through the organization of workshops. OIRSA noted that one constraint for standard implementation (point 1.2) was the lack of adequate capacity in some member countries. For example, some countries may not have the adequate legal framework to implement some phytosanitary measures e.g. establishment of pest free areas. The TC-RPPOs noted that while playing an important role in assisting their members, it should be made clear that RPPOs were not involved in the development of national phytosanitary regulations.

Goal 2: Information exchange systems appropriate to meet IPPC obligations

87. The IPPC Coordinator told the TC-RPPOs that there was a need to get NPPOs and others to use the IPP and that the IPPC Secretariat was monitoring its use. EPPO had conducted a workshop on pest reporting with participation of 18 member countries, which resulted in a range of practical recommendations. EPPO agreed that encouraging all countries to commit themselves in fulfilling their pest reporting obligations and using the IPP was an important challenge. The PPPO reported that they were providing pest alerts for the IPP and that they were maintaining the pest list database of the small island nations in the region.

Action: All RPPOs to encourage their members to make active use of the IPP as a means to improve information exchange among IPPC contracting parties.

Goal 3. Effective dispute settlement systems

88. The IPPC Coordinator explained that any recommendation from an IPPC dispute settlement process was non-binding, but that both parties would agree that the recommendations would become the basis for renewed consideration of the dispute. The dispute settlement system of the IPPC was limited to issues falling within the scope of the IPPC and its standards, complementary (not in derogation) to procedures of other international organizations dealing with trade matters, e.g. WTO, and was primarily designed and expected to solve technical phytosanitary problems. It depended on the will and good faith of the parties to resolve the dispute.

89. NAPPO informed the TC- RPPOs that it had its own regional dispute mechanism aimed at solving disputes at the regional level. It had been used successfully between the member countries of NAPPO and hence NAPPO would not be likely to involve the IPPC Secretariat. CA also had an effective mechanism for complaints with the intent of resolving disputes within the region. OIRSA suggested the preparation of a guideline for RPPOs on how to develop dispute mechanisms within their regions.

Goal 4. Improved phytosanitary capacity of members

90. NAPPO suggested that the TC- RPPOs could be used as a forum to assess and establish priorities on future workshops and that such an activity could be included in the TC-RPPOS work plan. EPPPO supported the suggestion. OIRSA mentioned that FAO had provided assistance to identify phytosanitary weaknesses in their region but that very often there was a lack of resources to implement solutions to problems. The APPPC agreed and mentioned that the PCE tool identified problems but in many cases there was no means to follow-up with implementing solutions.

Action: The TC-RPPOS to be used as a forum to assess and establish priorities on workshops aimed at improving the phytosanitary capacity of members.

Goal 5: Sustainable implementation of the IPPC

Goal 6: International promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant regional and international organisations

91. Goals 5 and 6 were considered together. The IPPC Coordinator noted that one of the planned activity areas under Goal 5 was for the IPPC Secretariat to negotiate assistance from RPPOs with the implementation of the annual CPM programme, and that Goal 6 required efficient and effective communication between the RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat. The IPPC Coordinator said that starting from 2008, the CPM Operational Plan would be an ongoing agenda item for the TC-RPPOs and the RPPOs could input and identify those areas where assistance could be given.

92. NAPPO stated that as far as cooperating with the Secretariat and implementing the work plan was concerned, they were willing to continue to contribute by organizing workshops and Expert Working Groups.

Goal 7: Review of the status of plant protection in the world

93. It was suggested that the review of the status of plant protection in the world could be a standing agenda item of the TC-RPPOS, with issues such as pest occurrences, new technologies, etc. being topics to explore.

94. The TC-RPPOs recognized that RPPOs had commitments which were clearly stated in the business plan and that annually there were two meetings in which RPPOs should participate, i.e., the annual Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures and the regular (annual) Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organisations. CA noted that some RPPOs may need support from the Secretariat in terms of explaining to relevant Ministries the importance of RPPO participation in the above two mentioned meetings.

17: REGULATED NON-QUARANTINE PESTS

95. EPPO presented a suggested set of questions that they felt could help structure information exchange between RPPO representatives on the subject of regulated non-quarantine pests (RNQPs). They noted that several of their member countries saw many complexities in implementing the concept of RNQPs and that so far only a few had applied the concept.

