

REPORT

Rome,
Italy,
7-11 April
2008

Third Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Report of the

Third Session of the
Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

Rome, 7-11 April 2008

CONTENT

Report of the Third Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

<i>Appendix 1</i>	Agenda
<i>Appendix 2</i>	Action items for SPTA responses to the recommendations of the independent evaluation of the workings of the IPPC and its institutional arrangements
<i>Appendix 3</i>	Amendments to ISPM No. 5 (<i>Glossary of Phytosanitary terms</i>)
<i>Appendix 4</i>	ISPM No. 30: <i>Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i>
<i>Appendix 5</i>	ISPM No. 31: <i>Methodologies for sampling of consignments</i>
<i>Appendix 6</i>	IPPC Recommendation: <i>Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure</i>
<i>Appendix 7</i>	Hierarchy of terms for standards
<i>Appendix 8</i>	Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme
<i>Appendix 9</i>	General considerations for standard setting
<i>Appendix 10</i>	IPPC standard setting procedure (Annex I of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM)
<i>Appendix 11</i>	Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for Technical Panels
<i>Appendix 12</i>	Provisions for the availability of documents
<i>Appendix 13</i>	IPPC standard setting work programme
<i>Appendix 14</i>	Programme for the Development of the “IPPC Implementation Review and Support System”
<i>Appendix 15</i>	Terms of Reference for the Open-ended Working Group on Building National Phytosanitary Capacity
<i>Appendix 16</i>	Model text for letter on acceptance of correspondence in electronic format
<i>Appendix 17</i>	Composition of the CPM Bureau
<i>Appendix 18</i>	Standards Committee: membership and potential replacements
<i>Appendix 19</i>	Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement: membership and potential replacements
<i>Appendix 20</i>	List of participants

THIRD SESSION OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Rome, 7-11 April 2008

REPORT

1. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. Mr Butler, Deputy Director-General of the FAO, opened the Third Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and welcomed the delegates.

2. He recalled the Director-General's opening address to the Second Session of the CPM in 2007, which mentioned the challenges facing the prevention of the transboundary movement of plant pests. He added that another challenge, that of climate change, also needed to be considered. He noted that the 34th FAO Conference called for expert meetings on climate change and bioenergy, to be followed by a high level meeting in June 2008. FAO recognized that the impact on food security due to climate change was likely to be one of the biggest challenges of this century and that most of those who suffer from hunger live in developing countries, which are predicted to be most affected by climate change.

3. The Deputy Director-General indicated that capacity building was an absolute priority and supported the development of a technical assistance strategy for phytosanitary capacity building. He noted that there were currently 166 contracting parties to the IPPC and that it would only be a short time before all FAO members were included. The CPM must ensure that the purpose of the IPPC was realized and that the needs of contracting parties were met. He supported the development of the 5-year business plan and noted with concern that the full requirements of the 2008 operational plan would not be met due to lack of staff and resources. He stated that FAO would continue funding the IPPC Secretariat from its regular programme budget, but would not be in a position to provide full annual funding of activities to meet the business plan. He called on contracting parties to press their countries to help fund this important programme. He also noted the paper to be presented to the CPM on project-oriented planning for the trust fund and asked members to give it their full attention and support.

4. He acknowledged and thanked members who had contributed to IPPC trust funds and provided in-kind support. Due to contributions from donors, over 70 delegates from developing countries attended last year's CPM meeting and seven regional workshops for the review of draft ISPMs were held in 2007. He welcomed the Associate Professional Officers and Visiting Experts provided by countries to work in the Secretariat, and also the additional in-kind contributions made in support of expert working groups, workshops, organizing and hosting meetings, and funding the attendance of the IPPC Secretariat at some meetings.

5. The Deputy Director-General noted the full agenda of the CPM meeting and noted in particular the importance of discussing the outcome of the evaluation of the IPPC. He offered his best wishes for the meeting's success.

6. The CPM noted the Statement of Competence and Voting Rights¹ submitted by the European Community and its 27 member states.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

7. The agenda² was adopted (Appendix 1).

¹ CPM 2008/INF/11

² CPM 2008/1/Rev.2

3. ELECTION OF THE RAPPORTEUR

8. Mr Ashby (United Kingdom) was elected by the CPM as rapporteur.

4. REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

9. The CPM Chairperson, Mr Kedera, presented his report³. He noted the large number of contracting parties and emphasized the challenge of financing the IPPC's operation to ensure that the CPM met its goals and was sustainable.

10. Some activities on the work programme had to be cancelled by the Bureau, the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) or the IPPC Secretariat because of lack of resources. He noted that in particular, trust funds were critical for the participation of developing countries in CPM-related activities. He noted that project-oriented budgeting of trust fund activities was envisaged as a means to tackle the lack of resources and provide parties with the means to talk to potential donors.

11. Regarding the outcome of the evaluation of the IPPC, which was discussed by the extraordinary and regular meetings of the SPTA, he noted that it would be critical for the CPM to consider the issues carefully, particularly in terms of resources and expectations.

12. The Chairperson stressed the importance of the proposal for a technical assistance strategy in order to build awareness and capacity for members to implement the provisions of the IPPC.

13. The Business Plan adopted at CPM-2 gave targets for future work but the realization of the work programme would require adequate staffing of the IPPC Secretariat. He acknowledged the decision to have a full time Secretary but noted that other positions should also be filled.

14. He noted that the Bureau was finishing its term at the current session. He thanked the Vice-Chairpersons for the tremendous amount of work accomplished, and thanked the CPM for the confidence shown in electing him as Chairperson.

15. The CPM:
1. *Noted* the report.

5. REPORT BY THE SECRETARIAT

16. The Secretary presented the report of the IPPC Secretariat for 2007⁴. He noted that the Second Session of the CPM had been the largest yet, with 132 contracting parties in attendance. He thanked countries and organizations for their contributions to Trust Funds for the IPPC and in-kind contributions.

17. The Secretary detailed the standard setting activities undertaken in 2007, especially by the Standards Committee (SC) and the Focus Group on the review of standard setting procedures, and the development of pest risk analysis training materials, which were now available on the website of the IPPC. He also indicated that over 150 delegates had attended regional workshops to review draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs).

18. Regarding information exchange, the Secretary noted the marked improvement of the accuracy of contact point details but mentioned that up-to-date information or nominations of contact points were still missing for some countries. A full-time webmaster had been appointed through the

³ CPM 2008/INF/3

⁴ CPM 2008/INF/9

Associate Professional Officer programme. He also noted that all FAO regions had now had a workshop on information exchange with a subsequent increase in the use of the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).

19. On dispute settlement activities, the Secretary reported that the Secretariat and FAO had provided advice to some countries.
20. The Secretary indicated that in addition to national capacity building projects in many countries, regional workshops had been held in various regions; to review draft ISPMs, on pest risk analysis and on the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool. . The PCE tool was being updated and strengthened and the Informal Working Group on Technical Assistance had discussed a set of priorities for this in 2008. The IPPC Secretariat had also participated in capacity building activities of other organizations such as the WTO-SPS Committee.
21. He noted that the Secretariat was seriously understaffed when compared with the numbers required in the Business Plan and recommendations made by the independent evaluation of the IPPC. Those countries who had contributed temporary staff through the Associate Professional Officer and Visiting Scientist programmes were thanked. The Secretary noted the activities of the FAO regional plant protection officers and stressed their importance in IPPC activities.
22. Although the Secretariat had not been able to commit resources to defining standards in relation to electronic certification, it was monitoring activities in that area. The Secretariat continued to participate in meetings held by other relevant organizations, within the limits of available resources.
23. The Republic of Korea expressed its appreciation to participating countries and the Secretariat of the APPPC for the success of the regional workshop on draft ISPMs for Asia in 2007 and indicated its intention to host that regional workshop again in 2008.
24. Canada indicated that it, together with the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO), was planning to host an international workshop on electronic certification in November 2008 to facilitate discussion on that topic.
25. The CPM:
 1. *Expressed* its gratitude to countries and organizations that had provided assistance and resources to the work programme.
 2. *Noted* the information provided by the Secretariat on the progress undertaken in 2007 on the CPM work programme.

6. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG REGIONAL PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATIONS

26. The Chairperson of the 19th Technical Consultation among RPPOs (TC-RPPOs)⁵ underlined the excellent attendance (eight RPPOs out of nine) and preparation for the meeting. He outlined the benefits of the TC-RPPOs including exchanging information on activities in the various regions.
27. He gave an overview of the topics discussed at the meeting, such as the CABI-Africa recommendations on the PCE tool, regional standards, training and information exchange for pest risk analysis and specific pest issues. He noted the increased emphasis in regions on invasive alien species.
28. He reported that the TC-RPPOs had discussed a number of items related to the implementation of ISPM No. 7 (*Export certification system*) and No. 12 (*Guidelines for phytosanitary certification*). Country experiences were presented and issues such as re-export (especially for seeds and plants for planting) were discussed.

⁵ CPM 2008/INF/1

29. The TC-RPPOs reviewed and gave advice on the recommendations of the IPPC evaluation that related to RPPOs. In particular RPPOs could be seen as additional resources for activities that the CPM did not have resources to carry out, for example in relation to electronic certification and could provide assistance for other activities, such as regional workshops on draft ISPMs,

30. The 20th TC-RPPOs would be held in Rome in August 2008.

31. The CPM:
1. *Noted* the report.

7. REPORT OF OBSERVER ORGANIZATIONS

7.1 WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary Committee

32. The WTO representative outlined work undertaken in 2007 by the WTO-SPS Committee that was of relevance to the CPM and the IPPC⁶, in particular new transparency procedures encouraging members to notify all new or modified measures, including those based on international standards. This would provide further predictability to the trading system, and would help to monitor the implementation of international standards globally. The WTO-SPS Committee had discussed the issue of private standards. Its members had raised a number of concerns regarding the trade, development and legal implications of private standards. The SPS Committee had agreed to maintain the issue on the agenda of its meeting. The issue of regionalization (i.e. pest free areas) had been under discussion since 2003 in relation to the implementation of Article 6 of the SPS Agreement and some members had indicated a preference to see it addressed by the IPPC and other appropriate bodies. A draft decision was under review which referred to the work of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) and IPPC, but the guidelines were not intended to duplicate work done by these bodies. The representative thanked the Secretariat for facilitating IPPC participation in SPS regional workshops.

33. The second review of the SPS Agreement had started in 2004, and the Committee had agreed to use ad hoc consultations to review trade concerns and the dispute settlement systems of the IPPC, OIE and Codex Alimentarius Commission.

34. The CPM:
1. *Noted* the report.

7.2 Standards and Trade Development Facility

35. The WTO representative presented the STDF report⁷. She noted that the STDF was a joint initiative and a vehicle for cooperation for technical assistance providers, mobilisation of funds, demonstrating best practices and implementation of international standards. The STDF was also organizing thematic workshops, such as the one on capacity evaluation tools. It could serve as a forum to promote coordination in international agencies in relation to the large number of tools available for technical assistance.

36. She encouraged National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) to submit applications for projects. The deadlines for submitting applications to the STDF review group were 25 April and 2 September, although they could be submitted at any time. She reported that at the STDF working group meeting during the week of 30 March 2008, the IPPC proposal on PRA training was considered favourably but the final decision would not be made until June 2008.

37. The CPM:

⁶ CPM 2008/INF/12

⁷ CPM 2008/INF/13

1. *Noted* the report.

7.3 Convention on Biological Diversity

38. The IPPC Secretariat presented a report on behalf of the Secretariat of the CBD⁸. The report noted that the growing scale of human activities, including global trade, contributed to non-native species invasions that threatened biodiversity and were costly to control. It also noted that collaboration between the IPPC and CBD had been in development since 2004 and that the partnership strengthened the CBD programme of work on invasive alien species.

39. In 2006, the eighth Conference of Parties to the CBD (COP-8) mandated the CBD to consult with relevant international bodies regarding gaps in the international framework of standards covering invasive alien species that were not pests of plants under the IPPC. The results of the consultation were discussed at the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) meeting at FAO in Rome in February 2008 and would be presented to the COP-9 in May 2008.

40. During the SBSTTA session, the Secretariats of the IPPC and the CBD held a joint meeting and updated their joint work programme.

41. The CPM:
1. *Noted* the report.

7.4 Montreal Protocol

42. The IPPC Secretariat presented a report on behalf of the Ozone Secretariat regarding its activities of relevance to the IPPC in 2007⁹. The report noted that the parties to the Montreal Protocol encouraged continued cooperation between the Montreal Protocol and the IPPC. As a concrete result of this collaboration, a joint IPPC-Montreal Protocol brochure on “Methyl Bromide: Quarantine and Pre-shipment Uses” had been published in 2007. The Ozone Secretariat also asked for an update on the status of the draft ISPM on alternatives to methyl bromide.

43. The CPM:
1. *Noted* the report.

7.5 Other Observer Organizations

7.5.1 Report of the World Organisation for Animal Health

44. The OIE representative reported on recent activities¹⁰ that paralleled those of the IPPC such as regionalization, capacity building and dispute mediation. Regarding regionalization, it was reported that OIE was promoting the use of disease free ‘zones’ (defined by geographical features) and ‘compartments’ (defined by management practices) to facilitate trade. In addition, new guidelines on compartmentalization would be presented to the OIE General Session in May 2008.

45. The representative noted that the OIE emphasized capacity building and collaborated with other organizations and donors in that regard, including within the WTO and STDF framework.

46. In respect of dispute settlement, the representative reported that the OIE provided a voluntary, informal mechanism to help members to resolve disputes. It was based on science and supported by experts. The outcomes of the process were not legally binding, unless so agreed in advance; any costs were incurred by the parties involved.

⁸ CPM 2008/INF/22

⁹ CPM 2008/INF/17

¹⁰ CPM 2008/CRP/6

7.5.2 Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture

47. The IICA representative described their recent activities¹¹ on regional capacity building. He discussed the implementation of tools for NPPOs to develop capacity of government services, the development of a handbook for phytosanitary procedures and various regional workshops. He noted that IICA continued to interact with existing institutions as well as developing work with new ones.

7.5.3 Southern African Development Community

48. A representative from the SADC secretariat noted the great importance placed on plant protection, on control of pests and impact on trade. He reported that the SADC secretariat aimed to strengthen dialogue among the NPPOs of its member states, and actively promoted involvement of its members in the IPPC. SADC had facilitated member participation at the CPM through travel assistance and preparatory workshops and was encouraging members who were not parties to the IPPC to adhere to the treaty. The representative noted the strong links between SADC and the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC).

7.5.4 Inter African Phytosanitary Council

49. The representative reported that the IAPSC had undergone a reorganization with the aim of improving its functions, fulfilling its mandates and exploring partnerships. He noted that the Council intended to strengthen regional information exchange networks.

50. The representative expressed gratitude to the USA for funding regional workshops on draft ISPMs, but noted concern on funding for coming years. He also thanked the EU for assisting the Africa region's participation in the IPPC standard setting process. The representative noted that gaps in infrastructure and legislation impeded the implementation of standards in the region. He noted that the Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service has been utilized and would be strengthened as an African centre of excellence and that additional centres of excellence and other infrastructural projects might be developed in other regions.

51. The representative reported that a proposed collaboration between the IAPSC and the Ecoport Foundation to strengthen access to technical information related to biosecurity was under review. He announced that the 40th anniversary of IAPSC within the African Union mechanism would take place in 2009, and invited the participation of the international community in the associated conference and book launch on phytosanitary initiatives in Africa.

52. It was noted that cassava pests presented an emerging phytosanitary concern in several regions.

8. RESPONSE TO THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE WORKINGS OF THE IPPC AND ITS INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

8.1 Response by the SPTA

53. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde) presented the response of the SPTA to the independent evaluation of the IPPC¹². She outlined clusters of themes summarizing all recommendations the SPTA discussed and noted those recommendations of the independent evaluation that the SPTA had rejected. She noted that a number of recommendations had already been implemented. Reference was made to agenda items 13.4.5 and 13.4.6 with regard to recommendations

¹¹ CPM 2008/CRP/8

¹² CPM 2008/15

on resource mobilization strategies. One member emphasized that environmental concerns were of high priority and should be well integrated in the IPPC work programme.

54. Comments, both written and in plenary, were discussed, and modifications were proposed for some action items associated with some recommendations (recommendation 1.5, 1.6-1.8 and 6.5). It was decided not to modify the action items for recommendations on the compliance mechanism, as it was dependent on the CPM response to the open-ended working group on a possible compliance mechanism.

55. The CPM:

1. *Commented on* and *confirmed* the SPTA responses to the recommendations;
2. *Adopted* the action items as amended and given in Appendix 2;
3. *Agreed* that the Bureau prepare appropriate modifications to the CPM Business Plan and the relevant action plans for implementation of the agreed recommendations, for consideration and approval by the SPTA and CPM-4.

8.2 Response by FAO Programme Committee and Council

56. The Secretary presented a summary of the responses of the FAO Governing Bodies to the independent evaluation of the IPPC¹³. He noted that a CPM Vice-Chairperson (Mr Lopian) had been invited to attend the Programme Committee meeting, which demonstrated the good cooperation between FAO and the CPM. He reported that the Council stressed that the IPPC should receive increased Regular Programme funding and that the budget for the IPPC Programme Entity had been increased for the 2008-09 biennium.

57. The Secretary further reported that the Council emphasized the importance of capacity building to enable members from developing countries to maximize the benefits of FAO standard setting bodies, and that the role of extra-budgetary funds would be essential for these endeavours. In this regard, the Governing Bodies suggested that the CPM explore the development of multilateral trust funds with a broader scope than the current trust fund. The Governing Bodies emphasized that a clearly defined multi-year funding strategy was a prerequisite to addressing funding issues.

58. He reported that the Governing Bodies supported the inclusion in the Secretariat of a full time Secretary to the IPPC, and that the selection should follow a transparent process, including the participation of the CPM Bureau.

59. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the responses of the FAO Governing Bodies to the independent evaluation of the IPPC.

9. GOAL 1: A ROBUST INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SETTING AND IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMME

9.1 Report by the Chairperson of the Standards Committee

60. The outgoing Chairperson of the Standards Committee (SC), Mr Verecke, presented the SC activities undertaken in 2007¹⁴. He noted that the SC had adapted well to the new funding policy implemented by the IPPC Secretariat.

61. He detailed the topics of discussion held at the May and November 2007 meetings and stressed that the SC was not able to complete its agenda due to lack of time.

¹³ CPM 2008/INF/25

¹⁴ CPM 2008/INF/2

62. He thanked the stewards for their considerable work on draft ISPMs. In addition, for the first time, summaries of SC reactions to member comments were prepared at the November 2007 SC meeting and appended to the SC report; he expressed his gratitude to stewards for their work on these.

63. The SC noted that only the SC-7 would meet in May 2008 due to lack of resources. There was concern and disappointment regarding the shortage of funds for the standard setting programme.

64. Regarding improvements to the standard setting process, he noted that the SC favoured two consultation periods per year for ISPMs under the fast-track process in order to ensure predictability. The SC also supported extending the time schedule for review of comments on draft ISPMs.

65. He thanked the SC members for the privilege of having worked with them for the past fourteen years and wished success to the new Chairperson, Mr Ribeiro e Silva.

66. The incoming SC Chairperson, Mr Ribeiro e Silva gave warm thanks to the outgoing chair and thanked his SC colleagues for the honour of his election. He looked forward to assisting the SC through a new phase of standard setting, with the development of specific standards more directly related to solving trade barriers, rather than conceptual standards. He called upon colleagues to maintain the momentum of work in the SC.

67. The SC had discussed the issue of observers at SC-7 and had decided that the SC-7 meeting to be held in May 2008 would not be open to observers. However, several members of CPM proposed that the SC-7 should be open to observers. The CPM Chairperson after consultation reported that the SC-7 would be open to observers, who would have to send a request to attend, to the Secretariat in writing, no later than 16 April 2008.

68. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the report.
2. *Decided* that the May 2008 SC-7 meeting would be open to observers, who should send a request in writing to the Secretariat to attend as observers, no later than 16 April 2008.

9.2 Adoption of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures

69. The Secretariat introduced four draft texts for consideration by the CPM¹⁵, which consisted of three proposed new standards (*Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*, *Methodologies for sampling of consignments* and *Replacement or reduction of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure*) and some amendments to ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

70. The Secretariat thanked countries that had sent written comments 14 days in advance of the meeting as it facilitated discussion by allowing the Secretariat to compile and distribute them in hard copy format to members. Some additional comments were presented in plenary. Working groups were established to consider the draft ISPMs and the comments¹⁶. The steward for each draft ISPM had made a preliminary study of comments and proposals for modification of the text.

71. The CPM

1. *Thanked* the stewards for their guidance and for the valuable assistance provided during discussions.

¹⁵ CPM 2008/2

¹⁶ CPM 2008/CRP/1, CPM 2008/CRP/2, CPM 2008/CRP/3, CPM 2008/CRP/3, CPM 2008/CRP/4, CPM 2008/CRP/10

9.2.1 Amendments to ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*)

72. A working group was chaired by a CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde). The text was adjusted based on comments submitted before and during the plenary. The proposed definition for *beneficial organism* was returned to the Technical Panel for the Glossary to consider the comments received and for consideration as to whether that term should be maintained in the Glossary.

73. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* the amendments to ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*) contained in Appendix 3;
2. *Requested* the Technical Panel for the Glossary to consider further the definition for *beneficial organism*.

9.2.2 Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (*Tephritidae*)

74. A working group was chaired by a CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde). The text was adjusted based on comments submitted before and during the plenary. The CPM discussed whether the draft should be considered as an annex to ISPM No. 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*) or as a standard. It was decided to consider it as a standard, which could be reconsidered if all adopted standards were reorganized. The terminology for fruit fly hosts was under review by the Technical Panel on Fruit Flies and it was agreed to maintain the current terminology of *primary* and *secondary* hosts for the time being.

75. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* as ISPM No. 30: *Establishment of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*, contained in Appendix 4.

9.2.3 Methodologies for sampling of consignments

76. A working group was chaired by a CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde). The text was adjusted based on comments submitted before and during the plenary. It was noted that it was a very technical standard and that an explanatory document should be urgently developed, which should consider all comments submitted to CPM-3, in particular those in rows 1, 27, 36, 84, 89 and 106 of CPM 2008/CRP/3.

77. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* as ISPM No. 31: *Methodologies for sampling of consignments*, contained in Appendix 5.
2. *Requested* the Standards Committee to develop urgently an explanatory document for the standard.

9.2.4 Replacement or reduction of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure

78. Many members supported the content of the draft, indicating that it was helpful for NPPOs. The CPM discussed whether it was appropriate to adopt the draft as a policy, a recommendation or an ISPM¹⁷. Two working groups were held, both chaired by Mr Wolff (Canada). The text was adjusted based on comments submitted before and during the plenary. The working group recommended adopting the document as an IPPC Recommendation with a reference in the text to IPPC Article XI.2(g), which refers to the adoption of recommendations for the implementation of the Convention as necessary. The working group also indicated that the recommendation should be published on the IPP independently from the CPM reports. The working group finally suggested that once criteria on the development and adoption of IPPC recommendations were developed (see 13.5), it may be necessary to review the format of the methyl bromide recommendation.

¹⁷ CPM 2008/INF/10/Rev.1, CPM 2008/INF/21, CPM 2008/INF/23

79. Several members supported the adoption of the recommendation, and stressed that it was adopted in the IPPC framework, irrespective of other agreements. Some delegates wished to see a standard on the use of methyl bromide while others wondered what the implication of the recommendation meant in view of the global status of methyl bromide.

80. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* IPPC Recommendation: *Replacement or reduction of the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure* (Appendix 6), and *agreed* that its format would be reviewed once criteria for IPPC recommendations were available.

9.3 Adoption of International Standards - under the fast-track process

81. The Secretariat presented an update¹⁸ on the draft ISPMs that had been circulated for member consultation under the fast-track process (diagnostic protocol for *Thrips palmi* and 14 phytosanitary treatments on irradiation). In accordance with the fast-track standard setting process, formal objections received should be resolved by the Secretariat. Regarding phytosanitary treatments, the consultation period ended at the end of January but the Secretariat had not had time to resolve the formal objections in time to present them to CPM-3.

82. With regard to the diagnostic protocol on *Thrips palmi*, attempts had been made to resolve the formal objections but formal objections from Australia and Japan remained. The Secretariat sought guidance from the CPM on how to proceed. In addition, papers on this topic had been provided by Australia and the EC and its Member States.

83. Many members believed that the diagnostic protocol on *Thrips palmi* was technically sound and ready for adoption. Several others noted however, that as this was the first diagnostic protocol presented to the CPM, it was important for the CPM to clarify the expertise that users of any diagnostic protocol should have.

84. During discussion Australia said that it could lift its formal objection as long as the CPM appreciated that some members would be unable to use the protocol.

85. A working group chaired by Mr Quiroga (Argentina) made proposals to CPM. As a result, the CPM agreed that Australia¹⁹ would submit specific comments on the draft diagnostic protocol on *Thrips palmi* to the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) through the Secretariat. In addition, Australia would also submit suggestions on improving the diagnostic protocols in general. The TPDP at its meeting in June 2008 would analyze Australia's suggestions along with the information submitted by the EC²⁰ and Japan, which were presented to the CPM. The TPDP would revise the draft diagnostic protocol and send it to the SC by email for clearance prior to a second round of member consultation.

86. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the status of the draft standards under the fast-track process;
2. *Agreed* to move all draft standards under the fast-track process into the "special standard setting process";
3. *Decided* to proceed with the draft diagnostic protocol on *Thrips palmi* in the special standard setting process;
4. *Agreed* exceptionally to allow the draft protocol, if agreed to by the Standards Committee, to be sent for member consultation in early July 2008, thus slightly shortening the consultation period.

¹⁸ CPM 2008/26

¹⁹ CPM 2008/INF/7

²⁰ CPM 2008/INF/14

9.4 Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme

87. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde) introduced the draft *Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme*²¹, as revised by the Focus Group meeting in July 2007 and reviewed by the SPTA and the SC. She outlined the hierarchy of terms (technical area, topic, subject) developed by the Focus Group to clarify the different types of items on which expert drafting groups might work.

88. Comments were made on the hierarchy of terms, on the procedure and on the criteria²². A working group chaired by Mr Quiroga (Argentina) reviewed the comments and made proposals to the CPM. Some members suggested adding the hierarchy of terms to the Procedural Manual and a review of the procedure and criteria to ensure the correct usage of these terms.

89. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the hierarchy of terms given in Appendix 7;
2. *Noted* that the Technical Panel on the Glossary, Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols and Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments were currently the only technical panels allowed to work on “subjects”;
3. *Adopted* the modified *Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme* as given in Appendix 8.

9.5 IPPC standard setting procedure (Annex 1 of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM)

90. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde) introduced a draft IPPC standard setting procedure²³, as revised by the Focus Group meeting in July 2007 and reviewed by the SPTA and the SC. She outlined the proposed general considerations for standard setting and the suggestion for the consolidation of all standard setting procedures.

91. Several suggestions²⁴ were presented to modify the general considerations and the procedure. A working group chaired by Mr Quiroga (Argentina) reviewed the proposals and made recommendations to CPM.

92. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the general considerations for standard setting as modified (Appendix 9), which would be included in the procedural manual;
2. *Adopted* the *IPPC standard setting procedure* as modified (Appendix 10);
3. *Agreed* that the IPPC standard setting procedure form Annex I of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, as mentioned in Rule X of those Rules of Procedure;
4. *Requested* the IPPC Secretariat to prepare a consolidation of all standard setting procedures which have been previously adopted by the CPM.
5. *Noted* that when the consolidated procedure was presented for adoption by the CPM as a stand-alone document, a revision to Rule X.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures to remove the reference to Annex I, would also be adopted.

9.6 Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for Technical Panels

93. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde) introduced the draft Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedures for Technical Panels²⁵ as revised by a Focus Group and reviewed by the SPTA

²¹ CPM 2008/7

²² CPM 2008/INF/20

²³ CPM 2008/8

²⁴ CPM 2008/CRP/9

²⁵ CPM 2008/9

and SC. She noted that the issue of transparency was considered throughout the Focus Group's discussions and outlined several ways in which transparency would be enhanced.

94. The Rules of Procedures were modified based on comments made by members²⁶. Some members suggested that the Secretariat examine the Terms of Reference to ensure the consistent use of the new terms used in the standard setting process (technical area, topic and subject) for documents on which drafting groups might work.

95. The CPM:

1. *Adopted* the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for Technical Panels as modified, with the understanding that a further consistency adjustment would be made (Appendix 11);
2. *Noted* that the calculation for 5 year terms for membership of Technical Panels would commence with the adoption of the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure.

9.7 Other items arising from the Focus Group on Standard Setting Procedures

96. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde) introduced a document outlining other items discussed by the Focus Group on standard setting procedures, such as the extended time schedule for the standard setting process and the funding policy for attendance at meetings. She noted the provisions for the availability of standard setting documents annexed to the paper²⁷. Several suggestions were presented to modify the provisions²⁸. A working group chaired by Mr Quiroga (Argentina) reviewed the proposals and made recommendations to CPM.

97. Several members were concerned that member comments submitted during the member consultation were not among the comments presented at the CPM. The Secretariat clarified that comments presented to the CPM were only those that were sent 14 days prior to the meeting, on the draft presented for adoption by the CPM. Comments received during member consultation (June-September) were compiled by the Secretariat and presented to the SC in November. In reviewing the comments, the SC decided whether to integrate them. It was stressed that comments developed at the regional workshops on draft ISPMs were not always those of members and participants were encouraged individually to submit their own country's comments to the Secretariat following the workshops.

98. Regarding travel assistance to attend meetings, one member noted that travel assistance should be based on FAO rules and no other guidelines. However, it was noted that the CPM Trust Fund had its own rules and that the shortage of funding made such a policy necessary.

99. The CPM:

1. *Agreed* to the provisions for the availability of documents as modified (Appendix 12);
2. *Requested* the Secretariat to implement these provisions (including the necessary modifications to the IPP system) as soon as possible;
3. *Noted* the response to member comments provided by the SC in November 2007 as presented in the SC report and provide feedback to SC members in their region as appropriate;
4. *Noted* that the Standards Committee would start using the extended time schedule for standard setting as appropriate;
5. *Noted* that the current prioritization of participants for travel assistance in IPPC meetings would be continued;
6. *Requested* the SC, Bureau, Technical Panels and Secretariat to carry out pending actions as detailed in paragraph 22 of CPM 2008/21.

²⁶ CPM 2008/CRP/14

²⁷ CPM 2008/21

²⁸ CPM 2008/CRP/16

9.8 IPPC Standard Setting Work Programme

100. The Secretariat introduced the IPPC standard setting work programme²⁹, indicating the status of topics under development. The topics and subjects that the technical panels were working on were also presented for transparency. It was noted that a call for new topics for the work programme had been carried out in 2007. The SPTA had provided strategic priorities on the submissions to the SC, who then had reviewed the submissions and made recommendations for additions to the work programme.

101. The CPM discussed the proposals for new topics for the work programme. Some members suggested that additional information on the intended scope of the standards should have been made available. Suggestions were made to combine some of the new topics with either other topics suggested or topics already on the work programme. A working group was chaired by a CPM Vice-Chairperson (Mr Lopian) to consider the matter. It suggested that the SC should decide whether to combine: the proposed topics of *Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts* and *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances* with *Handling and disposal of garbage moved internationally*. The SC should also decide whether to combine the proposed topic of *Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood* with *International movement of wood* (already on the work programme) or to make it an annex to *International movement of wood*. The SC would develop the specifications for these topics separately and, depending on comments made by members during the consultation period, would consider the suitability of developing the standards separately or combining them. It also recommended that the proposed topic *International movement of grain* should remain separate from the topic *Regulating stored products in international trade* (already on the work programme).

102. Some of the titles of the topics proposed were adjusted to reflect better the intended content of the ISPM to be developed, although it was noted that the working titles might further evolve during the development of the specification and ISPM. It was also noted that brief, additional information on the envisaged content of an ISPM would be useful for the CPM decision on the IPPC standard setting programme.

103. The proposal by Japan to reorganize the standards was discussed and it was agreed that it should be given attention. Some members noted that a reorganization would cause confusion and others felt that the task was not a priority. The Secretariat was requested to enquire if the consultant conducting the review of adopted ISPMs for consistency would be able to examine the logic of the order of the adopted standards and potential benefits of reorganization, as well as considering any potential drawbacks. To prepare for this, Japan was invited to submit a background paper on its views regarding the reorganization. The background paper by Japan and the findings of the consultant would then be submitted to the CPM through the SPTA and SC.

104. The CPM:

1. *Endorsed* the addition of topics, and their associated priorities;
2. *Removed* the topic of the development of Annex 1 of ISPM No. 18 from the work programme, noting that the irradiation treatments stayed in the work programme as a topic under the work of the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments;
3. *Adopted* the IPPC standard setting work programme as presented in Appendix 13;
4. *Noted* that calls for nominations of experts would be made for expert drafting groups to develop topics on the standard setting work programme and *encouraged* submission of nominations of experts by NPPOs and RPPOs.

²⁹ CPM 2008/23

9.9 IPPC Training Material for Pest Risk Analysis

105. The Secretariat explained³⁰ that as a result of a workshop on invasive alien species organized by the IPPC in 2003, a steering committee had been formed to help organize the PRA workshop in Canada in 2005 and develop PRA training material. This training material was further developed for a pilot workshop in India, funded by the STDF and Canada. The PRA training material was now available on the IPP. In addition, the steering committee had continued working and its membership and terms of reference were posted on the IPP.

106. Many members congratulated the group on the outcome and thanked the government of Canada, the STDF, and participants in the steering committee. It was noted that the steering committee was not an officially established CPM group and it was requested that the group reconsider its current name (IPPC Pest Risk Analysis Steering Committee) given its ad hoc status.

107. Several members indicated that the availability of the materials in more languages would be very useful. Delegates from Argentina and the Interamerican Coordination Group in Plant Protection (ICGPP) indicated they would assist in translating the training material into Spanish. Canada indicated that, together with France, it was beginning to translate the PRA training material into French. It encouraged assistance from other members if possible.

108. The CPM:

1. *Requested* that the group propose an alternative name more in line with its status, to be reported to CPM-4;
2. *Noted* that the PRA training materials would be used as appropriate in capacity building activities coordinated by the IPPC Secretariat;
3. *Encouraged* the use of the PRA training materials at a national level;
4. *Requested* that feedback on the training material be provided to the Secretariat.

9.10 Guidance document on "should", "shall", "must" and "may"

109. The IPPC Secretariat introduced a document on the practical guidance of the use of "should", "shall", "must" and "may" in ISPMs³¹. The document had been reviewed by the SC, which could not reach a consensus and so had forwarded the paper for a decision at the CPM. Some members had provided an alternative, shorter version of the guidance³².

110. Some members supported the document as it was, or with some modifications, noting that guidance could be revisited when more experience had been accumulated and that the examples given in the paper were useful. Others supported the alternative, shorter version, noting in particular that the examples from adopted ISPMs were confusing and pre-empted the findings of the review of adopted ISPMs, which would also examine how these terms had been used. Others proposed that the issue be put on hold until more experience had been gained from the decision taken at CPM-1 on the use of the terms.

111. The CPM agreed that guidance was needed but there was no agreement on the two alternatives presented, nor on the process to be followed for further development. The CPM finally agreed that both alternatives and any technical comments made during the CPM should be presented to the Technical Panel on the Glossary (TPG). The TPG would forward the results of its analysis to the SC, which would examine it and make recommendations to the CPM. It was noted that no particular timeline was set.

112. The CPM:

³⁰ CPM 2008/24

³¹ CPM 2008/17

³² CPM 2008/INF/18

1. *Agreed* that documents CPM 2008/17 and CPM 2008/INF/18, plus the comments made during CPM-3, be analyzed by the Technical Panel on the Glossary and subsequently presented to the Standards Committee for examination and development of recommendations for the CPM, specifically taking into account that CPM-1 had adopted previous decisions on the issue.

9.11 Report on the IPPC Bark Survey Conducted on ISPM No. 15 Marked Wood in 2007

113. A member of the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) presented the results of the survey conducted on bark on wood packaging material marked in accordance with ISPM No. 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*)³³ and thanked the Contracting Parties that took part in the survey. He noted that some of the data were not included in the numerical analyses because they did not follow the survey protocol. He highlighted that the survey and the additional data served as a valuable contribution to the revision of ISPM No. 15.

114. Some members invited the Secretariat to comment on the current status of the revision of ISPM No. 15. The Secretariat indicated that a draft revision of ISPM No. 15 would be presented to the SC in May 2008 and, depending on the decision of the SC, may go forward for member consultation in June.

115. One member expressed its gratitude for the work undertaken regarding the implementation of ISPM No. 15 but also noted with regret that the desire expressed by the COSAVE countries in CPM-2 for an investigation as to whether interceptions were due to fraudulent use of the mark was not taken into consideration.

116. The CPM:
1. *Noted* the report.

10. GOAL 2: INFORMATION EXCHANGE SYSTEMS APPROPRIATE TO MEET IPPC OBLIGATIONS

10.1 Proposed work programme 2008

117. The Secretariat noted that the work programme for information exchange activities planned for 2008 would be discussed as one component of the operational plan (agenda 13.4.3).

118. Additional information and statistics related to the use of the IPP were made available. It was noted that some countries met their reporting obligations through means other than the IPP and that this should be considered when looking at the implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs.

11. GOAL 3: EFFECTIVE DISPUTE SETTLEMENT SYSTEMS

11.1 Report of the Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement

119. The chairperson of the SBDS presented the report of the 6th meeting of the SBDS, which was held on 2-3 April 2008. The report was available to CPM-3.

120. He noted a request that the Secretariat provide an annual report of all dispute inquiries, in order to keep the SBDS informed of any developments and that a quarterly report also be provided to the SBDS in that regard.

121. The IPPC dispute settlement manual was available in English, Spanish and French and would be made available in Chinese and Arabic after review of the translation.

³³ CPM 2008/INF/4

122. Regarding promotion of the dispute settlement system, an advocacy document was being prepared. A CPM Vice-Chairperson and the IPPC coordinator had presented an overview of the IPPC dispute settlement mechanism to the SPS Committee and the TC-RPPOs.

123. As a follow-up to the Open-Ended Working Group on a possible IPPC compliance mechanism, the Chairperson noted that a general implementation programme had been suggested, for which a Secretariat post would be required.

11.2 Report on dispute settlement activities since CPM-2³⁴

124. The Secretariat noted that several inquiries had been made in 2007 regarding disputes, in particular regarding the interpretation of the term “public officers” in ISPMs Nos. 7 and 12.

125. Several members expressed concern that private standards, many of which had no scientific justification, adversely affected export markets and requested that the CPM discuss the implications of these private standards. Some countries were concerned with the approach by private retailers, by which more stringent and scientifically unjustified private standards were imposed on small scale farmers, especially in least developed and developing countries. It was suggested that this issue should be of concern to the IPPC and should be discussed with relevant international organizations with a view to removing any areas of conflict with the SPS Agreement. This was especially true for the “GlobalGAP” standard which included phytosanitary considerations as it was based on a value-chain approach.

126. The representative from the WTO informed the CPM that the next SPS Committee meeting in June 2008 would include a workshop on private standards, which could be of interest to members of the CPM.

11.3 Outcome of the Open-ended Working Group on a Possible IPPC Compliance Mechanism

127. The Chairperson of the SBDS presented the report of the Open-ended Working Group on a possible IPPC compliance mechanism, held in September 2007³⁵. After extensive discussion, the OEWG had agreed that a compliance (enforcement) process was believed to be contrary to the objectives and philosophy of the CPM and FAO.

128. The OEWG developed the “IPPC Implementation Review and Support System” (IRSS), which built on existing, or planned, processes already approved by the CPM, with the primary objective of facilitating and promoting the implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs. The IRSS could help in avoiding future disputes.

129. Advantages of the IRSS included: the ability to monitor, encourage and support the harmonised implementation of the IPPC and its ISPMs by contracting parties; and a means to identify and address emerging and potential implementation problems before they became disputes, through an assistance-based and non-confrontational process. This would address a number of recommendations from the independent evaluation of the IPPC, specifically the review of the state of plant protection in the world and the development of procedures to monitor the implementation of standards.

130. The CPM:

1. *Endorsed* the report of the Open-ended Working Group;
2. *Adopted* the modified Programme for the Development of the “IPPC Implementation Review and Support System” (IRSS) (see Appendix 14);

³⁴ CPM 2008/INF/8

³⁵ CPM 2008/22

3. *Agreed* that the focus of the IRSS should be implementation rather than compliance, that the establishment of the “IPPC Help Desk” was very important to the success of the IRSS and that the outcome of the IRSS would be used to adjust the Business and Operational Plans of the CPM;
4. *Recommended* that the IRSS be included in the IPPC Procedure Manual and that it would be implemented as soon as practically possible and as resources allowed;
5. *Requested* that the IRSS be incorporated into the CPM Capacity Building Strategy and that the Secretary pursue all reasonable options to ensure the post of a standards implementation officer (as foreseen in the IPPC Business Plan) be established as soon as practically possible.

12. GOAL 4: IMPROVED PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY OF MEMBERS

12.1 Analysis of the application of the PCE Tool

131. The IPPC Secretariat introduced the response of the SPTA regarding recommendations made by CABI Africa in its report to CPM-2 on the analysis of the application of the PCE tool³⁶. As agreed to by CPM-2, the SPTA had considered comments made by the Informal Working Group on the PCE and the 19th Technical Consultation among RPPOs in developing its response.

132. The recommendations of the SPTA were discussed, highlighting the need for a comprehensive capacity building strategy to address the needs of developing countries as proposed in agenda item 12.3. It was noted that the recommendations could be considered in the development of the capacity building strategy and it was proposed that an open-ended working group undertake the task rather than a focus group, in order to allow for broad participation. Some members felt that recommendation No. 9 regarding the establishment of a mechanism to collect and collate information while protecting anonymity was contrary to the IPPC and the principle of transparency.

133. The CPM:

1. *Noted* that the SPTA agreed that a phytosanitary capacity building strategy was required and *recommended* that an open-ended working group be established to develop a draft strategy for consideration by the SPTA for presentation to CPM-4;
2. *Noted* the comments made by the SPTA on the CABI recommendations and their relevance in developing the capacity building strategy.

12.2 Proposed work programme 2008-2009 for improved capacity-building of members

134. The Secretariat presented a summary of the planned capacity building activities for the year³⁷, noting that most regional workshops on draft ISPMs were on hold pending available funding and encouraged donor support for these activities. The Secretariat stressed the importance of the regional workshops on draft ISPMs and thanked the Republic of Korea for offering to fund the workshop for Asia and the EC for sponsoring the workshop for Latin America.

135. The Secretariat provided information on a project proposal for addressing the fruit fly problem in East Africa. It assured members from West and Northern Africa and the Near East that similar proposals were being considered for their regions.

136. Several members requested clarification on the procedure for selecting specific projects and recipient countries and requested that such projects be adjusted to include other regions. The Secretariat clarified that the projects were implemented in response to specific requests from countries and regions through the FAO Technical Cooperation Programme, and that similar project models may be applied elsewhere on request and as funds allowed.