96. NAPPO reported that it used the concept in limited instances, e.g. for those commodities with official, national certification programs such as seed potatoes. The certification programs had established tolerances for certain viruses. The PPPO did not apply the concept of RNQP. OIRSA had commenced with the implementation of the concept and to date, only Costa Rica had made use of it. Mexico indicated that non-quarantine pests had not yet been included in their list of regulated pests. COSAVE had answered EPPO's questionnaire and explained that the concept was applied by their member countries and even recognizing the complexities involved and lack of information, was including more pests. COSAVE offered the expertise of its region on this specific issue to the other RPPOs.

18: DISPUTE SETTLEMENT PRESENTATION

97. The IPPC Coordinator reminded the TC-RPPOs that Goal 3 (Effective dispute settlement systems) of the CPM Business Plan listed one of its areas as being: "3.1 Encouragement of the use of dispute settlement systems". One of the planned activities under the area was: "RPPOs to ensure members are aware of and able to use the dispute settlement system". He informed the meeting that the draft 2008 CPM Operational Plan requested that the RPPOs report at the 20th TC-RPPOs on any activities associated with the promotion and use of the IPPC dispute settlement mechanism.

98. A power point presentation on the IPPC dispute settlement mechanism was given, with the main points being:

- The scope was limited to issues falling within the scope of the IPPC and its standards and was for the resolution of technical problems.
- It was complementary to mechanisms of other international organizations such as the World Trade Organization.
- Primarily designed and expected to solve technical phytosanitary problems
- Options included consultation, mediation, arbitration, and good offices.
- One or both parties may request the D-G of FAO to establish an Expert Committee according to Article XIII.1 of the IPPC. The disputing parties had to agree on the Terms of Reference for the Expert Committee or it would not be established
- Advantages of the IPPC dispute settlement mechanism included:
 - Focused on technical differences
 - Improved the co-operation on a technical level
 - Minimized trade-political influences
 - Relatively fast
 - Cheap
 - Complemented the WTO dispute settlement mechanism at a technical level
- Disadvantages included:
 - Non-binding
 - Depended on the good will of parties to resolve the dispute
 - Any party could withdraw at any time
 - No appellate procedure

19: PROCEDURE FOR ORGANIZING A TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS

99. The IPPC Coordinator reminded the TC-RPPOs that an RPPO was an intergovernmental entity providing coordination on a regional level for the activities and objectives of the IPPC as laid down in its Article IX and that Article IX 4 required that the IPPC Secretary convene regular Technical Consultations of representatives of RPPOs. The TC-RPPOs was a FAO meeting (RPPOs were invited by the D-G FAO) and as such, FAO required an “agreement” with the host Government that the *Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the UN* would apply to the attendees at the TC-RPPOs.

100. The IPPC Coordinator presented a procedure (**Appendix V**) for guidance for RPPOs when hosting a TC-RPPOs, including an example of an invitation by an RPPO (NAPPO) to host the TC-RPPOs.

20: TC-RPPOs WORK PLAN FOR 2007/2008

101. Refer **Appendix II**

21: OTHER BUSINESS

Expanded Bureau

102. The IPPC Coordinator described the expanded bureau that would be established at CPM-3 in 2008. He said it would consist of the Chair and two vice Chairs (all from different FAO regions); and four other persons (one from each of the other four FAO regions). He reminded the TC-RPPOs that in order for the potential members of the Bureau to be appointed, they would have to be present at the meeting of the CPM. The Secretariat was asked to provide a list of “skill” sets to refer to when considering candidates for nominations.

Action: Secretariat to provide list of require “skills” to the RPPOs

22: DATE AND LOCATION OF THE TWENTIETH TC-RPPOs

103. The TC-RPPOs normally met in the last week of August/first week of September, which was useful in that tasks may be assigned to it by the CPM that could then be further considered by the SPTA meeting in October. EPPO noted that September was a difficult month for them due to their Executive Committee, and Council meetings. In addition, the recommendations from the country consultations on draft ISPMs would need to be collated and submitted to the IPPC Secretariat.

104. After some discussion, the TC-RPPOs agreed that the next TC-RPPOs would be held in Rome, Italy on 01-05 September 2008. [Note – this was subsequently altered to 25-29 August 2008 – RJI]

Action: The 20th TC-RPPOs among Regional Plant Protection Organizations will take place in Rome, Italy from 25-29 August 2008.

23: CLOSURE

105. NAPPO and the IPPC Secretariat Coordinator both thanked the participants for their very positive input into all the discussions held during the week.

Appendix I

**19th Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection
Organizations
10 – 14 September 2007**

Agenda

Monday 10 September

1. Opening of the Technical Consultation
2. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-chair and Rapporteur
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Actions arising from the Eighteenth TC-RPPOs
 - 4.1 Elaboration of the explanatory doc. prepared by
 - 4.2 Legal interpretation of Article V 2a of the IPPC
 - 4.2.1 FAO Legal Office
 - 4.2.2 NAPPO and COSAVE
 - 4.2.3 Comments from other RPPOs
 - 4.3 Databases managed by RPPOs
 - 4.3.1 Discussions on mechanisms to improve non-compliance information provided by RPPOs, including alert systems
 - 4.3.2 Discussions on mechanisms to improve information provided in databases managed by RPPOs
 - 4.3.3 RPPO Databases
 - 4.4 Presentations on reference laboratories
5. Review of RPPO activities (incl. organisation, regional standards, workshops)
 - 5.1 APPPC
 - 5.2 CA
 - 5.3 COSAVE
 - 5.4 CPPC
 - 5.5 EPP0
 - 5.6 IAPSC
 - 5.7 NAPPO
 - 5.8 OIRSA
 - 5.9 PPPO
6. Secretariat update

Tuesday 11 September

7. PCE Tool - CABI recommendations
8. Strengthening capacity building (IAPSC)
9. Authorisation of Individuals to issue phytosanitary certificates
10. Role and criteria for the ongoing recognition of an RPPO
11. Follow-up from CPM-2
12. CPM-3: Topics for an External presentation (Thursday session)

Wednesday 12 September

13. Presentation and discussion of implementation problems with ISPM No. 7 and 12
14. Problems associated with re-export
15. IPPC Evaluation Report –Comments by TC-19

Thursday 13 September

15. Continue IPPC Evaluation Report
16. CPM Business Plan – role/activities of RPPOs
17. Regulated Non-Quarantine Pests
18. Dispute settlement presentation
19. Procedure for organizing a TC
20. TC among RPPOs Work plan for 2007/2008
21. Other Business
22. Date and location of next TC

Friday 14 September

- 08:00 a.m. Agricultural field trip
- 15:00 p.m. Review the Report of the 19th TC-RPPOs

Appendix II

**WORK PROGRAMME OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION
AMONG RPPOS FOR 2007/2008**

	Activity	Responsible body
1	<p>4.3.3 RPPO Databases (Para 17)</p> <p>The IPPC Secretariat to ensure that consideration of linking various databases to the IPP is part of the in-depth information exchange discussion at the next TC-RPPOs (Rome 2008)</p>	IPPC Secretariat
2	<p>7: PCE Tool - CABI Recommendations (Para 55-56 and Appendix III)</p> <p>Comments from the TC-RPPOs to be forwarded to the SPTA meeting for consideration</p>	IPPC Secretariat
3	<p>9: Inspectors approved to issue phytosanitary certificates (NAPPO/COSAVE) (Para 58-63)</p> <p>i) CFIA to check to see if the course manuals are available for public distribution and advise other RPPOs accordingly.</p> <p>ii) The document to be revised as “Guidelines for best practices for officials issuing/signing phytosanitary certificates”</p> <p>iii) NAPPO to re-draft and circulate the document for feedback from other RPPOs (by the end of November, 2007). Comments to be sent to NAPPO by the end of the first week of January 2008.</p> <p>iv) NAPPO to make a final revision and forward it to the IPPC Secretariat as a document from the TC-RPPOs, prior to the Expert Working Group meeting (during the first week of February 2008).</p>	<p>CFIA</p> <p>NAPPO/COSAVE</p> <p>NAPPO, other RPPOs</p> <p>NAPPO IPPC Secretariat</p>
4	<p>10: Role and criteria for the ongoing recognition of an RPPO (Para 64-68)</p> <p>The TC-RPPOs agreed to use the criteria for recognition of an RPPO to identify areas where some RPPOs may require assistance in order to meet the ongoing expectations/requirements under the IPPC</p>	All RPPOs
5	<p>12: CPM-3: Topics for an External Presentation (Para 70-72)</p> <p>IPPC Coordinator to forward to the suggested list of topics to the SPTA for consideration.</p>	IPPC Secretariat