³⁶ CPM 2008/4

³⁷ CPM 2008/INF/5

12.3 Development of a CPM technical assistance strategy for phytosanitary capacity building

137. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Mr Lopian) presented a document on developing a strategy for capacity building, noting that adequate capacity and infrastructure for contracting parties played a critical role in achieving the objectives of the IPPC³⁸. He noted that Article XX of the IPPC and the CPM business plan (2007-2011) both promoted technical assistance but that a clear strategy to guide CPM capacity building activities was not in place.

138. He recalled that the independent evaluation of the IPPC and the report from CABI-Africa recommended the development of a comprehensive technical assistance strategy in support of capacity building.

139. He further recalled that the extraordinary meeting of the SPTA, the Informal Working Group on Technical Assistance, the TC-RPPOs, and the SPTA had all endorsed the recommendation for the development of such a strategy. He noted that a strategy would benefit from a broad understanding of technical assistance, avoiding overlap and taking advantage of synergies.

140. The CPM welcomed the initiative. It discussed the proposal to develop a concept paper on phytosanitary capacity building that could be closely linked to the development of a capacity building strategy³⁹. Members agreed that an open-ended working group, rather than a focus group, would be more appropriate in providing the necessary broad and balanced participation and inputs to the development of such a strategy. A working group chaired by Mr Hedley (New Zealand) reviewed and modified the draft terms of reference.

141. The CPM:

1. *Confirmed* the intention to have a national capacity building programme coordinated by the IPPC Secretariat;
2. *Established an* Open-ended working group on Building National Phytosanitary Capacity to develop:
 - (i) A concept paper on national phytosanitary capacity for consideration by the SPTA in 2008 for presentation to the CPM-4;
 - (ii) A draft strategy for national phytosanitary capacity building for consideration by the SPTA for presentation to CPM;
 - (iii) A proposed operational plan for implementing the strategy over the first six years of its operation;
3. *Agreed* to the modified Terms of Reference for the Open-ended Working Group on Building National Phytosanitary Capacity as presented in Appendix 15.

13. GOAL 5: SUSTAINABLE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IPPC

13.1 Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance

142. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde) presented the report of the 2nd meeting⁴⁰ of the SPTA. The SPTA had discussed its normal agenda as well as the outcome of the evaluation of the IPPC and the outcome of the Focus Group on standard setting procedures. Most topics discussed by the SPTA had been presented under different agenda items of CPM-3.

143. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the report of the SPTA.

³⁸ CPM 2008/14

³⁹ CPM 2008/14, CPM 2008/INF/15, CPM 2008/CRP/15

⁴⁰ CPM 2008/6

13.2 IPPC/CPM activities

13.2.1 State of membership to the IPPC

144. The Secretary of the IPPC presented the state of membership of the IPPC⁴¹, indicating that there were currently 166 contracting parties. Since CPM-2, five countries had become contracting parties to the IPPC. These were: Guinea-Bissau, Kuwait, Micronesia (Federated States of), Uganda and Vanuatu. He welcomed the new members to the CPM. It was also announced that on 9 April 2008 Djibouti had submitted its instrument of adherence, bringing the total number of contracting parties to 167.

13.2.2 Acceptance of documents in electronic format

145. The Secretariat presented a document on the acceptance of electronic correspondence⁴² and noted that few members had chosen that option. Members could notify their wish to receive correspondence only in electronic format either by using the form attached to the document, or by using the new option provided on the IPP.

146. The CPM:

1. *Encouraged* members to opt to receive electronic correspondence only, either by choosing that option on the IPP or by sending the model text in Appendix 16 to the Secretariat.

13.2.3 Convention in the authentic languages

147. The IPPC Secretariat introduced a document on the review of the linguistic versions of the Convention to ensure concordance⁴³. A Chinese text had been produced between the Chinese authorities and the FAO translation group and both had concluded that the text was consistent with other texts of the IPPC. A review of other linguistic versions had been carried out and its findings would be analyzed after CPM-3.

148. Several members encouraged the Secretariat to make available as much information as possible in FAO languages other than English, in order to facilitate understanding and the participation of non-English speaking members in IPPC activities.

149. The CPM:

1. *Noted* that the text presented in document CPM 2008/28 constituted the Chinese version of the IPPC.
2. *Noted* that analysis of the findings for other languages would be carried out after CPM-3.

13.3 Update to the Business Plan 2007 – 2011

150. The Coordinator presented the proposed updates to the Business Plan 2007-2011⁴⁴ as suggested by the SPTA at its 9th meeting in 2007.

151. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the proposed modifications to the Business Plan;
2. *Agreed* that these proposed modifications would be incorporated into the Business Plan.

⁴¹ CPM 2008/INF/16

⁴² CPM 2008/INF/19

⁴³ CPM 2008/28

⁴⁴ CPM 2008/5

13.4 Financial Report and Budget

13.4.1 Financial Report for 2007 (FAO Regular Programme and Trust Funds)

152. The Secretariat presented the report⁴⁵ on the IPPC Secretariat's expenditure in 2007 of the funds provided by the FAO regular programme, all trust funds established for the IPPC and in-kind contributions. The Secretariat acknowledged the in-kind contributions made by members and organizations during 2007, such as assisting with conducting meetings and releasing and funding experts to take part in various groups. The in-kind contributions were not reflected in the figures.

153. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the revenues and expenditures of the IPPC Secretariat for 2007;
2. *Thanked* the European Community for its contribution to help facilitate developing country participation in the standard setting process;
3. *Thanked* all the members and organizations that made in-kind contributions.

13.4.2 Financial Report for the Trust Fund for the IPPC for 2007

154. The Secretariat presented the financial report for the Trust Fund for the IPPC for 2007⁴⁶, outlining the expenditures made using funds from the Trust Fund.

155. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the contributions to the Trust Fund for the IPPC;
2. *Accepted* the expenditures against the Trust Fund for the IPPC;
3. *Thanked* the Government of New Zealand, the Southern African Confederation of Agricultural Unions and the Government of the United States for their contributions to the Trust Fund for the IPPC;
4. *Encouraged* contracting parties to contribute to the Trust Fund for the year 2008.

13.4.3 CPM Operational Plan for 2008

156. The Secretariat presented the operational plan⁴⁷, which was based on the business plan and described the activities that would be carried out by the Secretariat in 2008 using the resources from the FAO regular programme and various trust funds. Due to insufficient resources, activities had been prioritized by the SPTA and some would need to remain on hold unless additional funding became available. The proposed activities under each of the seven goals were detailed.

157. Several members noted that despite the increase to the IPPC budget from FAO, budget allocations for Goal 1 (standard setting and implementation) had been reduced compared with 2006. They felt that standard setting was the most important activity of the CPM and that priorities should be reflected in budget appropriations.

158. Several members supported the increased activities for the implementation of standards while a member stressed the importance of holding two SC meetings per year. Some members proposed that activities under Goal 4 be scrutinized for possible deletion until the strategy on national phytosanitary capacity building had been adopted.

159. In addition, one member requested the Secretariat or Bureau to consider ways to overcome shortages in staff availability through the use of persons who could work from their home countries instead of moving to Rome.

⁴⁵ CPM 2008/16

⁴⁶ CPM 2008/11

⁴⁷ CPM 2008/19/Rev.1

160. Members requested that priorities for spending should reflect the decisions made by the CPM and that this be considered when the Bureau or SPTA made their analyses of upcoming budgets.

161. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the anticipated revenues and budgeted expenses for 2008;
2. *Noted* the Operational Plan for 2008 and associated budget;
3. *Noted* that the activities identified in the Operational Plan may be modified depending on availability of resources (funding and staff);
4. *Thanked* the European Community and the Governments of the United States, Japan and Canada for their extra-budgetary contributions.

13.4.4 Budget for the Trust Fund for the IPPC for 2008

162. The Secretariat presented the budget for 2008 for the Trust Fund for the IPPC⁴⁸, and the proposed allocation of funds. It mentioned that discrepancies between the financial information provided in document CPM 2008/13 and the Operational Plan were because more updated financial figures had been used for the Operational Plan. No indication had been received of new contributions in 2008.

163. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the anticipated carry over from 2007 to the Trust Fund for the IPPC for 2008;
2. *Agreed* to the proposed allocations of the Trust Fund for the IPPC to the various activities;
3. *Noted* that as at March 2008, the Secretariat had received no indication from any contracting party of an intention to contribute to the Trust Fund for 2008;
4. *Actively encouraged* contracting parties to contribute to the Trust Fund for the IPPC.

13.4.5 Project-oriented Planning for the Multilateral IPPC Trust Fund

164. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Mr Lopian) introduced the topic⁴⁹ and recalled that CPM-2 had agreed to develop project-oriented planning for the multilateral trust fund. He indicated that the objective of the Trust Fund for the IPPC, to provide resources to benefit developing countries, was also applicable for project-oriented planning. The Vice-Chairperson outlined what he considered were some of the reasons why members were not contributing to the Trust Fund, and explained how the project-oriented planning could overcome those obstacles.

165. Several members noted that the Secretariat should develop guidelines for making contributions to the Trust Fund for the IPPC, as countries may want to contribute but not know how to proceed. Members stressed that projects under this scheme were for all activities of the IPPC and just not technical assistance. Some members requested that funding contributed for a project should not be allocated to another project without the prior consent of the donor. One member reminded the CPM that although contributions may be made by governments, they could also be made by others, such as industry.

166. No pledges for financial support of identified projects were made other than that made by the Republic of Korea (see paragraph 23). The United States announced it was finalizing arrangements for the provision of a person to the Secretariat for two years.

167. The CPM:

1. *Commented* on the proposed project planning for the multilateral trust fund of the IPPC;
2. *Considered* and *agreed* to the five projects proposed;
3. *Adopted* the proposed project-planning under the Trust Fund for the IPPC.

⁴⁸ CPM 2008/13

⁴⁹ CPM 2008/12 Add.1

13.4.6 Promotion Strategy for the Trust Fund for the IPPC

168. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde) recalled that the independent evaluation of the IPPC had urged the Secretariat to formulate a funding mobilisation strategy. She indicated that the Government of Canada had released an officer to work on this strategy, which was still in its initial stages. She indicated that the promotion strategy would consist of several parts to assist in the solicitation of funds, such as an information kit, outlining opportunities for contribution and training to contracting parties on how to strive for sustainability. An additional part of the strategy was to conduct a review of similar conventions to identify best management practices and innovative mechanisms for resource donations. It was intended that a draft paper on the subject would be submitted to the SPTA for further consideration by CPM-4.

13.5 Proposal for the Adoption of CPM Recommendations

169. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Ms Bast-Tjeerde) introduced the proposal⁵⁰, indicating that it was a suggestion on how decisions could be presented in a consistent manner and numbered in a way that could be tracked for later review, change or deletion. Currently decisions were contained in CPM reports and report appendices, which could be hard to track. She indicated that procedural decisions would not fall into the category of recommendations and would continue to be added to the Procedural Manual.

170. Several members wondered about the submission and review process for recommendations and suggested that more time was needed to develop a procedure for the submission and review of recommendations. Others were unsure of the status of recommendations in relation to ISPMs.

171. Two working groups chaired by Mr Wolff (Canada) discussed this issue in relation with section 9.2.4. The working group felt that criteria on the development and adoption of IPPC recommendations should be developed at the earliest opportunity. Proposals linked to section 9.2.4 are reported under that section.

172. The CPM:

1. *Considered* the format for CPM recommendations regarding long term operational and administrative recommendations;
2. *Requested* the further development of the proposal and format, taking into consideration the comments made by the CPM.

13.6 ISPM No. 15 Symbol – Status of Registration and Procedures and Estimated Costs for Registration in Countries where it is not yet Registered

173. The difference between the ISPM No. 15 mark and symbol was explained by the Secretariat. Confusion might be caused by the registration nomenclature in national intellectual property laws such as certification mark (collective mark or guarantee mark) and trade mark. To date the symbol had been registered on behalf of FAO in 96 countries⁵¹, leaving it unregistered in approximately 110 countries. The Secretariat indicated that it would continue this registration in the countries that had recently joined the Madrid system and in two regional organizations and later proceed with the remaining national registrations⁵².

174. The Secretariat informed the CPM that it had sent out letters asking for assistance in the registration process to those countries in which the symbol had not yet been registered. To date only 10 replies had been received. Countries were encouraged to reply to this letter as soon as possible as

⁵⁰ CPM 2008/18

⁵¹ CPM 2008/20

⁵² CPM 2008/27

priority would be given for registration to those countries that waived their fees and/or provided cost figures.

175. Members were reminded that since the FAO owned the symbol, any registration of the symbol would be done on behalf of FAO and in its name.

176. The CPM was informed that a procedure for the utilization of their assistance was being developed and would be communicated to NPPOs in due course.

177. One important issue raised was how would unauthorized use be dealt with? FAO Legal advised that in the event of such an eventuality, FAO, being an intergovernmental organization, would liaise with the NPPO of the country where the infringement had occurred, to assist the country to take the necessary administrative actions.

14. GOAL 6: INTERNATIONAL PROMOTION OF THE IPPC AND COOPERATION WITH RELEVANT REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

14.1 Report on promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant international organizations

178. The Secretariat provided highlights of cooperation with relevant international organizations⁵³, in particular giving an update on activities that had occurred since the report was finalized. The Secretariats of the IPPC and CBD had recently held a joint meeting to further develop the joint work programme on areas of mutual concern and provide updates on activities.

179. The Secretariat noted that the Joint FAO/IAEA Division provided financial and administrative support for the 2007 meeting of the TPFQ, including providing secretariat service and travel funding for some participants (including the Secretariat). The Secretariat was in the process of discussing similar arrangements for 2008.

180. The Secretariat noted that the governing body of the Montreal Protocol had taken decisions to encourage experts from relevant groups to participate in each other's meetings. In addition, the IPPC and Montreal Protocol had jointly published a brochure on quarantine and pre-shipment uses of methyl bromide to clarify the different meanings of the term "quarantine and pre-shipment". The Ozone Secretariat had expressed its interest in the draft text on "*Replacement or reduction of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure*".

181. The CPM:
1. *Noted* the report.

14.2 Report of the International Forest Quarantine Research Group

182. The Chairperson of the International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) outlined the evolving relationship between IFQRG and the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ), through which the TPFQ identified gaps in research and requested IFQRG to undertake that work⁵⁴. Much of the work related to establishing scientifically-based criteria for evaluation of new treatments for inclusion in ISPM No. 15, which would be particularly relevant in the context of the recently adopted recommendation on reducing the use of methyl bromide. The Chairperson encouraged scientists from other contracting parties to participate in the work of IFQRG.

⁵³ CPM 2008/25

⁵⁴ CPM 2008/INF/6

15. GOAL 7: REVIEW OF THE STATUS OF PLANT PROTECTION IN THE WORLD

183. A scientific presentation on “Climate Change and Plant Pests: Preparing the Contracting Parties” was given by Mr Ian Campbell of the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. The presentation summarized the consensus findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, in that human-caused climate changes were resulting in statistically detectable global warming, increases in frequencies of extreme weather such as precipitation, drought, and storms. The changes would very likely affect pest distribution and pest impact directly through changes in range and host plant condition and indirectly, by changes in pest movements through trade. New and better pest risk assessments incorporating climate change models would be needed to refine risk management and appropriate new measures. During the discussion, some members expressed concern and urged caution in considering climate change models in the pest risk assessment process as this might have an undue effect on phytosanitary regulations for international trade, especially if the climate change models turned out to be incorrect. They suggested that the discussion on the topic continue at future meetings.

184. Mr. Ribeiro e Silva (Argentina), reported on the “Expert Meeting on Climate-related transboundary pests and diseases, including relevant aquatic species” organized by FAO as part of the preparations for the “High-Level Conference on World Food Security: The Challenges of Climate Change and Bioenergy”, which was to be held on 3-5 June 2008. The Expert Meeting had discussed potential impacts on food security, international trade, and the environment. It considered *inter alia* the role of NPPOs and the IPPC in preparing for changing risks such as modification to existing PRAs and the relationship of phytosanitary matters to food safety.

185. The keynote address was considered to be very useful and it was agreed that similar scientific sessions should be held at future CPMs.

16. ELECTION OF THE CPM BUREAU

186. A CPM Vice-Chairperson (Mr. Lopian) introduced the election of the Bureau⁵⁵. He noted that the Bureau would now consist of seven members, including a Chairperson, two Vice-Chairpersons and one member from each of the four FAO regions not represented by the Chairpersons. The CPM elected the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons, and then elected the remainder of the Bureau.

187. The CPM:

1. *Elected* the Bureau as presented in Appendix 17.

17. MEMBERSHIP OF CPM SUBSIDIARY BODIES

188. Nominations were required for vacant positions on the Standards Committee and Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement, as well as vacant positions for potential replacements for both the subsidiary bodies⁵⁶.

189. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the current membership and potential replacements for the Standards Committee (Appendix 18) and Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (Appendix 19);
2. *Confirmed* the new members and potential replacements for the Standards Committee and Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement;
3. *Confirmed* the order in which potential replacements would be called upon for each region.

⁵⁵ CPM 2008/10

⁵⁶ CPM 2008/3

18. CALENDAR

190. The Secretariat presented a tentative IPPC meeting calendar for 2008⁵⁷, noting that some dates and locations would be confirmed after the CPM and that all meetings were subject to change. The Secretariat reminded the CPM that updated calendar information was maintained on the IPP and encouraged interested parties to consult the IPP calendar frequently. It was also noted that other relevant dates, such as the deadlines for submission of member comments to the Secretariat, would also be included on the IPP calendar.

191. The CPM:

1. *Noted* the IPPC meeting calendar for 2008.

19. OTHER BUSINESS

192. The Secretariat informed the CPM that they had received a request to hold a poster session at the CPM. It was suggested that the Bureau discuss the possibility of this at its next meeting and present the outcome to CPM-4 in further detail.

193. COSAVE acknowledged the work for the IPPC of a distinguished member of the phytosanitary community in its region, Ms Guillén, for whom this was the last CPM, and wished her success in her new position.

194. The Secretariat acknowledged the work of the outgoing Vice-Chairperson (Mr. Lopian), recognizing that his involvement in meetings and assistance to the Secretariat had been invaluable. The Government of Finland was also recognized for supporting his activities as Vice-Chairperson and Chairperson of the ICPM and subsequently Vice-Chairperson of the CPM.

195. The CPM thanked the outgoing Chairperson for his guidance through the changes associated with the transition from the ICPM to the CPM, and with the important steps such as the creation of technical panels to develop technical standards. The CPM acknowledged his direction, leadership, problem-solving and approachability.

196. The Chairperson thanked the CPM for the support given during his mandate. He reminded the CPM of the continuing challenge and the need to advance in a cohesive manner with the aim of fighting the spread of pests of plants and controlling these efficiently.

20. DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

197. The CPM:

1. *Agreed* that the next session of the CPM would be held at FAO, Rome, Italy, on 30 March - 3 April 2009.

21. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

198. The CPM *adopted* the report.

⁵⁷ CPM 2008/INF/24

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**7-11 April 2008****AGENDA**

1. Opening of the session
2. Adoption of the agenda
 - 2.1 Provisional agenda
3. Election of the Rapporteur
4. Report by the CPM Chairperson
5. Report by the Secretariat
6. Report of the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations
7. Report of observer organisations
 - 7.1 Report of WTO-SPS Committee
 - 7.2 Report of the Standards and Trade Development Facility
 - 7.3 Report of the Convention on Biological Diversity
 - 7.4 Report of the Montreal Protocol
 - 7.5 Other observer organizations
8. Response to the evaluation of the workings of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and its institutional arrangements
 - 8.1 Response by the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance
 - 8.2 Response by the FAO Programme Committee, Council and Conference
9. Goal 1: A robust international standard setting and implementation programme
 - 9.1 Report by the Chairperson of the Standards Committee
 - 9.2 Adoption of international standards - under the regular process
 - 9.3 Adoption of international standards - under the fast-track process
 - 9.3.1 Concerns relating to the draft diagnostic protocol for *Thrips Palmi* – proposal from Australia
 - 9.4 Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme
 - 9.5 IPPC standard setting procedure (Annex 1 of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM)
 - 9.6 Terms of reference and rules of procedure for Technical Panels
 - 9.7 Other items arising from the Focus Group on standard setting procedures
 - 9.8 IPPC standard setting work programme (with proposed adjustments)
 - 9.9 IPPC training material for pest risk analysis
 - 9.10 Practical guidelines on the use of “must”, “shall”, “should” and “may” in ISPMs
 - 9.11 Report of the IPPC bark survey conducted on ISPM No. 15 marked wood in 2007
10. Goal 2: Information exchange systems appropriate to meet IPPC obligations
 - 10.1 Proposed work programme 2008
11. Goal 3: Effective dispute settlement systems
 - 11.1 Report of the Chairperson of the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement

- 11.2 Report on dispute settlement activities since CPM-2
- 11.3 Outcome of the Open-ended Working Group on a Possible IPPC Compliance Mechanism
12. Goal 4: Improved phytosanitary capacity of members
 - 12.1 Analysis of the application of the PCE tool
 - 12.2 Proposed work programme 2008-2009 for improved capacity of members
 - 12.3 Development of a CPM technical assistance strategy for phytosanitary capacity building
13. Goal 5: Sustainable implementation of the IPPC
 - 13.1 Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance
 - 13.1.1 Report of the 2nd meeting of the CPM SPTA
 - 13.2 IPPC/CPM activities
 - 13.2.1 State of membership to the IPPC
 - 13.2.2 Acceptance of documents in electronic format
 - 13.2.3 Convention in the authentic languages
 - 13.3 Update to the Business Plan 2007-2011
 - 13.4 Financial report and budget
 - 13.4.1 Financial report 2007
 - 13.4.2 Financial report 2007 for the Trust Fund for the IPPC
 - 13.4.3 CPM Operational Plan for 2008
 - 13.4.4 Budget 2008 for the Trust Fund for the IPPC
 - 13.4.5 Project-oriented planning for the multilateral IPPC Trust Fund
 - 13.4.6 Promotion strategy for the Trust Fund for the IPPC
 - 13.5 Proposal for the adoption of CPM recommendations
 - 13.6 ISPM No. 15 symbol - status of registration
14. Goal 6: International promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant regional and international organizations
 - 14.1 Report on the international promotion of the IPPC and cooperation with relevant regional and international organizations
 - 14.2 Report of the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group
15. Goal 7: Review of the status of plant protection in the world
 - 15.1 Key note address (implications of climate change for movement of transboundary pests: preparing the contracting parties)
16. Election of the Bureau
17. Membership of CPM subsidiary bodies
18. Calendar
19. Other business
20. Date and venue of the next meeting
21. Adoption of the report

ACTION ITEMS ADOPTED BY CPM-3 REGARDING THE RESPONSE BY THE SPTA TO THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE WORKING OF THE IPPC AND ITS INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
1. Standards and Standard-setting Process					
Quality and usefulness of standards					
1.1. As the existing concept standards cover already many fundamental international plant quarantine and inspection functions, there should be a greater balance in the selection of standards in favour of specific standards;	Agree	Processes are in place to improve the balance in favour of specific standards	Already in place	Continuing	SPTA, SC for additions to work programme and CPM
1.2. Industry stakeholders should be consulted and their knowledge and experience used at an early stage of the standard-setting process, particularly for specific standards on the basis of the Codex model (as explained in paragraph 56), and the necessary safeguards should be set up;	Partially agree	The consultation of industry stakeholders is a good practice of preparation within contracting parties. More industry stakeholders can be reached this way than through international stakeholder involvement.	Contracting parties to consult with stakeholders in their countries	Ongoing	Contracting parties
1.3. Greater efforts should be put into prioritization of standards, using existing criteria and weighting their importance as well as taking into account available resources;	Agree		As per recommendations from the Focus Group on Standard Setting Procedures	CPM-3 and ongoing	SPTA, SC, CPM
1.4. Priorities should also be based on maintaining an average number of three to four standards per year at least in the next three to five years (an increased number of standards may be envisaged where greater efficiency is gained in the process). The process through which priorities are established should be made clear to Contracting Parties;	Disagree	Want to maintain a target of 5 per year as per the CPM Business Plan The number of standards will depend on the nature of the standards Overlap with 1.13	Follow the CPM Business Plan	Ongoing, resource dependent	SC SPTA CPM
1.5. Opportunities should be sought to make greater use of existing standards, particularly those developed by RPPOs;	Agree	Awareness of other standards is important Potential usefulness of an inventory of other existing standards [Note: the response by the 19 th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was: <i>Agree. This is already taking place.</i>]	As per the regular call, countries can consider other existing standards in their proposals RPPOs and other international organizations can submit their standards through the Secretariat	Ongoing	Contracting parties, SPTA, SC

* Abbreviations: IWG-TA - Informal Working Group on Technical Assistance; MOU - Memorandum of Understanding; OEWG - Open-ended working group; RPPO - Regional Plant Protection Organizations; SBDS - Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement; SC - Standards Committee; SPTA - Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance; TC-RPPOs or TC - Technical Consultation among RPPOs

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
			(optional) in accordance with established procedures		
Environmental and biodiversity concerns					
1.6. A Technical Panel on Biodiversity should be established to review standards from the point of view of environmental impacts, biodiversity threats, and invasive species pathways that could be given accelerated priority and that could be included in the CPM work programme;	Disagree	<p>1.6 to 1.8: The SPTA summarizes its concerns with respect to Recommendations 1.6 to 1.8 as follows:</p> <p>The SPTA stresses that the IPPC is contributing to the protection of the environment and biodiversity by preventing the introduction and spread of invasive alien species which are regulated or potentially regulated pests.</p> <p>The SPTA clarifies that environmental concerns are systematically considered in the development of international standards. This has been taken into account in ISPMs, e.g. ISPM No. 5 supplement 2, ISPM#11, statement regarding cooperation with the CBD, consideration of environment as criteria in standard setting. The CPM has agreed that the scope of the convention extends beyond just cultivated plants.</p> <p>The SPTA believes that the role of the IPPC in relation to other conventions as well as the scope of the IPPC itself needs to be kept under review in this respect. In addition, the IPPC does not have the resources to establish a specifically designed work programme aimed at protecting the environment and/or biodiversity unless extra budgetary resources become available.</p>	<p>1. Keep under review issues of linkage and consistency with the environment</p> <p>2. Promote among contracting parties the responsibility to implement standards and the objectives of the IPPC, which includes reference to phytosanitary environment matters</p> <p>3. A statement regarding biodiversity considerations in all standards as appropriate (new standards as they are developed and old standards as they are revised)</p> <p>4. When new ISPMs are being specified, or existing ones revised, consideration of environmental and biodiversity concerns should be included in the specification, where appropriate</p>	<p>1. Ongoing</p> <p>2. Ongoing</p> <p>3. CPM-3</p> <p>4. Ongoing</p>	<p>1. CPM</p> <p>2. Contracting parties</p> <p>3. CPM</p> <p>4. SC, contracting parties, RPPOs</p>
1.7 Some standards should have a primary theme directed at biodiversity issues;	Disagree				
1.8 The Expert Working Groups, Technical Panels and Standards Committee should incorporate bio-diversity and environmental considerations into their work so that all standards address these concerns, not just the standards coming from the Technical Panel on Biodiversity. All standards should have a statement regarding their biodiversity impact;	Agree				
1.9. An Environmental Liaison Officer position should be created in the IPPC Secretariat with responsibility for environmental content in standards, information and training, and for leading the Technical Panel; and she/he could also carry out liaison functions with other international organizations for the Secretariat such as the Convention on Biodiversity;	Partially agree	<p>1.9 The SPTA partially agrees. At the current time the SPTA believes that a general liaison officer is needed for cooperation at a technical level with all other relevant international organizations.</p>	Staffing as per the CPM Business Plan	Depending on resources and other staffing actions	Secretariat

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Implementation of standards					
1.10. A procedure for monitoring implementation and impact of standards should be developed by the CPM, and used to inform both revisions of standards and the priorities and processes for developing new standards;	Agree	1.10 and 1.11: The SPTA advises that although the new revised text of the IPPC has only been in force for 2 years, the first investigation into the establishment of a compliance mechanism has been undertaken. Recommendations regarding implementation of standards may follow. Mechanisms for supporting implementation were proposed by OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms	Dependent on the CPM reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the proposal by the OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms	CPM-3 or 4	SPTA, SC, CPM
1.11 Each standard should have an implementation statement indicating the expected timeframe for implementation, an estimate of the potential impacts and costs and benefits of implementation, and a plan on how implementation could be achieved and monitored;	Disagree				
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 1st part Partially agree with the 2nd part	Workshops supporting implementation -within a capacity building strategy [Note: the response by the 19 th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was: <i>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 RPPO assistance to members for the implementation of standards]</i>	Expand technical assistance and capacity building strategy in relation to the issue of implementation Combination of RWS on ISPMs with training on implementation of ISPMs proposed	2008	Secretariat, SPTA, IWG-TA CPM-3
Maintenance of the current level of standard setting					
1.13 The CPM should ensure that there is both sufficient direct funding either from the FAO Regular Programme or extra-budgetary sources, to recruit expertise in standard setting to facilitate the work of stewards and to be able to recruit the necessary expertise not provided on a voluntary basis and when needed;	Agree	In addition, the SPTA would like to point out that the aim of the CPM is to adopt 5 ISPMs or their equivalent annually, as outlined in the CPM Business Plan. The estimated costs of 5 ISPMs per year is US\$1.5 million, of which currently approximately \$200,000 are contributed in kind by member state experts acting as stewards for individual standards.	Develop, implement and promote a multi-year funding strategy	2007/08	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau
Participation of Contracting Parties					
1.14 Sufficient financial and technical support should be directed at active participation of experts from developing countries in the SC, and EWGs and TPs (this will mean the active search and financial support of experts from developing countries);	Agree	The SPTA recognizes the aim of that recommendation and fully supports it.	Develop, implement and promote a multi-year funding strategy	2007/08	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Transparency of the standard-setting process					
1.15 Minutes of standard-setting committees (EWGs, TPs, SC) should provide sufficient detail on the nature and depth of the debates on key issues related to draft standards, and be available prior to member consultations;	Agree	Reports of these groups are intended to show the outcome of these discussions. Reports will be posted to the IPP as per decisions of Focus Group and SPTA. Experts should ensure that sufficient detail is recorded in the reports.	Secretariat: 1. Remind committees of need for detail in their reports 2. Post the reports	Ongoing	Secretariat - responsible for posting the report Meeting participants - responsible for adopting reports with sufficient detail
1.16. Greater time should be allocated between the end of member consultation on draft ISPMs and the SC meeting and the posting of SC approved draft ISPMs and the meeting of the CPM to allow time for feedback on comments and to achieve greater consensus prior to the CPM;	Agree	The SC decides on the appropriate time to present the draft to the CPM	SC decides on the appropriate time to present the draft ISPM to the CPM	2007 and ongoing	SC
1.17. A three-year standard-setting cycle would be more appropriate to ensure adequate time for standards specification, drafting and consultation;	Partially agree	See 1.16 which incorporates flexibility into the timing of the standard setting cycle	SC decides on the appropriate time to present the draft ISPM to the CPM	2007 and ongoing	SC
1.18 The number of permanent professional staff in the Secretariat involved in supporting the standard-setting process should be increased from 1.5 person years to 4 person years plus part of the time from the Senior Environment Liaison Officer (mentioned above); (This did not include temporary staff and contractual arrangements);	Partially agree	The SPTA partially agrees but believes that the number of permanent professional staff in the Secretariat for the standard setting process should be increased from 1.5 person years to 6 person years as rationalized in the CPM Business Plan. This assumes less work done on a voluntary basis , which is contrary to the assumption in the evaluation report. This is necessary because in-kind contributions by member states with experts acting as stewards may not continue and is not necessarily the most efficient way of working. The arrangement with stewards was set up as a short-term option to deal with the shortage of staff in the Secretariat.	Staffing as per the CPM Business Plan	Depending on resources and other staffing actions	Secretariat
1.19 The Secretariat should be able to have a greater role all along the standard-setting process in support of the EWGs, TPs, the SC and the CPM with a view to increasing transparency, quality of the work and facilitating participation of all Contracting Parties;	Agree	The capacity of the Secretariat should be strengthened.	Staffing, as per the CPM Business Plan	Dependent on resources	Secretariat

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
2. Information Exchange					
Assistance to Contracting Parties					
2.1. The IPPC Secretariat should continue to assist countries to better understand their information reporting obligations and to provide training on how to use the IPP to meet those obligations;	Agree		As per recommendation	Ongoing	Secretariat
2.2. Once the Secretariat finishes giving the basic workshop to Contracting Parties in all the regions, future training support should involve the development and provision of short refresher courses to reinforce the training and ensure capacity;	Agree	Opportunities should be explored to combine training workshops with refreshers workshops, consider networking amongst editors	As per recommendation	Ongoing, and as resources become available	Secretariat
Evaluation of obligation status					
2.3. The IPPC Secretariat should consider developing a basic form, available on the IPP, for countries to use to auto-evaluate their reporting obligation status, as well as the accuracy of the data provided. Countries could be encouraged to auto-evaluate their status on a regular basis (e.g. yearly);	Agree	2.3 and 2.4 Need to consider mechanisms and tools to be used	CPM to review and decide on how to proceed with the proposal by the OEWG on a Possible Compliance Mechanism	CPM-3 or 4	Secretariat, CPM, contracting parties
2.4. In view of the arrival of new editors and the need for refresher information by existing ones, the IPPC Secretariat should continue the development of appropriate capacity-building tools;	Agree		Develop appropriate capacity-building tools and IPP manual	2008 depending on resources	Secretariat, IPP Support Group
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;	Agree	<p>The SPTA shares the comments contained in the FAO Management response, i.e.,</p> <p>Consider the need for a formal working group within the Organization, to make best use of resources in the International Portal on Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health (IPFSAPH) and synergies with similar information exchange programmes where possible (e.g. Codex Alimentarius).</p> <p>[Note: the response by the 19th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was:</p> <p><i>The TC-RPPOs agrees in principle with this recommendation, based on availability of the information.</i>]</p>	Further develop joint work programmes and associated MOUs where required	2008	IPPC, Secretariat, FAO

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
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.;	Agree	Recognize as an official reporting route rather than legal.	1. Consult with FAO legal office regarding legality	1. 2007	1. Secretariat
	Partially agree	Development of a MOU depends on outcome of legal interpretation, but SPTA preference is to do without MOU. Note: the response by the 19 th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was: <i>The 19th TC-RPPOs agreed on recognizing the RPPOs as an official reporting route and using a standard format for this purpose. However, the TC believes that the word "legal" in the recommendation is not appropriate and should be replaced with the word "official".</i>	2. Discuss at next CPM and discuss implementation at next TC of RPPOs 3. Continue to develop standard format for Reporting	2. 2008 3. Ongoing	2. TC and Secretariat 3. Secretariat and RPPOs
2.7. Further, the IPPC Secretariat should establish a mechanism for Contracting Parties to officially declare to the IPPC which reporting channel they are using to meet their reporting obligations;	Disagree	Mechanism already exists through the IPP Not all reporting obligations from a CP need to use the same reporting channel Also addressed through recommendations 2.8 and 2.9	Wait for outcome of actions under 2.6 (consultation with FAO legal)		
Compliance with mandatory information exchange obligations					
2.8. Compliance with mandatory information exchange obligations should be given much greater emphasis by the CPM and the Secretariat;	Agree	Refer to recommendations of the OEWG Contracting parties need to commit to meeting their reporting obligations These recommendations should be considered when discussing international recognition of pest free areas	Dependent on the CPM reviewing and deciding how to proceed with the proposal by the OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms	CPM-3 or 4	CPM and Secretariat
2.9. A monitoring and compliance system for meeting mandatory IPPC reporting obligations should be developed and implemented. (A first step in that direction would be to publish country information reporting every year at the CPM.) This system should specifically track Contracting Party compliance with all reporting obligations;	Agree	The OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms used the term implementation monitoring. Monitoring is a responsibility of CPM	Dependent on the CPM reviewing and deciding how to proceed with proposal by OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms	CPM-3 or 4	CPM and Secretariat

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
Professional support					
2.10. The Secretariat should hire a Webmaster for information exchange and a Programmer to maintain the IPP and to improve its tools and features;	Agree	2.10 and 2.11: The SPTA generally agrees, but stresses that the staff resources for information exchange of 5 persons projected in the CPM Business Plan need to be realized. Note that webmaster has been hired “external” IT assistant is understood to refer to external to the Secretariat	To discuss further in recommendation 6.9		
2.11. Funding should be made available for hiring external Information Technology professional assistance to assist with the maintenance of the IPP and to support its further development;	Agree		To discuss further in recommendation 6.9		
3. Technical Assistance					
Coordination of Global Support					
3.1 FAO, and not the IPPC Secretariat, is best placed to coordinate global support for strengthening national phytosanitary capacity; and	Disagree	<p>Contrary to the recommendation in the report, the SPTA feels that the IPPC secretariat is best placed to coordinate phytosanitary capacity building. To this end, the SPTA recommends the development of a phytosanitary capacity building strategy which addresses implementation, funding, and linkages to FAO resources. The strategy, as developed, will specify reporting channels.</p> <p>The requirements for phytosanitary capacity strengthening are best understood within the IPPC and not in the larger FAO system. The recommendation in the evaluation report would have the effect of relegating phytosanitary issues to a lower level. The CPM is made up of the world leaders of plant health and the Secretariat is staffed with some of the best expertise that can be found worldwide in phytosanitary matters. It would be better if the capacity of the IPPC Secretariat was improved to address the shortcomings of the technical assistance programme identified in the evaluation report. In this regard, the link between the IPPC Secretariat and FAO Technical Cooperation Programme and donors needs to be strengthened with the lead within the IPPC Secretariat, rather than outside it.</p>	Develop and facilitate implementation of capacity building strategy	starting 2008	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
<p>3.2 An International Consultative Group on Technical Assistance and Capacity-Building on Phytosanitary Matters should be set up and coordinated by the FAO Plant Production and Protection Division.</p> <p>The group:</p> <p>a) would be open to all donors and recipient countries in the field of phytosanitary capacity;</p> <p>b) objectives would be to define priority needs, facilitate resource mobilization, and ensure coordination;</p> <p>c) it should establish effective linkages with the CPM;</p>	Disagree	Same reason as for 3.1. In addition it is felt that the recommendation in the report would add unnecessary new layers of decision making.			
Organization of Technical Capacity					
3.3 FAO, through the Plant Production and Protection Division, should organize the necessary technical capacity outside the IPPC Secretariat as part of its regular programme with a view to providing technical assistance in support of phytosanitary capacity development. FAO should do so taking into account its resources and in partnership with other main actors;	Disagree	Taking into account its resources and in partnership with other organizations, FAO should provide strong support to the IPPC for phytosanitary capacity building in developing countries.	Develop and facilitate implementation of capacity building strategy	Starting 2008	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM
3.4 FAO should report to the CPM on its phytosanitary technical assistance;	Agree		As per recommendation	Ongoing	Secretariat
IPPC Technical Assistance					
3.5 Technical assistance carried out directly under the IPPC should be limited to its core business, i.e. closely linked to a better understanding of standards and monitoring of the impact of these standards, the development and use of the IPP as a tool for information exchange among Contracting Parties, and support to developing country attendance at technical and governance meetings;	Partially agree	<p>The technical capacity building strategy should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • support in the development and implementation of standards • better understanding of these standards • monitoring of the impact of these standards • development and use of the IPP as tool for information exchange • support for developing countries' preparation for and participation in technical meetings. • support for developing countries' technical inputs into phytosanitary policymaking <p>In addition, the CPM Business Plan specifies the critical areas addressed under the IPPC's technical assistance programme as being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • modernization of legal frameworks 	Develop and facilitate implementation of capacity building strategy	Starting 2008	Secretariat, SPTA, Bureau, CPM

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> institutional strengthening training in relation to the implementation of ISPMs pest surveillance pest risk analysis skills information systems for decision making documented procedures laboratory facilities strengthening of national capabilities and systems for the eradication/containment of introduced pest species establishment of pest free areas. 			
4. Dispute Settlement					
4.1. Continued effective support should be given to maintain the newly established Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement and to promote awareness of the IPPC's dispute settlement procedures;	Agree	The role of the dispute settlement system will continue to be promoted	Report shall be provided Secretariat to liaise with SBDS Promotion continues	CPM 3 Ongoing Ongoing	Secretariat Secretariat Secretariat, SBDS, Bureau, CPM
4.2. The CPM should encourage Contracting Parties, when appropriate, to make use of this process;	Agree	Parts of the system are being used	Report use of the system to CPM	Ongoing	SBDS, Secretariat
5. Governance					
CPM Programme of Work					
5.1 The CPM should review and formally adopt the annual programme of work and related budget;	Agree	See combined response to 5.1, 7.2 and 7.3 under recommendation 7.	As per the recommendation, the CPM will review and adopt the distribution of the funds allocated by FAO, as well funds from other sources	CPM meetings	CPM
CPM's Cost					
5.2 In order to reduce the CPM's cost, it is recommended that translation costs should be reduced by outsourcing these activities;	Agree	<p>The SPTA fully supports the recommendation, provided such translations are consistent with the expectations of the IPPC and within FAO requirements.</p> <p>The programme committee, in response to the intervention of the vice chair of the CPM, supported the ESPTA decision that the translation policy be relaxed.</p>	<p>Request an update on possibility to outsource translation for CPM- 4</p> <p>Request that contracting parties discuss the issue on behalf of the Bureau and raise it at FAO council and conference</p>	CPM-4 (enquire in Oct-Nov 2008) Next FAO council and conference	FAO CPM Chair

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
		“It also noted the view of the Vice-Chair of the CPM that standards were highly technical and best translated by plant protection professionals. The Committee agreed that the FAO policy in this regard should be further reviewed with a view to its relaxation.”			
Information					
5.3 Acknowledging that one of the CPM’s key functions should remain the review of phytosanitary issues at the global level, but noting that the Secretariat does not have the capacity to carry out such a review on a regular basis. FAO (and not the IPPC Secretariat) should integrate into its core work programme a review of the phytosanitary status of the world as part of the technical services provided by the Plant Production and Protection Division to the IPPC and to the FAO membership as a whole;	Disagree	It should be noted that Article XI.2a of the IPPC, states that the “review of the state of plant protection in the world” is a function of the CPM and this is correctly stated in paragraph 145 of the evaluation report. The SPTA believes that a review of phytosanitary issues at a global level is best carried out under the IPPC because existing reporting channels like the IPP are already functional. The IPP could be an important medium in gathering information about the state of plant protection in the world and the increased efficiency or use of the IPP coupled with accurate reporting may contribute considerably to such a review.	Dependent on CPM reviewing and deciding how to proceed with proposal by OEWG on Possible Compliance Mechanisms	CPM-3 or 4	CPM
Structures and Transparency					
5.4 To combine the functions of the Bureau and the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance into the newly enlarged Bureau;	Agree	The SPTA will still have one annual open ended meeting with the extended bureau as its core group	Elections for Bureau	2008	CPM
5.5 Greater transparency be ensured through various measures including quick availability of minutes of meetings and audio-recordings on the Internet as well as possibility to co-opt or invite experts;	Agree	Agree that transparency is an ongoing issue being addressed by CPM and its bodies, wherever practical and possible The Standards Setting Focus Group made recommendations regarding transparency in standard setting	Prepare minutes quickly and have docs available	Ongoing	Secretariat, others as appropriate
Effective management of the work to be undertaken by the Standards Committee					
5.6. The total membership of the Committee should be reduced to 14: two from each FAO Region;	Disagree	Should be no change, especially since CPM put considerable effort into reaching consensus on the size of the SC, and the decision should not be reviewed at this time			

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
5.7. RPPOs should be involved in the identification of appropriate candidates;	Partially agree	This is a matter for each FAO Regional Group to decide. In several regions this is already the case. [Note: the response by the 19 th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was: <i>The TC-RPPOs agrees with this recommendation</i>]	No further action		
Staffing					
5.8 The Secretariat should ensure that proposed members meet the requirements as described in the Standards Committee's rules of procedure (subsequently, candidates should be endorsed by the Bureau against agreed criteria before being submitted to the CPM for confirmation);	Partially agree	Secretariat to make sure that FAO regions are aware of the criteria and use criteria for nomination of SC members, and show how criteria have been met	Summarize requirements for SC members from existing rules of procedure	Annual - prior to the CPM meeting	Secretariat
6. Secretariat					
6.1 The Secretary post should not be associated with other FAO functions and should be a full-time D1 (Manager);	Agree	The SPTA strongly supports the aim of the recommendation of having a full-time D1 Secretary focusing on the leadership and management of the IPPC and its Secretariat (within FAO), and strategic relations with other international bodies. Any other activities of the Secretary should be complementary to that role. The Programme Committee also agrees with the recommendation The SPTA realizes that there is a budget implication	Appoint full time secretary	As soon as possible, but depending on resources	FAO
6.2 There should be open competition for the post of Secretary;	Agree	Bureau should be involved in developing job description	Draft job description	2007	Bureau, Secretariat
6.3 The Coordinator post should then be abolished;	Disagree	The SPTA believes that after appointing the full time Secretary, the Coordinator position must be maintained for at least a certain period in order to maintain and improve an efficient functioning of the Secretariat. Once the full time secretary is appointed, the workload and the CPM's expectations of the Secretariat should be reviewed to determine the appropriate structure, size and scope of the Secretariat.			