	Activity	Responsible body
6	<p>13: Presentation and Discussion of Implementation Problems with ISPM No. 7 and ISPM No. 12 (Para 73-77)</p> <p>The TC-RPPOs recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Canada's document be forwarded as a discussion paper to the Expert Working Group reviewing the standards. ii) The observations presented by RPPOs also be forwarded to the EWG 	IPPC Secretariat
7	<p>15: IPPC Evaluation Report (Para 82-83)</p> <p>IPPC Coordinator to forward the TC-RPPOs comments on the recommendations and suggestions within the report that pertained to RPPO involvement to the SPTA for information/consideration.</p>	IPPC Secretariat
8	<p>16: CPM Business Plan – Role/Activities of RPPOs (Para 84-92)</p> <p>A review of the Business Plan and RPPO involvement/implementation to be a standing agenda item for Technical Consultations among RPPOs.</p> <p>Goal 2: Information exchange systems appropriate to meet IPPC obligations All RPPOs to encourage their members to make active use of the IPP as a means to improve information exchange among IPPC contracting parties.</p> <p>Goal 4. Improved phytosanitary capacity of members The TC-RPPOs to be used as a forum to assess and establish priorities on workshops aimed at improving the phytosanitary capacity of members.</p>	<p>IPPC Secretariat</p> <p>All RPPOs</p> <p>All RPPOs</p>
9	<p>21: Other Business (Para 101)</p> <p>Expanded Bureau Secretariat to provide list of require "skills" to the RPPOs</p>	IPPC Secretariat
10	<p>22: Date and location of the 20th TC-RPPOs (Para 102-103)</p> <p>The 20th TC-RPPOs among Regional Plant Protection Organizations will take place in Rome, Italy from Sept. 1- 5 2008</p>	IPPC Secretariat

Appendix III

Comments by the
19th Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations
Recommendations from the CABI Analysis of the Application of the PCE Tool

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19th TC-RPPOs
<p>Group 1: An overall technical assistance (TA) strategy:</p>		
<p>Recommendation 1 That a strategic plan for TA be developed that addresses the full range of issues. While various subgroups, IWG, focus groups etc may engage in developing and implementing TA, they all must be aware of and working from a single cohesive strategy with timely cross communication. A coordination role must be appropriately assigned.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE fully supports the recommendation.</p>	<p>The TC agreed with Recommendation 1. The TC believed that (following) after recommendation 2, this should precede all other actions.</p> <p>The TC also recommended that, as part of this process, existing tools used on plant health issues be identified and collected from contracting parties or other sources, for consideration before new tools are developed (see recommendation 8)</p>

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19 th TC-RPPOs
<p>Recommendation 2 That the CPM endorses a definition of national phytosanitary capacity that best fits its vision and expectations for all efforts under the IPPC</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE fully supports the recommendation and proposes that it should be developed in the framework of the IWG-TA</p>	<p>The TC-RPPOs partly agreed with Rec. 2. It felt that rather than a definition, a concept paper should be prepared and that this recommendation should be responded and agreed to before the other recommendations. The TC felt that the concept paper should be drafted by the SPTA and that as it would be a universal concept, both developed and non-developing countries should participate in the formulation. The TC-RPPOs agreed that CABI would provide additional information to be used in the preparation of a concept document for the next SPTA.</p>
<p>Group 2 – Future development of the PCE</p>		
<p>Recommendation 3 That the PCE, (minus the information in Recommendation 7 below), be arranged into a stratified framework so that a user may follow the tool on a modular basis, going deeper into detail when more assistance is needed, with provision of links to additional information and guidance.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE agrees to this recommendation, and suggests modifying the structure of the PCE to include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grouping the ISPMs into conceptual categories (modules), avoiding the need to create different PCE modules for each ISPM. This means the PCE will require to be updated by categories (conceptual ISPMs) and not necessarily for the full content of the newer ISPMs. <p>The PCE should be modified so as not to display further questions when the answer to the lead question precludes the need for further questions on the same area.</p>	<p>The TC-RPPOs agreed with this recommendation.</p> <p>However, the TC-RPPOs suggests that recommendations 1 and 2 need to be addressed first.</p>