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
6.4 The seniority of the posts dealing with the IPPC's two core functions (i.e. standard-setting and information exchange) should be upgraded to P5, supervising other professionals;		The SPTA believes that determination of pay grade is to be done by the IPPC Secretary and FAO and strongly recommends that staff is remunerated in accordance with their responsibilities as per 6.3 - review of structure			
Technical Assistance					
In view of the proposed changes regarding the role of the Secretariat on technical assistance: 6.5. Regional Plant Protection Officers should perform specific tasks against reimbursement from the IPPC budget. Activities funded from this source should be concerned with the primary role of the IPPC (e.g. standard-setting, information exchange and dispute settlement);	Agree	The time that FAO regional plant protection officers dedicate to IPPC activities should be broadly correlated with the IPPC contribution to their post. The activities of the regional plant protection officers will be determined by the CPM work programme and the technical capacity building strategy	1. Regional officers liaise with NPPOs in their region on the planning of their phytosanitary activities 2. Regional officers report through the Chief, AGPP to the IPPC Secretariat on phytosanitary activities	1. Immediate 2. Immediate	1. Regional plant protection officers, contracting parties 2. FAO, IPPC Secretariat
6.6. The activities carried out by the Regional Officers should be reported annually in the CPM as part of the activity and financial report of the Secretariat to the CPM;	Agree	The regional plant protection officers should report on their IPPC activities.	Regional plant protection officers report annually	Annually	IPPC Secretariat, Regional plant protection officers
Selection of staff					
6.7 In line with the provisions of Article XIV of the FAO Constitution, the Bureau and the representatives of the Director-General (e.g. from the Plant Production and Protection Division) will recommend a candidate for Secretary to the Director-General following a transparent and competitive selection process.	Agree	The SPTA agrees with the principle of the CPM or Bureau being involved in the selection process for the post of Secretary. Therefore, it recommends that FAO should investigate how CPM representatives may be involved in this process. Programme Committee suggested the bureau be involved Note: the response made by the ESPTA to 6.7 and 6.8: was based on an earlier version of the Evaluation Report, which was later modified by the Evaluation Team	As per recommendation	Dependent on resource availability	Bureau, FAO
6.8 A similar procedure will be followed for the selection of the professional staff of the IPPC Secretariat. Such staff would not be eligible for consideration as internal candidates for posts elsewhere in FAO.	Agree	The SPTA agrees with the principle of the CPM or Bureau being involved in the selection process for posts of professional staff, limited to the P4 and P5 level. Therefore, it recommends that FAO should investigate how CPM representatives may be involved in this process. Note the FAO Management Response, i.e. <i>"Professional appointments will be considered by the</i>	No action required as this extends beyond the authority of the CPM		

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
		<i>Professional Staff Selection Committee (PSSC) before a short list is presented. For identification of the most qualified candidates for the short list, the positions will be widely advertised and nominations will be sought from relevant institutions and organizations, including the CPM. Once appointed, under FAO Staff rules, any staff member must be eligible for consideration as an internal candidate for posts elsewhere in FAO."</i>			
Structure and number of Professional Secretariat Staff					
6.9 Based on the analysis in the previous chapters, changes proposed regarding the structure and the number of professional staffing of the Secretariat are as follows: - D-1 IPPC Secretary (Manager) - 1 P-5 Senior Environmental Liaison Officer and Coordination with other international organizations - 1 P-5 IPPC Senior Standards Officer - 3 P-4 Standards Officers - 1 P-5 IPPC Senior Information Exchange Officer - 1 P-4 Information Officer - 1 P-3 Programmer - 1 P-2 Webmaster;	Partially agree	The SPTA believes that the CPM Business Plan (2007-2011) accurately reflects the staffing needs of the Secretariat. The recommendation does not reflect the capacity building staff needs as it recommends that this area be moved outside of the Secretariat (Rec 3.1). Neither does it reflect the general staff, nor contracted assistance (see Recommendations (and comments), 1.8, 1.18, 2.10 and 2.11) Staff requirements are set out in the Business Plan. Following the IPPC Evaluation, the meeting of the Focus Group on the Standards Setting Procedure, the meeting of the Programme Committee and the subsequent CPM 2008, there may be a need to review the Business Plan. It is noted that the both the IPPC Evaluation and the FAO Programme Committee recommended significant Secretariat staff increases.	Review of CPM Business Plan	2008-2009	SPTA, CPM
7. IPPC's Financial Resources					
7.1. FAO should preferably ensure systematic annual core funding of the Secretariat's core activities on a basis agreed upon by the CPM's expanded Bureau and FAO;	Agree	The SPTA agrees with the general aim of the recommendation as contained in the report but recommends that the terms "preferably" and "expanded bureau" be deleted so that the recommendation would read: <i>FAO should ensure systematic annual core funding of the Secretariat's core activities on a basis agreed upon by the CPM and FAO.</i> The basis for the CPM's consideration of core activities are the 7 strategic 5-year goals presented in the CPM Business Plan and aimed at implementing	FAO Council and Conference	2007 and ongoing	FAO

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
		<p>the provisions of the IPPC. The SPTA considers that the successful implementation of these goals will require sufficient resources both from FAO and external sources. This would also be in accordance with the opening speech of the Director-General at CPM-2.</p> <p>In addition, the SPTA would like to draw attention to paragraph 170 of the Evaluation Report. Funding of staff needs to be included in the list of that paragraph</p>			
7.2. The annual budget and programme should be defined by the expanded bureau.	Agree	<p>5.1, 7.2 and 7.3: The procedure for developing and adopting the work programme and associated budget should be carried out as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the financial resources provided by FAO regular programme and other contributions, the Bureau, in consultation with the Secretariat will develop and propose an annual work programme with an associated budget. Based on the proposals by the Bureau, the CPM may adopt the programme. <p>With respect to the <i>work programme and associated budget</i>, the Secretariat is fully accountable to the Bureau and the CPM and should provide detailed and clear financial reports.</p> <p>Note: The FAO Management Response: <i>According to the Convention, the Secretary is responsible for implementing the policies and activities of the Commission and carrying out such other functions as may be assigned to the Secretary by this Convention and shall report thereon to the Commission. In such a situation the Bureau can only have an advisory function unless the CPM decides otherwise. Furthermore, this can only be seen in the context of the CPM as an Article XIV body of the IPPC, which does not include financial responsibility for FAO's Regular Programme funds. FAO Management accepts that the Secretariat should continue to provide the CPM, the Bureau and the SPTA with detailed financial information and to make them aware of possibilities and limitations.</i></p>	As for 5.1 (... the CPM will review and adopt the distribution of the funds allocated by FAO, as well funds from other sources)		
7.3. The Secretariat should be fully accountable to the expanded Bureau and should provide detailed and clear financial reports;	Agree		Provide detailed and clear financial report	Bureau, SPTA and CPM	Secretariat

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
7.4. The Secretariat should have a more solid resource mobilization strategy, stressing the preference for multi-donor trust funding over bilateral funding;	Agree	The SPTA attributes considerable importance to this recommendation and agrees that the Secretariat should have a more solid resource mobilisation strategy, stressing the preference for multi-donor trust funding over bilateral funding. However, the SPTA emphasises that any form of extra-budgetary contribution at any time would be considered. In addition, it should be easy to contribute extra-budgetary resources to the IPPC. The development of a more solid resource mobilization strategy should be done in cooperation between Secretariat and the Bureau.	Develop strategy	2007-08	Secretariat and Bureau
7.5. Donor Contracting Parties should make an effort to tie their contributions to the IPPC's annual planning cycle;	Partially agree	Same comment as under 7.4			
7.6 More innovative approaches of funding such as cost-recovery schemes will have to be systematically and carefully considered in the future;	Partially agree	The SPTA partially agrees and emphasises that alternative funding mechanisms, including cost recovery schemes had been investigated since 2002 by the ICPM and CPM. It was found that cost-recovery schemes are not practical at present. However, other innovative approaches will be considered as part of the development of a resource mobilization strategy being developed under 7.4.	[Consider for Ministerial meeting]		
Regional Plant Protection Organizations (Suggestions)					
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: 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: 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	Agree	Note: the following response by the 19 th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was: <i>a) The TC-RPPOs agrees (refer 2.6)</i> <i>b) Standards</i> <i>i) The TC agrees and may be extended to cooperation between the RPPOs.</i> <i>ii) The TC agrees with the suggestion that in regions</i>	As per the TC response; TC should consider SPTA response to recommendation 2.6 Refer to response of TC	TC of RPPOs 2008	RPPOs

Recommendation	Agreement by SPTA*	SPTA Comment on the Recommendation	Action items adopted by CPM-3		
			Action	Timing	Unit Responsible
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.		<p><i>which have FAO Plant Protection Officers, a workplan should be developed for cooperation in implementation of ISPMs.</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p> <p>Development of RPPOs could be aspect of capacity building strategy</p>	Consider RPPOs in capacity building strategy		[CPM]
<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 (APPPC) and the Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC)¹ 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>Agree</p> <p>Agree</p>	<p>The SPTA fully supports the suggestions made in paragraph 190 of the evaluation report.</p> <p>Note: the response by the 19th TC-RPPOs (Ottawa 2007) was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>APPPC - The TC-RPPOs believes that this is an FAO issue</i> <i>Near East – The TC-RPPOs agrees with the comment regarding the Near East</i> <i>Capacity - The TC agrees with the comment and noted that strengthening capacity should not be limited to only some RPPOs.</i> <p>The SPTA considers that all of the RPPOs should be strengthened and a strategy developed to ensure their sustainability</p> <p>Note the positive evolution of the APPPC over the past years</p>	As per the recommendation		[FAO]
			FAO to develop a strategy to strengthen RPPOs and ensure their sustainability	2008 and ongoing	FAO

¹ The CPPC is currently being disestablished and the RPPO activities will be taken over by the Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA), which will function as the RPPO for the Caribbean subregion in accordance with Article IX of the New Revised Text of the IPPC.

AMENDMENTS TO ISPM No. 5 (GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS)**1. NEW TERM AND DEFINITIONS**

bark The layer of a woody trunk, branch or root outside the cambium

2. REVISED TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

bark-free wood **Wood** from which all **bark**, except ingrown bark around knots and bark pockets between rings of annual growth, has been removed

debarked wood* **Wood** that has been subjected to any process that results in the removal of **bark**. (Debarked wood is not necessarily **bark-free wood**.)

* Note: this will replace the current term *debarking*.

3. DELETIONS

- authority
- biological pesticide (biopesticide)
- classical biological control
- establishment (of a biological control agent)
- exotic
- Import Permit (of a biological control agent)
- introduction (of a biological control agent)
- micro-organism
- specificity.

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

ISPM No. 30

***ESTABLISHMENT OF AREAS OF LOW PEST
PREVALENCE FOR FRUIT FLIES (TEPHRITIDAE)***

(2008)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

REFERENCES

DEFINITIONS

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

BACKGROUND**REQUIREMENTS****1. General Requirements**

- 1.1 Operational plans
- 1.2 Determination of an FF-ALPP
- 1.3 Documentation and record keeping
- 1.4 Supervision activities

2. Specific Requirements

- 2.1 Establishment of the FF-ALPP
 - 2.1.1 Determination of the specified level of low pest prevalence
 - 2.1.2 Geographical description
 - 2.1.3 Surveillance activities prior to establishment
- 2.2 Phytosanitary procedures
 - 2.2.1 Surveillance activities
 - 2.2.2 Reduction and maintenance of target fruit fly species population level
 - 2.2.3 Phytosanitary measures related to movement of host material or regulated articles
 - 2.2.4 Domestic declaration of an FF-ALPP
- 2.3 Maintenance of the FF-ALPP
 - 2.3.1 Surveillance
 - 2.3.2 Measures to maintain low prevalence levels of target fruit fly species
- 2.4 Corrective action plans
- 2.5 Suspension, reinstatement and loss of FF-ALPP status
 - 2.5.1 Suspension of FF-ALPP status
 - 2.5.2 Reinstatement of FF-ALPP status
 - 2.5.3 Loss of FF-ALPP status

ANNEX 1

Parameters used to estimate the level of fruit fly prevalence

ANNEX 2

Guidelines on corrective action plans for fruit flies in an FF-ALPP

APPENDIX 1

Guidelines on trapping procedures

APPENDIX 2

Typical application of an FF-ALPP

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

This standard provides guidelines for the establishment and maintenance of areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (FF-ALPPs) by a National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO). Such areas may be utilised as official pest risk management measures alone, or as part of a systems approach, to facilitate trade of fruit fly host products, or to minimize the spread of regulated fruit flies within an area. This standard applies to fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance.

REFERENCES

Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, 1994. World Trade Organization, Geneva.

Determination of pest status in an area, 1998. ISPM No. 8, FAO, Rome.

Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae), 2006. ISPM No. 26, FAO, Rome.

Glossary of phytosanitary terms, 2008. ISPM No. 5, FAO, Rome.

Guidelines for surveillance, 1997. ISPM No. 6, FAO, Rome.

International Plant Protection Convention, 1997. FAO, Rome.

Pest reporting, 2002. ISPM No. 17, FAO, Rome.

Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence, 2007. ISPM No. 29, FAO, Rome.

Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence, 2005. ISPM No. 22, FAO, Rome.

The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management, 2002. ISPM No. 14, FAO, Rome.

DEFINITIONS

Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in the present standard can be found in ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

The general requirements for establishment and maintenance of an area of low pest prevalence for fruit flies (FF-ALPP) include:

- confirming the operational and economic feasibility of the FF-ALPP
- describing the purpose of the area
- listing the target fruit fly species(s) for the FF-ALPP
- operational plans
- determination of the FF-ALPP
- documentation and record keeping
- supervision activities.

For the establishment of the FF-ALPP, parameters used to estimate the level of fruit fly prevalence and the efficacy of trapping devices for surveillance should be determined as stated in Annex 1. Surveillance, control measures and corrective action planning are required for both establishment and maintenance. Corrective action planning is described in Annex 2.

Other specific requirements include phytosanitary procedures, as well as suspension, loss and reinstatement of the status of the FF-ALPP.

BACKGROUND

The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC, 1997) contains provisions for areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs), as does the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (Article VI of the WTO-SPS Agreement). ISPM No. 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*) describes different types of ALPPs and provides general guidance on the establishment of ALPPs. ALPPs may also be used as part of a systems approach (ISPM No. 14: *The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*).

Fruit flies are a very important group of pests for many countries because of their potential to cause damage to fruits and restrict national and international trade for plant products that are hosts of fruit flies.

The high probability of introduction of fruit flies associated with a wide range of hosts results in restrictions imposed by many importing countries and the need for phytosanitary measures to be applied in exporting countries related to movement of host material or regulated articles to ensure that the risk of introduction is appropriately mitigated.

This standard provides guidance for the establishment and maintenance by the NPPO of FF-ALPPs with the aim to facilitate trade by minimizing the risk of introduction or spread of regulated fruit flies.

FF-ALPPs are generally used as buffer zones for fruit fly-pest free areas (FF-PFAs), fruit fly free places of production or fruit fly free production sites (either as a permanent buffer zone or as part of an eradication process), or for export purposes, usually in conjunction with other risk mitigation measures as a component of a systems approach (this may include all or part of an FF-ALPP that acts as a buffer zone).

They may occur naturally (and subsequently be verified, declared and monitored or otherwise managed); they may occur as a result of pest control practices during crop production that suppress the population of fruit flies in an area to limit their impact on the crop; or they may be established as a result of control practices that reduce the number of fruit flies in the area to a specified low level.

The decision to establish an FF-ALPP may be closely linked to market access as well as to economic and operational feasibility.

If an FF-ALPP is established for export of fruit fly host commodities, the parameters for establishment and maintenance of the FF-ALPP should be determined and agreed to in conjunction with the importing country and in consideration of the guidelines presented in this standard and in accordance with ISPM No. 29 (*Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence*).

The requirements for the establishment of FF-ALPPs in this standard can also be applied for movement of fruit between ALPPs within a country.

The target pests for which this standard was developed include insects of the order Diptera, family Tephritidae, of the genera *Anastrepha*, *Bactrocera*, *Ceratitis*, *Dacus*, *Rhagoletis* and *Toxotrypana*.

REQUIREMENTS

1. General Requirements

The concepts and provisions of ISPM No. 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*) apply to the establishment and maintenance of ALPPs for a specified pest, or a group of pests including fruit flies, and therefore ISPM No. 22 should be referred to in conjunction with this standard.

An FF-ALPP may be established in accordance with this standard under a variety of situations. Some may require the application of the full range of elements provided by this standard, whereas others may require the application of only some of those elements.

Phytosanitary measures and specific procedures as further described in this standard may be required for the establishment and maintenance of an FF-ALPP by the NPPO. The decision to establish an official FF-ALPP may be based on all or some of the technical factors provided in this standard, as appropriate. They include components such as pest biology and control methods, which will vary according to the species of fruit fly for which the FF-ALPP is being established.

The establishment of an official FF-ALPP should be considered against the overall operational and economic feasibility of establishing a programme to meet and maintain the low pest level and the objectives of the FF-ALPP.

An FF-ALPP may be applied to facilitate the movement of fruit fly hosts from one FF-ALPP to another of the same fruit fly pest status to protect areas endangered by a regulated fruit fly pest.

The essential prerequisite for establishment of an FF-ALPP is an area that exists naturally, or that can be established, and that can be delimited, monitored and verified by the NPPO to be of a specified fruit fly prevalence level. The area may be in place to protect an FF-PFA or support sustainable crop production, or may have developed in response to suppression or eradication actions. It may occur naturally as a result of climatic, biological or geographical factors that reduce or limit the fruit fly population through all or part of the year.

An area can be defined as an FF-ALPP for one or more target fruit fly species. However, for an FF-ALPP covering multiple target fruit fly species, trapping devices and their deployment densities and locations should be specified, and low pest prevalence levels determined for each target fruit fly species.

FF-ALPPs should include public awareness programmes of a similar nature as outlined in section 1.1 of ISPM No. 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*).

1.1 Operational plans

An official operational plan is needed to specify the phytosanitary procedures required to establish and maintain an FF-ALPP.

The operational plan should describe the main procedures to be carried out such as surveillance activities, procedures to maintain the specified level of low pest prevalence, the corrective action plan and any other procedures that are required to achieve the objective of the FF-ALPP.

1.2 Determination of an FF-ALPP

Elements to be considered in the determination of an FF-ALPP are as follows:

- delimitation of the area (size of location, detailed maps including an accurate description of the boundaries or Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates showing the boundaries, natural barriers, entry points, location of commercial and, as appropriate, non-commercial hosts of the target fruit fly and urban areas)
- target fruit fly species and its/their seasonal and spatial distribution within the area
- location, abundance and seasonality of hosts, including wherever possible specifying primary (biologically preferred) hosts
- climatic characteristics, including rainfall, relative humidity, temperature, and prevailing wind speed and direction
- identification of factors limiting and keeping fruit fly population at low levels.

In areas where prevalence of fruit flies is naturally at a low level because of climatic, geographical or other reasons (e.g. natural enemies, availability of suitable hosts, host seasonality), the target fruit fly population may already be below the specified level of low pest prevalence without applying any control measures. In such cases, surveillance should be undertaken over an appropriate length of time to validate the low prevalence status and this status may be recognized in accordance with the examples listed in section 3.1.1 of ISPM No. 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*). If, however, the fruit flies are detected above the specified level of low pest prevalence (e.g. because of extraordinary climatic conditions) corrective actions should be applied. Guidelines for corrective action plans are provided in Annex 2.

1.3 Documentation and record keeping

The phytosanitary procedures used for the determination, establishment, verification and maintenance of an FF-ALPP should be adequately documented. These procedures should be reviewed and updated regularly, including the corrective actions if required (as described in ISPM No. 22: *Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*). It is recommended that a manual of procedures relating to the operational plan be prepared for the FF-ALPP.