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19th TC-RPPOs
<p>Recommendation 4 That the IWG-PCE decides whether this new PCE should be linked to the Performance, Vision, Strategy (PVS) tool developed by the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA) as far as modules/topics or should remain independent of it.</p>	<p>Considering the stated objectives of each tool, the IWG-PCE felt that there was no need for any formal linkage but that recognition of the PVS was adequate. The meeting felt that proposed improvements to the PCE would, in any case, make it more comprehensive and suitable for the purpose for which it is used.</p>	<p>The TC was not in a position to comment as not all RPPOs were familiar with the IICA PVS tool. COSAVE indicated that the plant health PVS was still influenced by the fact that the original PVS was developed for animal health. COSAVE members felt that both tools (PVS and PCE) should remain separated.</p>
<p>Group 3 - Development of other tools:</p>		
<p>Recommendation 5 That the Subsidiary Body for Dispute Settlement consider the usefulness of individual ISPM implementation sheets, in the form of check lists, and how these would be developed.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE felt that this subject fell outside the intended use of the PCE. However the IWG-PCE acknowledged the need for other, more appropriate tools to be developed for this purpose</p>	<p>The TC agreed with the comments made by the IWG.</p>
<p>Recommendation 6 That the IICA PVS be adopted by the IPPC for rapid assessment of national phytosanitary systems, based on expert judgment, and as a starting point for engaging different stakeholders and agreeing priorities.</p>	<p>In view of the comments on recommendation 4, the IWG-PCE felt that there was no need to consider formal adoption of the IICA PVS</p>	<p>The TC was not in a position to evaluate Recommendation 6 (see comments on Recommendation 4)</p>

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19th TC-RPPOs
<p>Recommendation 7 That information commonly requested by trading partners, including the existing requirements for information sharing under the IPPC/ISPMs, be integrated into a harmonized template to be posted on the IPP with appropriate access.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE agreed to this recommendation, noting that templates for reporting obligations were already provided for. Similar provisions could be made to harvest specific PCE information, taking into account confidentiality of specific information and the need to avoid duplication of effort</p>	<p>The TC agreed with the IWG comment that information should be placed on the portal. However, the TC felt that more clarification was needed as to what exactly the recommendation meant (“... information commonly asked by trading partners, ...”), in order to avoid asking member countries for unnecessary and non-relevant information.</p>
<p>Recommendation 8 That simple tools, based on spreadsheets for example, be developed to address very specific evaluation objectives such as modeling risks, assessing efficiency of services, cost recovery calculations, investment decision making, etc.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE fully supported this recommendation and suggested to also include a spreadsheet dealing with the cost benefit of conformity with the international standards</p>	<p>The TC agreed that simple tools could be used for self assessment. It was noted that many NPPOs would not possess the expertise to develop risk models, cost recovery calculations, investment decision making, etc. Any tools would need to be adapted to developing country conditions.</p>
<p>Group 4 - Long term considerations:</p>		
<p>Recommendation 9 That a mechanism for collating information anonymously on NPPO capacity and related issues be designed and presented to the CPM for approval, taking account of confidentiality needs.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE suggests that this recommendation should be part of a TA policy recommendation (Recommendation 1) rather than a long term objective, but that there might be no need for CPM adoption.</p>	<p>The TC agreed with comments by the IWG and that there be an upfront requirement for the NPPO to provide information (in a form that could not be identified to source).</p>

CABI Recommendations	Comments by the IWG on PCE	Comment by the 19th TC-RPPOs
<p>Recommendation 10 That the role of reviewing uses of the information generated from the PCE/PVS and other tools be assigned appropriately, so as to learn of trends, ensure the accurate transfer of information and better communicate the needs and value of plant health to other sectors.</p>	<p>It was suggested that this recommendation should be considered under the TA strategy suggested in Recommendation 1</p>	<p>The TC agreed with the comments by IWG</p>
<p>Recommendation 11 That an initiative on the quality of phytosanitary data should be launched, as a targeted assistance to NPPOs. .</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE observed that quality of information put on the IPP was a responsibility of the Contracting parties. The IPPC Secretariat will be working with Contracting Parties to improve the quality of information reported under IPPC obligations</p>	<p>According to CABI, the IWG did not make a correct interpretation of the recommendation. The recommendation was more focused on improving baseline data collection (accuracy, appropriateness) within the countries and regions, in order to be able to address more adequately recommendation 8.</p>
<p>Recommendation 12 That all of the above systems and tools be reviewed for inclusion of environmental concerns, i.e. protection of domestic plant resources, rather than strictly trade related concerns.</p>	<p>The IWG-PCE felt that the process of incorporating environmental and other concerns was already in place and will be reflected more prominently in the revised PCE.</p>	<p>The TC noted that the environment was being considered within the context of the IPPC. The second part of the comment by the IWG is an assumption and could not be supported as the decision to revise the PCE has yet to be made.</p>

Appendix IV

**Comments by the
19th Technical Consultation among RPPOs
on the
Recommendations of the Independent Evaluation of the Workings of the IPPC and its Institutional Arrangements
Relevant to Regional Plant Protection Organisations**

Recommendation	Comment by TC-RPPOs
1. Standards and Standard-setting Process	
Quality and usefulness of standards	
1.5. Opportunities should be sought to make greater use of existing standards, particularly those developed by RPPOs;	Agree. This is already taking place.
Implementation of standards	
1.12. Regional workshops reviewing draft ISPMs should continue and new regional workshops promoting implementation should be initiated, with the assistance of RPPOs;	Agree with the recommendations including assistance from RPPOs. A coordinated strategy will be necessary between IPPC and RPPOs in order to accomplish the new regional WS on implementation. The TC-RPPOs notes that Goal 1 of the CPM BP includes RPPOs assistance to members for the implementation of standards.

Recommendation	Comment by TC-RPPOs
2. Information Exchange	
Increased availability of information	
2.5. The IPPC Secretariat should establish formal linkages with other information exchange mechanisms and their databases in particular with RPPOs and the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health, through Memoranda of Understanding or other appropriate mechanisms to improve the availability of information and to increase the usefulness of the IPP;	The TC-RPPOs agrees in principle with this recommendation, based on availability of the information.
2.6. Information provided through RPPOs should be recognized as a legal reporting route for the IPPC, providing that IPPC can harvest the information. This would imply that a standard format for data exchange be defined in the Memorandum of Understanding to permit periodic harvesting of data from these official sources.;	The TC-RPPOs agrees on recognizing the RPPOs as an official reporting route and using a standard format for this purpose. The TC-RPPOs believes that the word “legal” in the recommendation is not appropriate and should be replaced with the word “official”.
3. Technical Assistance	
4. Dispute Settlement	
5. Governance	
Effective management of the work to be undertaken by the Standards Committee	
5.7. RPPOs should be involved in the identification of appropriate candidates;	The TC agrees with this recommendation

Recommendation	Comment by TC-RPPOs
6. Secretariat	
7. IPPC's Financial Resources	
Regional Plant Protection Organisations (Suggestions)	
<p>Para 189. The evaluation team identified a number of areas where RPPOs could have a greater role in the implementation of the Convention, which are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a) Information Exchange: - The development of MOU for the establishment of systematic links with databases of RPPOs as discussed in the section above on Information Exchange; EPPO, NAPPO and COSAVE have particularly well-developed databases. - b) Standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) RPPOs could play a greater role regarding the development and implementation of ISPMs, including the organization and conduct of regional workshops to review draft ISPMs; ii) RPPOs could plan the regional implementation of adopted ISPMs in cooperation with the FAO Plant Protection Officers. This could also involve the coordination of technical assistance requirements for Contracting Parties to meet their obligations as well as the provision of technical assistance support to facilitate the implementation of ISPMs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The TC agrees b) i. The TC agrees and may be extended to cooperation between the RPPOs. ii). The TC agrees with the suggestion that in regions which have FAO Plant Protection Officers, a work plan should be developed for cooperation in implementation of ISPMs. However, coordination of technical assistance could be a new role for RPPOs and additional resources will be required and the capacity to varies from region to region. There may also be opportunities for collaboration among RPPOs in this activity

Recommendation	Comment by TC-RPPOs
<p>Para 190. The evaluation team was not in a position to conduct an evaluation of the RPPOs. However, it identified issues that need to be further explored and that should be addressed by FAO in the near future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission and the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission are FAO subsidiary bodies; FAO should review carefully its support to these bodies. In particular, it should define ways of ensuring greater independence and long-term sustainability; • Efforts should be undertaken to finalize the establishment of the Near East Plant Protection Organization; and • FAO, in collaboration with relevant regional bodies, should explore opportunities to strengthen the capacity of certain RPPOs, such as the Inter African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC), in collaboration with the African Union (AU). 	<p>The TC-RPPOs believes that this is an FAO issue.</p> <p>The TC-RPPOs agrees with the comment regarding the Near East PPO.</p> <p>The TC-RPPOs agrees with the comment and noted that strengthening capacity should not be limited to only some RPPOs.</p>