Documentation for determination and establishment may include:

- list of fruit fly hosts known to occur in the area, including seasonality and commercial fruit production in the area
- delimitation records: detailed maps showing the boundaries, natural barriers and points where fruits may enter the area; description of agro-ecological features such as soil type, the location of main host areas of target fruit fly, and marginal and urban host areas; and climatic conditions, for example rainfall, relative humidity, temperature, and prevailing wind speed and direction
- surveillance records:
 - trapping: types of surveys, number and type of traps and lures, frequency of trap inspection, trap density, trap array, trapping time and duration, number of target fruit flies captured by species for each trap, trap servicing
 - fruit sampling: type, quantity, date, frequency and result
- record of control measures used for fruit flies and other pests that may have an effect on fruit fly populations: type(s) and locations.

For verification and maintenance, documentation should include the data recorded to demonstrate the population levels of the target fruit fly species are below the specified level of low pest prevalence. The records of surveys and results of other operational procedures should be retained for at least 24 months. If the FF-ALPP is being used for export purposes, records should be made available to the NPPO of the relevant importing country on request and verification may take place if necessary.

Corrective action plans should also be developed and maintained (see section 2.4).

1.4 Supervision activities

The FF-ALPP programme, including applicable domestic regulations, surveillance procedures (e.g. trapping, fruit sampling) and corrective action plans, should comply with officially approved procedures. These procedures may include official delegation of responsibility assigned to key personnel, for example:

- a person with defined authority and responsibility to ensure that the systems/procedures are implemented and maintained appropriately
- entomologist(s) with responsibility for the identification of fruit flies to species level.

The NPPO should evaluate and audit the operation of the procedures for establishment and maintenance of the FF-ALPP to ensure that effective management is maintained even where the responsibility to carry out specific activities has been delegated to outside the NPPO. Supervision of operational procedures include:

- operation of surveillance procedures
- surveillance capability
- trapping materials (traps, attractants) and procedures
- identification capability
- application of control measures
- documentation and record keeping
- implementation of corrective actions.

2. Specific Requirements

2.1 Establishment of the FF-ALPP

Elements for consideration when establishing an FF-PFA are described in sections 2.1 and 2.2 of ISPM No. 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and may also be applied to an FF-ALPP as defined in following subsections.

2.1.1 Determination of the specified level of low pest prevalence

Specified levels of low pest prevalence will depend on the level of risk associated with the target fruit fly species–host–area interaction. These levels should be established by the NPPO of the country where the FF-ALPP is located and with sufficient precision to allow assessment of whether surveillance data and protocols are adequate to determine that pest prevalence is below these levels.

Individual NPPOs may draw on a variety of different factors when determining exactly what an appropriate level of pest prevalence should be for a given FF-ALPP. Some commonly considered factors include the following:

- levels stipulated by trading partners in order for trade to proceed
- levels in use by other NPPOs for the same or similar fruit fly species, hosts and agro-ecological conditions (including experience and historical data gained from the operation of other FF-ALPPs as to what levels are required to be maintained to achieve pest free fruits).

Establishment of the parameters used to estimate the level of fruit fly prevalence is described in Annex 1.

2.1.2 Geographical description

The NPPO defines the limits of a proposed FF-ALPP. Isolation of the area (physical or geographical) is not necessarily required for establishment of FF-ALPPs.

Boundaries used to describe the delimitation of the FF-ALPP should be established and closely related to the relative presence of hosts of the target fruit fly species or adjusted to readily recognizable boundaries.

2.1.3 Surveillance activities prior to establishment

Prior to the establishment of an FF-ALPP, surveillance to assess the presence and level of prevalence of the target fruit fly species should be undertaken for a period determined by its biology, behaviour, climatic characteristics of the area, host availability and appropriate technical considerations. This surveillance should continue for at least 12 consecutive months.

2.2 Phytosanitary procedures

2.2.1 Surveillance activities

Surveillance systems based on trapping are similar in any type of ALPP. The surveillance used in an FF-ALPP may include those processes described in ISPM No. 6 (*Guidelines for surveillance*), section 2.2.2.1 on trapping procedures of ISPM No. 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and any other relevant scientific information.

Fruit sampling as a routine surveillance method is not widely used for monitoring fruit flies in low prevalence areas except in areas where sterile insect technique (SIT) is applied, where it may be a major tool.

The NPPO may complement trapping for adults with fruit sampling for larvae. Fruit sampling may be especially useful for surveillance for fruit flies when no traps are available. If larvae are detected in fruit sampling, it may be necessary to rear the larvae to adults in order to identify them. This is the case particularly if multiple species of fruit flies may be present. However, fruit sampling alone will not provide sufficient accuracy for describing the size of the population and should not be solely relied on to validate or verify the FF-ALPP status. Surveillance procedures may include those described in section 2.2.2.2 on fruit sampling procedures of ISPM No. 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*).

The presence and distribution of fruit fly hosts should be recorded separately identifying commercial and non-commercial hosts. This information will help in planning the trapping and host sampling activities and may help in anticipating the potential ease or difficulty of establishing and maintaining the phytosanitary status of the area.

The NPPO should have, or have access to, appropriate identification capabilities for identification of the target fruit fly species detected during the surveys (whether adult or larvae). This capability should also exist for the ongoing verification of FF-ALPP status for the target fruit fly species.

2.2.2 Reduction and maintenance of target fruit fly species population level

Specific control measures may be applied to reduce fruit fly populations to or below the specified level of low pest prevalence. Suppression of fruit fly populations may involve the use of more than one control option; some of these are described in section 3.1.4.2 of ISPM No. 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*) and Annex 1 of ISPM No. 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*).

Since the target fruit fly species are either endemic or established in the area, preventive control measures to maintain fruit fly populations at or below the specified level of low pest prevalence are nearly always necessary (some FF-ALPPs may occur naturally). Efforts should be made by NPPOs to select those measures with least environmental impact.

Available methods may include:

- chemical control (e.g. selective insecticide bait, aerial and ground spraying, bait stations and male annihilation technique)
- physical control (e.g. fruit bagging)
- use of beneficial organisms (e.g. natural enemies, SIT)
- cultural control (e.g. stripping and destruction of mature and fallen fruit, elimination or replacement of other host plants by non-host plants where appropriate, early harvesting, discouraging intercropping with fruit fly host plants, pruning before the fruiting period, use of perimeter trap hosts).

2.2.3 Phytosanitary measures related to movement of host material or regulated articles

Phytosanitary measures may be required to reduce the risk of entry of the specified pests into the FF-ALPP. These are outlined in section 3.1.4.3 of ISPM No. 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*) and 2.2.3 of ISPM No. 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*).

2.2.4 Domestic declaration of an FF-ALPP

The NPPO should verify the status of the FF-ALPP (in accordance with ISPM No. 8: *Determination of pest status in an area*) specifically by confirming compliance with the procedures established in accordance with this standard (surveillance and controls). The NPPO should declare and notify the establishment of the FF-ALPP, as appropriate.

To verify the status of the FF-ALPP and for purposes of internal management, the continuing FF-ALPP status should be verified after it has been established and any phytosanitary measures for the maintenance of the FF-ALPP have been put in place.

2.3 Maintenance of the FF-ALPP

Once the FF-ALPP is established, the NPPO should maintain the relevant documentation and verification procedures (auditable), and continue the application of phytosanitary procedures as described in section 2.2 of this standard.

2.3.1 Surveillance

In order to maintain the FF-ALPP status, the NPPO should continue surveillance, as described in section 2.2.1 of this standard.

2.3.2 Measures to maintain low prevalence levels of target fruit fly species

In most cases the control measures as identified in section 2.2.2 may be applied to maintain the FF-ALPP, since the target fruit flies are still present in the established area.

If the monitored fruit fly prevalence level is observed to be increasing (but remains below the specified level for the area), a threshold set by the NPPO for the application of additional control measures may be reached. At this point the NPPO may require implementation of such measures (e.g. as described in section 3.1.4.2 of ISPM No. 22: *Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*). This threshold should be set to provide adequate warning of potentially exceeding the specified level of low pest prevalence and avert suspension.

2.4 Corrective action plans

A corrective action plan for the FF-ALPP should be applied by the NPPO when the population level of the target fruit fly exceeds the specified level of low pest prevalence. Annex 2 provides guidelines on corrective action plans for FF-ALPPs.

2.5 Suspension, reinstatement and loss of FF-ALPP status

2.5.1 Suspension of FF-ALPP status

If the specified level of low pest prevalence of the target fruit fly species is exceeded either throughout the whole FF-ALPP area or within a part of the FF-ALPP, the entire FF-ALPP is normally suspended. However, where the affected area within the FF-ALPP can be identified and clearly delimited, then the FF-ALPP may be redefined to suspend only that area.

Relevant importing NPPOs should be notified without undue delay of these actions (further information on pest reporting requirements is provided in ISPM No. 17: *Pest reporting*).

Suspension may also apply if faults in the application of the procedures are found (for example, inadequate trapping, pest control measures or documentation).

If an FF-ALPP is suspended, an investigation by the NPPO should be initiated to determine the cause of the failure and introduce measures to prevent such failures from reoccurring.

When an FF-ALPP is suspended, the criteria for reinstatement should be made clear.

2.5.2 Reinstatement of FF-ALPP status

Reinstatement of FF-ALPP status applies only to suspended areas and may take place when:

- the population level no longer exceeds the specified level of low pest prevalence and this is maintained for a period determined by the biology of the target fruit fly species and the prevailing environmental conditions; and/or
- faulty procedures have been corrected and verified.

Once the specified level of low prevalence has been achieved and maintained as required above or procedural faults have been rectified through the application of corrective actions contained in the plan, the FF-ALPP status can be reinstated. If the FF-ALPP is established for export of host fruits, records regarding the reinstatement should be made available to the NPPO of the relevant importing country(ies) on request and verification may take place if necessary.

2.5.3 Loss of FF-ALPP status

Loss of FF-ALPP status should occur after suspension if reinstatement has failed to take place within a justifiable time frame, taking into account the biology of the fruit fly target species. Relevant importing NPPOs should be notified without undue delay of the change in status of the FF-ALPP (further information on pest reporting requirements is provided in ISPM No. 17: *Pest reporting*).

In the event that FF-ALPP status is lost, the procedures for establishment and maintenance outlined in this standard should be followed to achieve the FF-ALPP status again, and should take into account all background information related to the area.

ANNEX 1

PARAMETERS USED TO ESTIMATE THE LEVEL OF FRUIT FLY PREVALENCE¹

Parameters used to determine the level of fruit fly prevalence in the FF-ALPP are defined by the NPPO. The most widely used parameter is flies per trap per day (FTD). More precise spatial data may be presented on the basis of trap density (i.e. FTD per unit area) or temporally for each trap present in an area over time.

The FTD is an index used to estimate the population by averaging the number of flies captured by one trap in one day. This parameter estimates the relative number of fruit fly adults in a given time and space. It provides baseline information to compare fruit fly populations among different places and/or time.

The FTD is the result of dividing the total number of captured flies by the product obtained from multiplying the total number of inspected traps by the average number of days the traps were exposed. The formula is as follows:

$$\text{FTD} = \frac{F}{T \times D}$$

Where

F = total number of flies captured

T = number of inspected traps

D = number of days traps were exposed in the field.

In cases where traps are regularly inspected on a weekly basis, or longer in the case of winter surveillance operations, the parameter may be “flies per trap per week” (FTW). It estimates the number of flies captured by one trap in one week. Thus, FTD can be obtained from FTW by dividing by 7. Any significant changes in the status of any parameters critical to the efficacy of the FF-ALPP should be reviewed and modified, as appropriate.

Specified levels of low pest prevalence, as expressed in FTD values, should be established in relation to the risk of infestation of the fruits that are intended to be protected by the FF-ALPP, and in relation to any specific related objectives of the FF-ALPP (e.g. fruit-fly free commodities for export). In situations where a single FF-ALPP contains more than one host species (i.e. the ALPP is intended to protect more than one target fruit fly host), the specified level of low pest prevalence should be based on scientific information relating to each host of the fruit fly species, the risks of infestation and comparative preferences of the target fruit fly species for the different hosts. However, in situations where the FF-ALPP is established to protect only one type of host, consideration should be given to the level of infestation expected on that host. In such situations, lower specified levels of low pest prevalence are usually established for the primary host(s) of the target fruit fly species and comparatively higher levels for secondary hosts.

The biology of the target fruit flies (including number of generations per year, host range, host species present in the area, temperature thresholds, behaviour, reproduction and dispersion capacity) plays a major role in establishing appropriate specified levels of low pest prevalence. For an FF-ALPP with several hosts present, the established specified levels of low pest prevalence should reflect host diversity and abundance, host preference and host sequence for each target fruit fly species present. Although an FF-ALPP may have different specified levels of low pest prevalence for each relevant fruit fly target species, those levels should remain fixed for the whole area and duration of the FF-ALPP operation.

Efficiency of the types of traps and attractants used to estimate the levels of the pest population and the procedures applied for servicing the traps should be taken into consideration. The rationale is that different trap efficiencies could lead to different FTD results at the same location for a given population, so they have a significant effect in measuring the prevalence level of the target fruit fly species. Thus, when specifying the level of low pest prevalence accepted in terms of an FTD value, the efficacy of the trapping system should be stated as well.

Once a specified level of low pest prevalence has been established for a given situation using a specific lure/attractant, the lure/attractant used in the FF-ALPP must not be changed or modified until an appropriate specified level of low pest prevalence is determined for the new formulation. For FF-ALPPs with multiple target fruit fly species present that are attracted to different lures/attractants, trap placement should take into consideration possible interactive effects between lures/attractants.

Fruit sampling can be used as a complementary surveillance method to trapping to assess the profile of the fruit fly population levels, particularly if traps are not available for target species. Fruit sampling should be done on known hosts. It should be taken into account that efficacy of fruit sampling depends on sample size, frequency and timing. Fruit sampling may include rearing larvae to identify the fruit fly species. If fruit cutting is done, the efficacy of visually detecting larvae should be considered. However, fruit sampling will not provide sufficient accuracy for describing the size of the population and should not be solely relied on to validate or verify the FF-ALPP status.

¹ This annex is an official part of the standard.

GUIDELINES ON CORRECTIVE ACTION PLANS FOR FRUIT FLIES IN AN FF-ALPP²

Faults in the procedures or their application (e.g. inadequate trapping or pest control measures, inadequate documentation) or the detection of a population level exceeding the specified level of low pest prevalence for the target fruit fly species in the FF-ALPP should trigger the application of a corrective action plan. The objective of the corrective action plan is to ensure procedures and their applications are adequate and suppression of the fruit fly population to below the specified level for low pest prevalence is achieved as soon as possible. It is the responsibility of the NPPO to ensure that appropriate corrective action plans are developed. Corrective action plans should not be repeatedly implemented because this may lead to a loss of FF-ALPP status and the need to re-establish the area in accordance with the guidelines of this standard.

The corrective action plan should be prepared taking into account the biology of the target fruit fly species, the geography of the FF-ALPP, climatic conditions, phenology, and host abundance and distribution within the area.

The elements required for implementation of a corrective action plan include:

- declaration of suspension of FF-ALPP of status, where appropriate
- legal framework under which the corrective action plan can be applied
- time scales for the initial response and follow-up activities
- delimiting survey (trapping and fruit sampling) and application of the suppression actions
- identification capability
- availability of sufficient operational resources
- effective communication within the NPPO and with the NPPO(s) of the relevant importing country(ies), including provision of contact details of all parties involved
- a detailed map and definition of the suspension area
- revision and rectification of operational procedures, or
- range of control measures available e.g. pesticides.

Application of the corrective action plan

1. Notice to implement corrective actions

The NPPO notifies interested stakeholders and parties, including relevant importing countries, when initiating the application of a corrective action plan. The NPPO is responsible for supervising the implementation of corrective measures.

Notification should include the reason for initiating the plan i.e. faulty procedures or exceeding the specified level of low pest prevalence.

2. Determination of the phytosanitary status

Immediately after detecting a population level higher than the specified level of low pest prevalence, a delimiting survey (which may include the deployment of additional traps, fruit sampling of host fruits and increased trap inspection frequency) should be implemented to determine the size of the affected area and more precisely gauge the level of the fruit fly prevalence.

3. Suspension of FF-ALPP status

If the specified level of low pest prevalence of the target fruit fly species is exceeded or faulty procedures are found, the FF-ALPP status should be suspended as stated in section 2.5.1 of this standard.

4. Rectification of procedural faults

Faulty procedures and associated documentation should be immediately reviewed to identify the source of the fault(s). The source and corrective action taken should be documented and the modified procedures monitored to ensure compliance with the objectives of the FF-ALPP.

5. Implementation of control measures in the affected area

Specific suppression actions should immediately be implemented in the affected area(s). Available methods include:

- selective insecticide-bait treatments (aerial and/or ground spraying and bait stations)
- sterile insect technique
- male annihilation technique
- collection and destruction of affected fruit
- stripping and destruction of host fruits, if possible
- insecticide treatments (ground, cover).

² This annex is an official part of the standard.

6. Notification of relevant agencies

Relevant NPPOs and other agencies should be kept informed of corrective actions. Information on pest reporting requirements under the IPPC is provided in ISPM No. 17 (*Pest reporting*).

GUIDELINES ON TRAPPING PROCEDURES³

Information about trapping is available in the following publication of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA): *Trapping Guidelines for area-wide fruit fly programmes*, IAEA/FAO-TG/FFP, 2003. IAEA, Vienna.

This publication is widely available, easily accessible and generally recognized as authoritative.

³ This appendix is not an official part of the standard. It is provided for information only.

TYPICAL APPLICATIONS OF AN FF-ALPP⁴

1. An FF-ALPP as a buffer zone

In cases where the biology of the target fruit fly species is such that it is likely to disperse from an infested area into a protected area, it may be necessary to define a buffer zone with a low fruit fly prevalence (as described in ISPM No. 26: *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). Establishment of the FF-ALPP and FF-PFA should occur at the same time, enabling the FF-ALPP to be defined for the purpose of protecting the FF-PFA.

1.1 Determination of an FF-ALPP as a buffer zone

Determination procedures draw upon those listed in section 1.2 of this standard. In addition, in delimiting the buffer zone, detailed maps may be included showing the boundaries of the area to be protected, distribution of hosts, host location, urban areas, entry points and control checkpoints. It is also relevant to include data related to natural biogeographical features such as prevalence of other hosts, climate, and location of valleys, plains, deserts, rivers, lakes and sea, as well as other areas that function as natural barriers. The size of the buffer zone in relation to the size of the area being protected will depend on the biology of the target fruit fly species (including behaviour, reproduction and dispersal capacity), the intrinsic characteristics of the protected area, and the economic and operational feasibility of establishing the FF-ALPP.

1.2 Establishment of an FF-ALPP as a buffer zone

The establishment procedures are described in section 2.1 of this standard. The movement of relevant fruit fly host commodities into the area may need to be regulated. Additional information can be found in section 2.2.3 of ISPM No. 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*).

1.3 Maintenance of an FF-ALPP as a buffer zone

Maintenance procedures include those listed in section 2.3 of this standard. Since the buffer zone has features similar to the area or place of production it protects, procedures for maintenance may include those listed for the FF-PFA as described in section 2.3 of ISPM No. 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) and sections 3.1.4.2, 3.1.4.3 and 3.1.4.4 of ISPM No. 22 (*Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*). The importance of information dissemination may also be considered in the maintenance of an FF-ALPP as a buffer zone.

2. FF-ALPPs for export purposes

FF-ALPPs may be used to facilitate fruit exports from the area. In most cases the FF-ALPP is the main component of a systems approach as a pest risk mitigation measure. Examples of measures and/or factors used in conjunction with FF-ALPPs include:

- pre- and post-harvest treatments
- production of secondary hosts or non-hosts in preference to primary hosts
- export of host material to areas not at risk during particular seasons
- physical barriers (e.g. pre-harvest bagging, insect-proof structures).

2.1 Determination of an FF-ALPP for export purposes

Determining procedures may include those listed in section 1.2 of this standard. In addition, the following elements should be considered for the determination of an FF-ALPP:

- a list of products (hosts) of interest
- a list of other commercial and non-commercial hosts of the target fruit fly species present but not intended for export and their level of occurrence, as appropriate
- additional information such as any historical records in connection with biology, occurrence and control of the target fruit fly species or any other fruit fly species that may be present in the FF-ALPP.

2.2 Maintenance of an FF-ALPP for export purposes

Maintenance procedures may include those described in section 2.3.2 of this standard and should be applied if hosts are available. If appropriate, surveillance may continue at a lower frequency during the off-season period. This will depend on the biology of the target fruit fly species and its relationship with hosts present during the off-season period.

⁴ This appendix is not an official part of the standard. It is provided for information only.

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

ISPM No. 31

***METHODOLOGIES FOR SAMPLING OF
CONSIGNMENTS***

(2008)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

REFERENCES

DEFINITIONS

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

BACKGROUND**OBJECTIVES OF SAMPLING OF CONSIGNMENTS****REQUIREMENTS****1. Lot Identification****2. Sample Unit****3. Statistical and Non-Statistical Sampling**

3.1 Statistically based sampling

3.1.1 Parameters and related concepts

3.1.1.1 Acceptance number

3.1.1.2 Level of detection

3.1.1.3 Confidence level

3.1.1.4 Efficacy of detection

3.1.1.5 Sample size

3.1.1.6 Tolerance level

3.1.2 Links between the parameters and tolerance level

3.1.3 Statistically based sampling methods

3.1.3.1 Simple random sampling

3.1.3.2 Systematic sampling

3.1.3.3 Stratified sampling

3.1.3.4 Sequential sampling

3.1.3.5 Cluster sampling

3.1.3.6 Fixed proportion sampling

3.2 Non-statistically based sampling

3.2.1 Convenience sampling

3.2.2 Haphazard sampling

3.2.3 Selective or targeted sampling

4. Selecting a Sampling Method**5. Sample Size Determination**

5.1 Pests distribution unknown in the lot

5.2 Pest distribution aggregated in the lot

6. Varying Level of Detection**7. Outcome of Sampling****APPENDIX 1**

Formulae used in appendices 2-5

APPENDIX 2

Calculating sample sizes for small lots: hypergeometric-based sampling (simple random sampling)

APPENDIX 3

Sampling of large lots: binomial or Poisson based sampling

APPENDIX 4

Sampling for pests with an aggregated distribution: beta-binomial based sampling

APPENDIX 5

Comparison of hypergeometric and fixed proportion sampling results

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

This standard provides guidance to National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) in selecting appropriate sampling methodologies for inspection or testing of consignments to verify compliance with phytosanitary requirements.