Appendix V

PROCEDURE FOR ORGANISING TC-RPPOs

- i) **August/September** - TC-RPPOs decides at the meeting the host of the next TC-RPPOs (plus back up) and designates a contact point.
- ii) **August/September** - On return to their country the RPPO representative (contact point) confirms with their parent organisation agreement to host the next TC-RPPOs
- iii) **October** - Contact point confirms agreement to hold the next TC with the IPPC Secretariat
- iv) **November** - IPPC Coordinator supplies the RPPO contact point with a copy of a model letter to be sent from the host RPPO/Ministry of Agriculture/... to the D-G FAO offering to host the next TC-RPPOs
- v) **December** - Host RPPO/Ministry drafts the letter and forwards to Coordinator IPPC for comment/checking
- vi) **January/February** - "Host letter" sent to FAO D-G
- vii) **March** - FAO (Knowledge and Communication Department) communicates with the appropriate minister in the host country thanking them for the offer to host the TC-RPPOs and requests acceptance of the host Government of the appropriate sections of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations.
- viii) [CPM (March) – informal meeting of RPPOs to confirm agenda for the next TC-RPPOs]
- ix) **April** - Host Government confirms acceptance
- x) **June/July** - D-G FAO sends invitations to the RPPO contact points plus invited observers (EC, Japan and the WTO)
- xi) **August/September** - TC-RPPOs

Example of an invitation by an RPPO (NAPPO) to FAO offering to host the TC-RPPOs

Mr Jacques Diouf
Director-General

...

Dear Mr Diouf

I have the honour to write you concerning the 19th Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPO) of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). The North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) proposes to host the meeting in Ottawa, Canada from September 10-14, 2007.

NAPPO headquarters are located in Ottawa, Canada. As the host of the 19th Technical Consultation, NAPPO will take responsibility for all costs related to the organization and conduct of the meeting and will coordinate the administrative and operational arrangements with the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division.

All the current RPPOs will be invited to attend, including: the Andean Community (CA), the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC), the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC), the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO), the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC), the Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO), the Regional International Organization for Plant Protection and Animal Health (OIRSA) and the Southern Cone Plant Protection Committee (COSAVE), as well as the Inter American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA).

I look forward to your positive consideration of this request.

Sincerely

Appendix VI

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS

<p>Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission</p> <p>Mr. Yongfan Piao c/o FAO Regional Office for Asia and Pacific Maliwan Mansion 39, Phra Atit Road Bangkok, 10200 Thailand Tel.: + 66 2 697 4268 Fax: + 66 2 697 4400 Email: Yongfan.Piao@fao.org</p> <p>Mr. Jingquan Zhu Plant Quarantine Division National Agro-Technical Extension and Service Center(NATESC) Ministry of Agriculture, P.R China, P.C.100026 Tel: 8610-64194524,Fax:8610-64194726 Email: timzjq@agri.gov.cn</p> <p>Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)</p> <p>Ms. Shelia Y. Harvey Chief Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture Jamaica Tel.: 1 876 977 0637 Fax: 1 876 977 6992 Email: syharvey@moa.gov.jm; sheharv@yahoo.com</p> <p>Comite de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE)</p> <p>Ms. Ana Peralta Coordination Secretary Av. Libertador Bernardo O'Higgins (Alameda) 1315, 5to. piso oficina 52 Santiago de Chile Tel.: +56-2 6710722 Email: ana.peralta@sag.gob.cl</p> <p>Comunidad Andina (CA)</p> <p>Mr. Juan Palomino Paseo de la República 3895, esq. Aramburú, San Isidro, Lima 27 Peru Tel. (511) 411 14 00, ext. 1489 Fax: (511) 221 33 29 Email: jpalomino@comunidadandina.org</p>	<p>European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)</p> <p>Mr. Nico van Opstal Director-General European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization 1, rue le Nôtre 75016 Paris, France Tel.: (33) 1 4520 7794 Fax.: (33) 1 4224 8943 Email: hq@eppo.fr</p> <p>North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)</p> <p>Mr. Ian McDonell NAPPO – Executive Director 1431 Merivale Rd., 3rd Floor, Room 309 Ottawa, ON KIA 0Y9 – Canada Tel.: (1) 613 221 5144 Fax.: (1) 613 228 2540 Email: imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca</p> <p>Alba Campos NAPPO – Executive Assistant 1431 Merivale Rd., 3rd Floor, Room 309 Ottawa, ON KIA 0Y9 – Canada Tel.: (1) 613 221 5145 Fax.: (1) 613 228 2540 Email: camposa@inspection.gc.ca</p> <p>Mr. Walther Enkerlin NAPPO Technical Director 1431 Merivale Rd., 3rd Floor, Room 309 Ottawa, ON KIA 0Y9 – Canada Tel.: (1) 613 221 51474 Fax.: (1) 613 228 2540 Email: enkerlinw@inspection.gc.ca</p> <p>Marta Singh NAPPO – Translator 1431 Merivale Rd., 3rd Floor, Room 309 Ottawa, ON KIA 0Y9 – Canada Tel.: (1) 613 221 5145 Fax.: (1) 613 228 2540 Email: singhm@inspection.gc.ca</p>
--	--