This standard does not give guidance on field sampling (for example, as required for surveys).

REFERENCES

Cochran, W.G. 1977. *Sampling techniques*. 3rd edn. New York, John Wiley & Sons. 428 pp.

Glossary of phytosanitary terms, 2008. ISPM No. 5, FAO, Rome.

Guidelines for inspection, 2005. ISPM No. 23, FAO, Rome.

Guidelines for phytosanitary import regulatory systems, 2004, ISPM No. 20, FAO Rome.

Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms, ISPM No. 11, 2004, FAO, Rome.

Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests, 2004. ISPM No. 21, FAO, Rome.

Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade, 2006. ISPM No. 1, FAO, Rome.

DEFINITIONS

Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in the present standard can be found in ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

The sampling methodologies used by NPPOs in selecting samples for the inspection of consignments of commodities moving in international trade are based on a number of sampling concepts. These include parameters such as acceptance level, level of detection, confidence level, efficacy of detection and sample size.

The application of statistically based methods, such as simple random sampling, systematic sampling, stratified sampling, sequential sampling or cluster sampling, provides results with a statistical confidence level. Other sampling methods that are not statistically based, such as convenience sampling, haphazard sampling or selective sampling, may provide valid results in determining the presence or absence of a regulated pest(s) but no statistical inference can be made on their basis. Operational limitations will have an effect on the practicality of sampling under one or another method.

In using sampling methodologies, NPPOs accept some degree of risk that non-conforming lots may not be detected. Inspection using statistically based methods can provide results with a certain level of confidence only and cannot prove the absence of a pest from a consignment.

BACKGROUND

This standard provides the statistical basis for, and complements, ISPMs No. 20 (*Guidelines for phytosanitary import regulatory systems*) and No. 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*). Inspection of consignments of regulated articles moving in trade is an essential tool for the management of pest risks and is the most frequently used phytosanitary procedure worldwide to determine if pests are present and/or the compliance with phytosanitary import requirements.

It is usually not feasible to inspect entire consignments, so phytosanitary inspection is performed mainly on samples obtained from a consignment. It is noted that the sampling concepts presented in this standard may also apply to other phytosanitary procedures, notably selection of units for testing.

Sampling of plants, plant products and other regulated articles may occur prior to export, at the point of import, or other points as determined by NPPOs.

It is important that sampling procedures established and used by NPPOs are documented and transparent, and take into account the principle of minimum impact (ISPM No. 1: *Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*), particularly because inspection based on sampling may lead to the refusal to issue a phytosanitary certificate, refusal of entry, or treatment or destruction of a consignment or part of a consignment.

Sampling methodologies used by NPPOs will depend on the sampling objectives (for example, sampling for testing) and may be solely statistically based or developed noting particular operational constraints. Methodologies developed to achieve the sampling objectives, within operational constraints, may not yield the same statistical confidence levels in the results as fully statistically based methods, but such methods may still give valid results depending on the desired sampling objective. If the sole purpose of sampling is to increase the chance of finding a pest, selective or targeted sampling is also valid.

OBJECTIVES OF SAMPLING OF CONSIGNMENTS

Sampling of consignments is done for inspection and/or testing in order to:

- detect regulated pests
- provide assurance that the number of regulated pests or infested units in a consignment does not exceed the specified tolerance level for the pest
- provide assurance of the general phytosanitary condition of a consignment
- detect organisms for which a phytosanitary risk has not yet been determined
- optimize the probability of detecting specific regulated pests
- maximize the use of available sampling resources
- gather other information such as for monitoring of a pathway
- verify compliance with phytosanitary requirements
- determine the proportion of the consignment infested.

It should be noted that inspection and/or testing based on sampling always involves a degree of error. The acceptance of some probability that the pests are present is inherent in the use of sampling procedures for inspection and/or testing. Inspection and/or testing using statistically based sampling methods can provide a level of confidence that the incidence of a pest is below a certain level, but it does not prove that a pest is truly absent from a consignment.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Lot Identification

A consignment may consist of one or more lots. Where a consignment comprises more than one lot, the inspection to determine compliance may have to consist of several separate visual examinations, and therefore the lots will have to be sampled separately. In such cases, the samples relating to each lot should be segregated and identified in order that the appropriate lot can be clearly identified if subsequent inspection or testing reveals non-compliance with phytosanitary requirements. Whether or not a lot will be inspected should be determined using factors stated in ISPM No. 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*, section 1.5).

A lot to be sampled should be a number of units of a single commodity identifiable by its homogeneity in factors such as:

- origin
- grower
- packing facility
- species, variety, or degree of maturity
- exporter
- area of production
- regulated pests and their characteristics
- treatment at origin

- type of processing.

The criteria used by the NPPO to distinguish lots should be consistently applied for similar consignments.

Treating multiple commodities as a single lot for convenience may mean that statistical inferences can not be drawn from the results of the sampling.

2. Sample Unit

Sampling first involves the identification of the appropriate unit for sampling (for example, a fruit, stem, bunch, unit of weight, bag or carton). The determination of the sample unit is affected by issues related to homogeneity in the distribution of pests through the commodity, whether the pests are sedentary or mobile, how the consignment is packaged, intended use, and operational considerations. For example, if determined solely on pest biology, the appropriate sample unit might be an individual plant or plant product in the case of a low-mobility pest, whereas in the case of mobile pests, a carton or other commodity container may be the preferred sample unit. However, when inspection is to detect more than one type of pest, other considerations (for example, practicality of using different sample units) may apply. Sample units should be consistently defined and independent from each other. This will allow NPPOs to simplify the process of making inferences from the sample to the lot or consignment from which the sample was selected.

3. Statistical and Non-Statistical Sampling

The sampling method is the process approved by the NPPO to select units for inspection and/or testing. Sampling for phytosanitary inspection of consignments or lots is done by taking units from the consignment or lot without replacement of the units selected¹. NPPOs may choose either a statistically based or non-statistical sampling methodology.

Sampling based on statistical or targeted methods is designed to facilitate the detection of a regulated pest(s) in a consignment and/or lot.

3.1 Statistically based sampling

Statistically based sampling methods involve the determination of a number of interrelated parameters and the selection of the most appropriate statistically based sampling method.

3.1.1 Parameters and related concepts

Statistically based sampling is designed to detect a certain percentage or proportion of infestation with a specific confidence level, and thus requires the NPPO to determine the following interrelated parameters: acceptance number, level of detection, confidence level, efficacy of detection and sample size. The NPPO may also establish a tolerance level for certain pests (for example, regulated non-quarantine pests).

3.1.1.1 Acceptance number

The acceptance number is the number of infested units or the number of individual pests that are permissible in a sample of a given size before phytosanitary action is taken. Many NPPOs determine this number to be zero for quarantine pests. For example, if the acceptance number is zero and an infested unit is detected in the sample then phytosanitary action will be taken. It is important to appreciate that a zero acceptance number within a sample does not imply a zero tolerance level in the consignment as a whole. Even if no pests are detected in the sample there remains a probability that the pest may be present in the remainder of the consignment, albeit at a very low level.

The acceptance number is linked to the sample. The acceptance number is the number of infested units or the number of individual pests that are permissible in the sample whereas the tolerance level (see section 3.1.1.6) refers to the status of the entire consignment.

3.1.1.2 Level of detection

The level of detection is the minimum percentage or proportion of infestation that the sampling methodology will detect at the specified efficacy of detection and level of confidence and which the NPPO intends to detect in a consignment.

The level of detection may be specified for a pest, a group or category of pests, or for unspecified pests. The level of detection may be derived from:

- a decision based on pest risk analysis to detect a specified level of infestation (the infestation determined to present an unacceptable risk)
- an evaluation of the effectiveness of phytosanitary measures applied before inspection

¹ Sampling without replacement is selecting a unit from the consignment or lot without replacing the unit before the next units are selected. Sampling without replacement does not mean that a selected item cannot be returned to a consignment (except for destructive sampling); it means only that the inspector should not return it before selecting the remainder of the sample.

- an operationally based decision that inspection intensity above a certain level is not practical.

3.1.1.3 Confidence level

The confidence level indicates the probability that a consignment with a degree of infestation exceeding the level of detection will be detected. A confidence level of 95% is commonly used. The NPPO may choose to require different confidence levels depending on the intended use of the commodity. For example, a higher confidence level for detection may be required for commodities for planting than for commodities for consumption, and the confidence level may also vary with the strength of the phytosanitary measures applied and historical evidence of non-compliance. Very high confidence level values quickly become difficult to achieve, and lower values become less meaningful for decision-making. A 95% confidence level means that the conclusions drawn from the results of sampling will detect a non-compliant consignment, on average, 95 times out of 100, and therefore, it may be assumed that, on average, 5% of non-compliant consignments will not be detected.

3.1.1.4 Efficacy of detection

The efficacy of detection is the probability that an inspection or test of an infested unit(s) will detect a pest. In general the efficacy should not be assumed to be 100%. For example, pests may be difficult to detect visually, plants may not express symptoms of disease (latent infection), or efficacy may be reduced as a result of human error. It is possible to include lower efficacy values (for instance, an 80% chance of detecting the pest when an infested unit is inspected) in the determination of sample size.

3.1.1.5 Sample size

The sample size is the number of units selected from the lot or consignment that will be inspected or tested. Guidance on determining the sample size is provided in Section 5.

3.1.1.6 Tolerance level

Tolerance level refers to the percentage of infestation in the entire consignment or lot that is the threshold for phytosanitary action.

Tolerance levels may be established for regulated non-quarantine pests (as described in ISPM No. 21: *Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*, section 4.4) and may also be established for conditions related to other phytosanitary import requirements (for example, bark on wood or soil on plant roots).

Most NPPOs have a zero tolerance level for all quarantine pests, taking into account probabilities of pest presence in the non-sampled units as described in section 3.1.1.1. However, an NPPO may determine to establish a tolerance level for a quarantine pest based on pest risk analysis (as described in ISPM No. 11: *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*, section 3.4.1) and then determine sampling rates from this. For example, NPPOs may determine a tolerance level that is greater than zero because small numbers of the quarantine pest may be acceptable if the establishment potential of the pest is considered low or if the intended end use of the product (for example, fresh fruit and vegetables imported for processing) limits the potential of entry of the pest into endangered areas.

3.1.2 Links between the parameters and tolerance level

The five parameters (acceptance number, level of detection, confidence level, efficacy of detection and sample size) are statistically related. Taking into account the established tolerance level, the NPPO should determine the efficacy of the detection method used and decide upon the acceptance number in the sample; any two of the remaining three parameters can also be chosen, and the remainder will be determined from the values chosen for the rest.

If a tolerance level greater than zero has been established, the level of detection chosen should be equal to (or less than, if the acceptance number is greater than zero) the tolerance level to ensure that consignments having an infestation level greater than the tolerance level will be detected with the specified confidence level.

If no pests are detected in the sample unit, then the percentage of infestation in the consignment can not be stated beyond the fact that it falls below the level of detection at the stated confidence level. If the pest is not detected with the appropriate sample size, the confidence level gives a probability that the tolerance level is not exceeded.

3.1.3 Statistically based sampling methods

3.1.3.1 Simple random sampling

Simple random sampling results in all sample units having an equal probability of being selected from the lot or consignment. Simple random sampling involves drawing the sample units in accordance with a tool such as a random numbers table. The use of a predetermined randomization process is what distinguishes this method from haphazard sampling (described in section 3.2.2).

This method is used when little is known about the pest distribution or rate of infestation. Simple random sampling can be difficult to apply correctly in operational situations. To use this method, each unit should have an equal probability of selection. In cases where a pest is not distributed randomly through the lot, this method may not be optimal. Simple random sampling may require greater resources than other sampling methods. The application can be dependent on the type and/or configuration of the consignment.

3.1.3.2 Systematic sampling

Systematic sampling involves drawing a sample from units in the lot at fixed, predetermined intervals. However, the first selection must be made at random through the lot. Biased results are possible if pests are distributed in a manner similar to the interval chosen for sampling.

Two advantages of this method are that the sampling process may be automated through machinery and that it requires the use of a random process only to select the first unit.

3.1.3.3 Stratified sampling

Stratified sampling involves separating the lot into separate subdivisions (that is, strata) and then drawing the sample units from each and every subdivision. Within each subdivision, sample units are taken using a particular method (systematic or random). Under some circumstances, different numbers of sample units may be taken from each subdivision – for instance, the number of sample units may be proportional to the size of the subdivision, or based on prior knowledge concerning the infestation of the subdivisions.

If at all feasible, stratified sampling will almost always improve detection accuracy. The smaller variation associated with stratified sampling yields more accurate results. This is especially true when infestation levels may vary across a lot depending on packing procedures or storage conditions. Stratified sampling is the preferred choice when knowledge about the pest distribution is presumed and operational considerations will allow it.

3.1.3.4 Sequential sampling

Sequential sampling involves drawing a series of sample units using one of the above methods. After each sample (or group) is drawn, the data are accumulated and compared with predetermined ranges to decide whether to accept the consignment, reject the consignment or continue sampling.

This method can be used when a tolerance level greater than zero is determined and the first set of sample units does not provide sufficient information to allow a decision to be made on whether or not the tolerance level is exceeded. This method would not be used if the acceptance number in a sample of any size is zero. Sequential sampling may reduce the number of samples required for a decision to be made or reduce the possibility of rejecting a conforming consignment.

3.1.3.5 Cluster sampling

Cluster sampling involves selecting groups of units based on a predefined cluster size (for example, boxes of fruit, bunches of flowers) to make up the total number of sample units required from the lot. Cluster sampling is simpler to evaluate and more reliable if the clusters are of equal size. It is useful if resources available for sampling are limited and works well when the distribution of pests is expected to be random.

Cluster sampling can be stratified, and can use either systematic or random methods for selecting the groups. Of the statistically based methods, this method is often the most practical to implement.

3.1.3.6 Fixed proportion sampling

Sampling a fixed proportion of the units in the lot (for example, 2%) results in inconsistent levels of detection or confidence levels when lot size varies. As shown in Appendix 5, fixed proportion sampling results in changing confidence levels for a given level of detection, or in changing levels of detection for a given confidence level.

3.2 Non-statistically based sampling

Other sampling methods that are not statistically based, such as convenience sampling, haphazard sampling or selective or targeted sampling, may provide valid results in determining the presence or absence of a regulated pest(s). The following methods may be used based on specific operational considerations or when the goal is purely detection of pests.

3.2.1 Convenience sampling

Convenience sampling involves selecting the most convenient (for example, accessible, cheapest, fastest) units from the lot, without selecting units in a random or systematic manner.

3.2.2 Haphazard sampling

Haphazard sampling involves selecting arbitrary units without using a true randomization process. This may often appear to be random because the inspector is not conscious of having any selection bias. However, unconscious bias may occur, so that the degree to which the sample is representative of the lot is unknown.

3.2.3 Selective or targeted sampling

Selective sampling involves deliberately selecting samples from parts of the lot most likely to be infested, or units that are obviously infested, in order to increase the chance of detecting a specific regulated pest. This method may rely on inspectors who are experienced with the commodity and familiar with the pest's biology. Use of this method may also be triggered through a pathway analysis identifying a specific section of the lot with a higher probability of being infested (for example, a wet section of timber may be more likely to harbour nematodes). Because the sample is targeted, and hence statistically biased, a probabilistic statement about the infestation level in the lot can not be made. However, if the sole purpose of sampling is to increase the chance of finding a regulated pest(s), this method is valid. Separate samples of the commodity may be required to meet general confidence in detection of other regulated pests. The use of selective or targeted sampling may limit the opportunities to derive information about the overall pest status of the lot or consignment, because sampling is focused on where specific regulated pests are likely to be found not on the remainder of the lot or consignment.

4. Selecting a Sampling Method

In most cases the selection of an appropriate sampling method is necessarily dependent on information available about pest incidence and distribution in the consignment or lot as well as the operational parameters associated with the inspection situation in question. In most phytosanitary applications operational limitations will dictate the practicality of sampling under one or another method. Subsequently determining the statistical validity of practical methods will narrow the field of alternatives.

The sampling method that is ultimately selected by the NPPO should be operationally feasible and be the most appropriate to achieve the objective and be well documented for transparency. Operational feasibility is clearly linked to judgements concerning situation-specific factors, but should be consistently applied.

If sampling is undertaken to increase the chance of detecting a specific pest targeted sampling (described in section 3.2.3) may be the preferred option as long as the inspectors can identify the section(s) of the lot with a higher probability of being infested. Without this knowledge, one of the statistically based methods will be more appropriate. Non-statistically based sampling methods do not result in each unit having an equal probability of being included in the sample and do not allow for quantification of a confidence level or level of detection.

Statistically based methods will be appropriate if sampling is undertaken to provide information about the general phytosanitary condition of a consignment, to detect multiple quarantine pests or to verify compliance with phytosanitary requirements.

In selecting a statistically based method, consideration may be given to how the consignment has been treated in harvesting, sorting and packing, and the likely distribution of the pest(s) in the lot. Sampling methods may be combined: for instance, a stratified sample may have either random or systematic selection of sample units (or clusters) within strata.

If sampling is undertaken to determine whether a specific non-zero tolerance level has been exceeded, a sequential sampling method may be appropriate.

Once a sampling method has been selected and correctly applied, repeating the sampling with the aim of achieving a different result is unacceptable. Sampling should not be repeated unless considered necessary for specific technical reasons (for example, suspected incorrect application of sampling methodology).

5. Sample Size Determination

To determine the number of samples to be taken, the NPPO should select a confidence level (for example, 95%), a level of detection (for example, 5%) and an acceptance number (for example, zero), and determine the efficacy of detection (for example, 80%). From these values and the lot size, a sample size can be calculated. Appendices 2-5 set out the mathematical basis for sample size determination. Section 3.1.3 of this standard provides guidance on the most appropriate statistical based sampling method when considering the distribution of the pest in the lot.

5.1 Pests distribution unknown in the lot

Because sampling is done without replacement and the population size is finite, the hypergeometric distribution should be used to determine the sample size. This distribution gives a probability of detecting a certain number of infested units in a sample of a given size drawn from a lot of a given size, when a specific number of infested units exist in the lot (see Appendix 2). The number of infested units in the lot is estimated as the level of detection multiplied by the total number of units in the lot.

As lot size increases, the sample size required for a specific level of detection and confidence level approaches an upper limit. When the sample size is less than 5% of the lot size, the sample size can be calculated using either the binomial or Poisson distribution (see Appendix 3). All three distributions (hypergeometric, binomial and Poisson) give almost identical sample sizes for specific confidence and detection levels with large lot sizes, but binomial and Poisson distributions are easier to calculate.

5.2 Pest distribution aggregated in the lot

Most pest populations are aggregated to some degree in the field. Because commodities may be harvested and packed in the field without being graded or sorted, the distribution of infested units in the lot may be clustered or aggregated. Aggregation of infested units of a commodity will always lower the likelihood of finding an infestation. However, phytosanitary inspections are aimed at detection of infested units and/or pest(s) at a low level. The effect of aggregation of the infested units on the efficacy of detection of a sample and on the required sample size is small in most cases. When NPPOs identify that there is a high likelihood that there will be aggregation of infested units in the lot a stratified sampling method may help increase the chance of detecting an aggregated infestation.

When pests are aggregated, the calculation of sample size should ideally be performed using a beta-binomial distribution (see Appendix 4). However, this calculation requires knowledge of the degree of aggregation, which is generally not known and therefore this distribution may not be practical for general use. One of the other distributions (hypergeometric, binomial or Poisson) can be used; however, the confidence level of the sampling will decline as the degree of aggregation increases.

6. Varying Level of Detection

The choice of a constant level of detection may result in a varying number of infested units entering with imported consignments because lot size varies (for example, a 1% infestation level of 1000 units corresponds to 10 infested units, while a 1% infestation level of 10,000 units corresponds to 100 infested units). Ideally the selection of a level of detection will reflect in part the number of infested units entering on all consignments within a particular period of time. If NPPOs want to manage the number of infested units entering with each consignment as well, a varying level of detection may be used. A tolerance level would be specified in terms of a number of infested items per consignment, and the sample size would be set in order to give the desired confidence and detection levels.

7. Outcome of Sampling

The outcome of activities and techniques related to sampling may result in phytosanitary action being taken (further details can be found in ISPM No. 23: *Guidelines for inspection*, section 2.5).

FORMULAE USED IN APPENDICES 2–5²

Formula No.	Purpose	Appendix No.
1	Probability of detecting i infested units in a sample.	2
2	Approximation for calculating the probability of finding no infested units.	2
3	Probability of detecting i infested units in a sample of n units (sample size is less than 5% of the lot size).	3
4	Binomial distribution probability of not observing an infested unit in a sample of n units.	3
5	Binomial distribution probability of observing at least one infested unit.	3
6	Binomial distribution formulae 5 and 6 rearranged to determine n .	3
7	Poisson distribution version of binomial formula 6	3
8	Poisson distribution probability of finding no infested units (simplified).	3
9	Poisson distribution probability of finding at least one infested unit (the confidence level).	3
10	Poisson distribution to determine the sample size for n .	3
11	Beta-binomial based sampling for aggregated spatial distribution	4
12	Beta-binomial – probability of not observing an infested unit after inspecting several lots (for a single lot)	4
13	Beta-binomial – probability of observing one or more infested units	4
14	Beta-binomial formulae 12 and 13 rearranged to determine m .	4

² This appendix is not an official part of the standard. It is provided for information only.