Mr. Steve Côté
Senior Plant Health Standards Officer
Plant Health Division, Canadian Food Inspection
Agency
Floor 3, Room 3213 E
59 Camelot Dr., Ottawa ON K1A 0Y9
Tel.: (1) 613 221 4546
Fax: (1) 228 6602
Email: cotes@inspection.gc.ca

Mr. Mario Puente
Director de Regulación Fitosanitaria
Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal
Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela No. 127
Col. del Carmen, Coyoacán
México, D. F., CP 04100, México
Tel.: (1) 52-55-5554 5147
Fax: (1) 52 55 5658 0696
Email: mpuente@senasica.sagarpa.gob.mx

Ms. Julie E. Aliaga
International Phytosanitary Standards Program
Director
USDA APHIS PPQ
4700 River Road, Unit 140
Riverdale MD 20737 US
Tel.: (1) 301 734-0763
Fax: (1) 301 734 7639
Email: Julie.E.Aliaga@aphis.usda.gov

Mr. Nancy Klag
Phytosanitary Issues Management Deputy Director,
USDA APHIS PPQ
Tel. (1) 301 734 8469
Fax: (1) 301 734
Email: narcy.g.klag@aphis.usda.gov

Ms. Karen Bedigian
Senior Export Specialist, USDA APHIS PPQ
Tel.: (1) 301 734 5712
Fax: (1) 301 734 7639
Email: karen.j.bedigian@aphis.usda.gov

Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)

Plutarco Elías Echegoyén Ramos
Sanidad Vegetal
Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)
Calle Ramón Belloso y Final Pasaje Isolde, Colonia Escalón, San Salvador, El Salvador, Centro América
Tel.: + (503) 2209-9222
Fax: (503) 2263-1128
Email: pechegoyen@oirsa.org

Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)

Mr. Sidney Suma
Executive Secretary
Land Resources Division
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
Private Bag Mail Service, Suva
Fiji Islands
Tel.: (1) 679 337 0733; 9233
Fax: (1) 679 337 0021
Email: sidneys@spc.int

Ms Lois Ransom
Chief Plant Protection Officer
Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer
Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Tel.: (1) 61 2 6272 4888
Fax: (1) 61 2 6272 5835
Email: Lois.Ransom@daff.gov.au

Other International Organizations - CABI

Ms. Mary Megan Quinlan
CABI Associate
Suite 17, 24-28 Saint. Leonard's Road
Windsor, Berkshire SL4 3BB
United Kingdom
Tel.: +44 1753 854 799
Email: quinlanmm@aol.com

Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO)	Canadian Food Inspection Agency Observers
<p>Richard Ivess Coordinator IPPC Secretariat Plant Production and Protection Division FAO 00100 Rome, Italy Tel.: (39) 06 5705 3588 Fax.: (39) 06 5705 6347 Email: Richard.Ivess@fao.org</p>	<p>Vivian Brownell Nathalie Bruneau Brian Double Marie-Claude Forest Kanwal Kochhar Klaus Koehler John McDonald Dominique Pelletier Christine Tibelius Billy Williams</p>
<p>Ms. Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde Vice-Chair IPPC Commission on Phytosanitary Measures FAO</p>	
<p>Manager International Plant Protection Issues Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa ON K1A 0Y9 Tel: (1) 221 4344 Fax: (1) 228 Email: rbast@inspection.gc.ca</p>	