APPENDIX 2

**CALCULATING SAMPLE SIZES FOR SMALL LOTS: HYPERGEOMETRIC-BASED SAMPLING
(SIMPLE RANDOM SAMPLING)³**

The hypergeometric distribution is appropriate to describe the probability of finding a pest in a relatively small lot. A lot is considered as small when the sample size is more than 5% of the lot size. In this case, sampling of one unit from the lot affects the probability of finding an infested unit in the next unit selected. Hypergeometric-based sampling is based on sampling without replacement.

It is also assumed that the distribution of the pest in the lot is not aggregated and that random sampling is used. This methodology can be extended for other schemes such as stratified sampling (further details can be found in Cochran, 1977).

The probability of detecting i infested units in a sample is given by

$$P(X = i) = \frac{\binom{A}{i} \binom{N - A}{n - i}}{\binom{N}{n}} \quad \text{Formula 1}$$

Where:

$$\binom{a}{b} = \frac{a!}{b!(a-b)!} \quad \text{where } a! = a(a-1)(a-2)\dots 1 \text{ and } 0! = 1$$

$P(X = i)$ is the probability of observing i infested units in the sample, where $i = 0, \dots, n$.

The confidence level corresponds to: $1 - P(X = i)$

A = number of infested units in the lot that could be detected if every unit in the lot was inspected or tested, given the efficacy of detection (level of detection $\times N \times$ efficacy, truncated to an integer)

i = number of infested units in the sample

N = number of units in the lot (size of the lot)

n = number of units in the sample (sample size)

In particular the approximation that can be used for the probability of finding no infested units is

$$P(X=0) = \left(\frac{N - A - u}{N - u} \right)^n \quad \text{Formula 2}$$

where $u = (n-1)/2$ (from Cochran, 1977).

Solving the equation to determine n is difficult arithmetically but can be done with approximation or through maximum likelihood estimation.

Tables 1 and 2 show sample sizes calculated for different lot sizes, levels of detection and confidence levels, when the acceptance number is 0.

³ This appendix is not an official part of the standard. It is provided for information only.

Table 1. Table of minimum sample sizes for 95% and 99% confidence levels at varying levels of detection according to lot size, hypergeometric distribution

Number of units in lot	P = 95% (confidence level)					P = 99% (confidence level)				
	% level of detection × efficacy of detection					% level of detection × efficacy of detection				
	5	2	1	0.5	0.1	5	2	1	0.5	0.1
25	24*	-	-	-	-	25*	-	-	-	-
50	39*	48	-	-	-	45*	50	-	-	-
100	45	78	95	-	-	59	90	99	-	-
200	51	105	155	190	-	73	136	180	198	-
300	54	117	189	285*	-	78	160	235	297*	-
400	55	124	211	311	-	81	174	273	360	-
500	56	129	225	388*	-	83	183	300	450*	-
600	56	132	235	379	-	84	190	321	470	-
700	57	134	243	442*	-	85	195	336	549*	-
800	57	136	249	421	-	85	199	349	546	-
900	57	137	254	474*	-	86	202	359	615*	-
1 000	57	138	258	450	950	86	204	368	601	990
2 000	58	143	277	517	1553	88	216	410	737	1800
3 000	58	145	284	542	1895	89	220	425	792	2353
4 000	58	146	288	556	2108	89	222	433	821	2735
5 000	59	147	290	564	2253	89	223	438	840	3009
6 000	59	147	291	569	2358	90	224	442	852	3214
7 000	59	147	292	573	2437	90	225	444	861	3373
8 000	59	147	293	576	2498	90	225	446	868	3500
9 000	59	148	294	579	2548	90	226	447	874	3604
10 000	59	148	294	581	2588	90	226	448	878	3689
20 000	59	148	296	589	2781	90	227	453	898	4112
30 000	59	148	297	592	2850	90	228	455	905	4268
40 000	59	149	297	594	2885	90	228	456	909	4348
50 000	59	149	298	595	2907	90	228	457	911	4398
60 000	59	149	298	595	2921	90	228	457	912	4431
70 000	59	149	298	596	2932	90	228	457	913	4455
80 000	59	149	298	596	2939	90	228	457	914	4473
90 000	59	149	298	596	2945	90	228	458	915	4488
100 000	59	149	298	596	2950	90	228	458	915	4499
200 000+	59	149	298	597	2972	90	228	458	917	4551

Values in table 1 marked with an asterisk (*) have been rounded down to a whole number because scenarios resulting in a fraction of a unit being infested (for example, 300 units with 0.5% infestation corresponds to 1.5 infested units in the shipment) are not possible. This means that the sampling intensity increases slightly, and may be greater for a shipment size where the number of infested units is rounded down than for a larger shipment where a larger number of infested units are calculated (for example, compare results for 700 and 800 units in the lot). It also means that a slightly lower proportion of infested units might be detected than the proportion indicated by the table, or that such infestation is more likely to be detected than the confidence level shown.

Values in table 1 marked with a dash (-) refer to scenarios presented that are not possible (less than one unit infested).

Table 2: Table of sample sizes for 80% and 90% confidence levels at varying levels of detection according to lot size, hypergeometric distribution

Number of units in lot	P = 80% (confidence level)					P = 90% (confidence level)				
	% level of detection × efficacy of detection					% level of detection × efficacy of detection				
	5	2	1	0.5	0.1	5	2	1	0.5	0.1
100	27	56	80	-	-	37	69	90	-	-
200	30	66	111	160	-	41	87	137	180	-
300	30	70	125	240*	-	42	95	161	270*	-
400	31	73	133	221	-	43	100	175	274	-
500	31	74	138	277*	-	43	102	184	342*	-
600	31	75	141	249	-	44	104	191	321	-
700	31	76	144	291*	-	44	106	196	375*	-
800	31	76	146	265	-	44	107	200	350	-
900	31	77	147	298*	-	44	108	203	394*	-
1 000	31	77	148	275	800	44	108	205	369	900
2 000	32	79	154	297	1106	45	111	217	411	1368
3 000	32	79	156	305	1246	45	112	221	426	1607
4 000	32	79	157	309	1325	45	113	223	434	1750
5 000	32	80	158	311	1376	45	113	224	439	1845
6 000	32	80	159	313	1412	45	113	225	443	1912
7 000	32	80	159	314	1438	45	114	226	445	1962
8 000	32	80	159	315	1458	45	114	226	447	2000
9 000	32	80	159	316	1474	45	114	227	448	2031
10 000	32	80	159	316	1486	45	114	227	449	2056
20 000	32	80	160	319	1546	45	114	228	455	2114
30 000	32	80	160	320	1567	45	114	229	456	2216
40 000	32	80	160	320	1577	45	114	229	457	2237
50 000	32	80	160	321	1584	45	114	229	458	2250
60 000	32	80	160	321	1588	45	114	229	458	2258
70 000	32	80	160	321	1591	45	114	229	458	2265
80 000	32	80	160	321	1593	45	114	229	459	2269
90 000	32	80	160	321	1595	45	114	229	459	2273
100 000	32	80	160	321	1596	45	114	229	459	2276
200 000	32	80	160	321	1603	45	114	229	459	2289

Values in table 2 marked with an asterisk (*) have been rounded down to a whole number because scenarios resulting in a fraction of a unit being infested (for example, 300 units with 0.5% infestation corresponds to 1.5 infested units in the shipment) are not possible. This means that the sampling intensity increases slightly, and may be greater for a shipment size where the number of infested units is rounded down than for a larger shipment where a larger number of infested units are calculated (for example, compare results for 700 and 800 units in the lot). It also means that a slightly lower proportion of infested units might be detected than the proportion indicated by the table, or that such infestation is more likely to be detected than the confidence level shown.

Values in table 2 marked with a dash (-) refer to scenarios presented that are not possible (less than one unit infested).

APPENDIX 3

SAMPLING OF LARGE LOTS: BINOMIAL OR POISSON BASED SAMPLING⁴

For large lots sufficiently mixed, the likelihood of finding an infested unit is approximated by simple binomial statistics. The sample size is less than 5% of the lot size. The probability of observing i infested units in a sample of n units is given by:

$$P(X=i) = \binom{n}{i} \phi p^i (1-\phi p)^{n-i} \quad \text{Formula 3}$$

p is the average proportion of infested units (infestation level) in the lot and ϕ represents the percentage inspection efficacy divided by 100.

$P(X = i)$ is the probability of observing i infested units in the sample. The confidence level corresponds to: $1 - P(X = i)$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$.

For phytosanitary purposes, the probability of not observing a pest specimen or symptom in the sample is determined. The probability of not observing an infested unit in a sample of n units is given by

$$P(X=0) = (1 - \phi p)^n \quad \text{Formula 4}$$

The probability of observing at least one infested unit is then:

$$P(X>0) = 1 - (1 - \phi p)^n \quad \text{Formula 5}$$

This equation can be rearranged to determine n

$$n = \frac{\ln[1 - P(X > 0)]}{\ln(1 - \phi p)} \quad \text{Formula 6}$$

The sample size n can be determined with this equation when the infestation level (p), efficacy (ϕ) and the confidence level ($1 - P(X > 0)$) are determined by the NPPO.

The binomial distribution can be approximated with the Poisson distribution. As n increases and p decreases, the binomial distribution equation given above tends to the Poisson distribution equation given below,

$$P(X=i) = \frac{(n\phi p)^i e^{-n\phi p}}{i!} \quad \text{Formula 7}$$

where e is the base-value of the natural logarithm.

The probability of finding no infested units simplifies to

$$P(X=0) = e^{-n\phi p} \quad \text{Formula 8}$$

The probability of finding at least one infested unit (the confidence level) is calculated as

$$P(X>0) = 1 - e^{-n\phi p} \quad \text{Formula 9}$$

Solving for n gives the following, which can be used to determine the sample size:

$$n = -\ln[1 - P(X>0)]/\phi p \quad \text{Formula 10}$$

Tables 3 and 4 show sample sizes when the acceptance number is 0, calculated for different levels of detection, efficacy and confidence levels with the binomial and Poisson distributions, respectively. A comparison of the case for 100% efficacy with the sample sizes in Table 1 (see Appendix 2) shows that the binomial and Poisson give very similar results to the hypergeometric distribution when n is large and p is small.

⁴ This appendix is not an official part of the standard. It is provided for information only.

Table 3: Table of sample sizes for 95% and 99% confidence levels at varying levels of detection, according to efficacy values where lot size is large and sufficiently mixed, binomial distribution

% efficacy	P = 95% (confidence level)					P = 99% (confidence level)				
	% level of detection					% level of detection				
	5	2	1	0.5	0.1	5	2	1	0.5	0.1
100	59	149	299	598	2995	90	228	459	919	4603
99	60	150	302	604	3025	91	231	463	929	4650
95	62	157	314	630	3152	95	241	483	968	4846
90	66	165	332	665	3328	101	254	510	1022	5115
85	69	175	351	704	3523	107	269	540	1082	5416
80	74	186	373	748	3744	113	286	574	1149	5755
75	79	199	398	798	3993	121	305	612	1226	6138
50	119	299	598	1197	5990	182	459	919	1840	9209
25	239	598	1197	2396	11982	367	919	1840	3682	18419
10	598	1497	2995	5990	29956	919	2301	4603	9209	46050

Table 4: Table of sample sizes for 95% and 99% confidence levels at varying levels of detection, according to efficacy values where lot size is large and sufficiently mixed, Poisson distribution

% efficacy	P = 95% (confidence level)					P = 99% (confidence level)				
	% level of detection					% level of detection				
	5	2	1	0.5	0.1	5	2	1	0.5	0.1
100	60	150	300	600	2996	93	231	461	922	4606
99	61	152	303	606	3026	94	233	466	931	4652
95	64	158	316	631	3154	97	243	485	970	4848
90	67	167	333	666	3329	103	256	512	1024	5117
85	71	177	353	705	3525	109	271	542	1084	5418
80	75	188	375	749	3745	116	288	576	1152	5757
75	80	200	400	799	3995	123	308	615	1229	6141
50	120	300	600	1199	5992	185	461	922	1843	9211
25	240	600	1199	2397	11983	369	922	1843	3685	18421
10	600	1498	2996	5992	29958	922	2303	4606	9211	46052

**SAMPLING FOR PESTS WITH AN AGGREGATED DISTRIBUTION:
BETA-BINOMIAL BASED SAMPLING⁵**

In the case of aggregated spatial distribution, sampling can be adjusted to compensate for aggregation. For this adjustment to apply, it should be assumed that the commodity is sampled in clusters (for example, boxes) and that each unit in a chosen cluster is examined (cluster sampling). In such cases, the proportion of infested units, f , is no longer constant across all clusters but will follow a beta density function.

$$P(X=i) = \binom{n}{i} \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{i-1} (f + j\theta) \prod_{j=0}^{n-i-1} (1 - f + j\theta)}{\prod_{j=0}^{n-1} (1 + j\theta)} \quad \text{Formula 11}$$

f is the average proportion of infested units (infestation level) in the lot.

$P(X = i)$ is the probability of observing i infested units in a lot.

n = number of units in a lot.

\prod is the product function

θ provides a measure of aggregation for the j th lot where θ is $0 < \theta < 1$.

Phytosanitary sampling is often more concerned with the probability of not observing an infested unit after inspecting several batches. For a single batch, the probability that $X > 0$ is

$$P(X > 0) = 1 - \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} (1 - f + j\theta) / (1 + j\theta) \quad \text{Formula 12}$$

and the probability that each of several lots has no infested unit equals $P(X=0)^m$, where m is the number of lots. When f is low, equation 1 can be estimated by

$$\Pr(X=0) \approx (1 + n\theta)^{-(mf/\theta)} \quad \text{Formula 13}$$

The probability of observing one or more infested units is given by $1 - \Pr(X=0)$.

This equation can be rearranged to determine m

$$m = \frac{-\theta}{f} \left[\frac{\ln(1 - P(x > 0))}{\ln(1 + n\theta)} \right] \quad \text{Formula 14}$$

Stratified sampling offers a way of reducing the impact of aggregation. Strata should be chosen so that the degree of aggregation within the strata is minimized.

When the degree of aggregation and the confidence level are fixed, the size of the sample can be determined. Without the degree of aggregation, the sample size can not be determined.

Efficacy (ϕ values of less than 100% can be included by substituting ϕf for f in the equations.

⁵ This appendix is not an official part of the standard. It is provided for information only.

APPENDIX 5

**COMPARISON OF HYPERGEOMETRIC AND FIXED
PROPORTION SAMPLING RESULTS⁶**

Table 5: Confidence in the results of different sampling schemes for a 10% level of detection

Lot size	Hypergeometric-based sampling (random sampling)		Fixed proportion sampling (2%)	
	sample size	confidence level	sample size	confidence level
10	10	1	1	0.100
50	22	0.954	1	0.100
100	25	0.952	2	0.191
200	27	0.953	4	0.346
300	28	0.955	6	0.472
400	28	0.953	8	0.573
500	28	0.952	10	0.655
1 000	28	0.950	20	0.881
1 500	29	0.954	30	0.959
3 000	29	0.954	60	0.998

Table 6: Minimum levels that can be detected with 95% confidence using different sampling schemes

Lot size	Hypergeometric-based sampling (random sampling)		Fixed proportion sampling (2%)	
	sample size	minimum level of detection	sample size	minimum level of detection
10	10	0.10	1	1.00
50	22	0.10	1	0.96
100	25	0.10	2	0.78
200	27	0.10	4	0.53
300	28	0.10	6	0.39
400	28	0.10	8	0.31
500	28	0.10	10	0.26
1 000	28	0.10	20	0.14
1 500	29	0.10	30	0.09
3 000	29	0.10	60	0.05

⁶ This appendix is not an official part of the standard. It is provided for information only.

**RECOMMENDATION FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
IPPC**

IPPC Recommendation

***REPLACEMENT OR REDUCTION OF THE USE OF
METHYL BROMIDE AS A PHYTOSANITARY MEASURE***

(2008)

CONTENTS**INTRODUCTION**

SCOPE

REFERENCES

DEFINITIONS

OUTLINE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

BACKGROUND**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. Replacement of Methyl Bromide Use as a Phytosanitary Measure**
- 2. Reducing Volumes of Methyl Bromide Use as a Phytosanitary Measure**
- 3. Physically Reducing Methyl Bromide Emissions**
- 4. Recording Methyl Bromide Use as a Phytosanitary Measure**
- 5. Guidelines for Appropriate Use of Methyl Bromide as a Phytosanitary Measure**

APPENDIX 1

Examples of potential phytosanitary treatments to replace or reduce methyl bromide

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

This document is an IPPC Recommendation as provided for in the IPPC (1997) (Article XI.2.g). This Recommendation¹ provides guidance to National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) on the replacement or reduction in the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure in order to reduce emissions of methyl bromide.

REFERENCES

- Copenhagen Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer* (from the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, Copenhagen, 1992).
- Glossary of phytosanitary terms*, 2008. ISPM No. 5, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*, 2004. ISPM No. 20, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for inspection*, 2005. ISPM No. 23, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*, 2002, with modifications to Annex I, 2006. ISPM No. 15, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*, 2005. ISPM No. 24, FAO, Rome.
- International Plant Protection Convention*, 1997. FAO, Rome.
- Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer*, 2000. UNEP Ozone Secretariat, United Nations Environment Programme. ISBN: 92-807-1888-6. <http://www.unep.org/ozone/pdfs/Montreal-Protocol2000.pdf>
- Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*, 2004. ISPM No. 11, FAO, Rome.
- Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*, 2004. ISPM No. 21, FAO, Rome.
- Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*, 2006. ISPM No. 1, FAO, Rome.
- Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*, 2007. ISPM No. 28, FAO, Rome.
- Report of the Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee (1998). *Assessment of alternatives to methyl bromide*, 30 October 1998, 354 pp. UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Report of the Second Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, 2007. FAO, Rome.
- Requirements for the establishment of areas of low pest prevalence*, 2005. ISPM No. 22, FAO, Rome.
- Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*, 1995. ISPM No. 4, FAO, Rome.
- Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites*, 1999. ISPM No. 10, FAO, Rome.
- The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*, 2002. ISPM No. 14, FAO, Rome.

DEFINITIONS

Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in this Recommendation can be found in ISPM No. 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

OUTLINE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This IPPC Recommendation outlines areas for action and guidelines to replace or reduce the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure. With the overall aim of reducing release of methyl bromide into the atmosphere, NPPOs may consider methods of reducing the quantities of methyl bromide used, reducing methyl bromide emissions by physical means, and promoting and implementing phytosanitary measures that are economically and technically feasible as viable alternatives to the use of methyl bromide. The IPPC Recommendation also provides guidance on recording the use of methyl bromide.

¹ Nothing in this IPPC Recommendation shall affect the rights or obligations of contracting parties under other international agreements. Provisions of other international agreements may be applicable, for example the Montreal Protocol.

BACKGROUND

The main purpose of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the responsibility of its contracting parties is to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products and to promote appropriate measures for their control. In doing so, contracting parties also undertake the promotion of appropriate measures for the control of regulated pests. In its preamble, the IPPC states that in agreeing to the Convention, contracting parties take into account “internationally approved principles governing the protection of plant, human and animal health, and the environment”. The second meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) “Encouraged contracting parties to promote best fumigation practices, recapture technology and development and use of alternatives to methyl bromide in phytosanitary measures where this was technically and economically feasible”. Thus, while pursuing the IPPC’s purpose, contracting parties are also encouraged to take into account environmental concerns, among which is protection of the ozone layer by reducing methyl bromide emissions.

IPPC contracting parties may also be party to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. Signatories to the Montreal Protocol are obliged to protect the ozone layer by reducing, and ultimately eliminating, emissions of ozone-depleting substances through a phase-out of production and import and consumption of such substances, noting the quarantine and pre-shipment (QPS)² exemptions.

In the 1992 Copenhagen Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, methyl bromide was listed as an ozone-depleting substance subject to phase-out provisions of the Montreal Protocol. However, the use of methyl bromide for QPS purposes is currently exempt from the protocol’s phase-out provisions because of difficulties in identifying technically and economically feasible alternatives. There is currently no limit on the amount of methyl bromide that can be used for these QPS purposes. In 1999, in the Beijing Amendment to the Montreal Protocol, mandatory requirements for the provision of statistical data on amounts of methyl bromide used annually for QPS purposes were agreed to. This amendment entered into force in January 2001. Therefore, parties to the Montreal Protocol already have obligations to monitor and report their use of methyl bromide for QPS applications.

Methyl bromide has been widely used as a pest control treatment for many decades. It offers a broad spectrum of control for insects, nematodes, weeds, pathogens and rodents. Methyl bromide has been employed primarily as a soil fumigant before planting crops, and is also used for commodity treatment and structural fumigation. Most uses of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure are for the treatment of durable commodities, such as grains, cereals and dried foodstuffs, wood packaging materials, wood and logs, as well as perishable commodities, such as fruit.

It is recognized that alternatives to methyl bromide for use as phytosanitary measures are needed, particularly because there may be future restrictions on the use of methyl bromide. It is also recognized that there is a need for contracting parties to continue to use methyl bromide until equivalent and feasible alternative phytosanitary measures are available.

Some countries have already successfully reduced or eliminated the use of methyl bromide.

To be considered viable under the IPPC, phytosanitary measures that are alternatives to methyl bromide and that are equivalent to methyl bromide fumigation as per ISPM No. 24 (*Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*) should also be economically and technically feasible. In comparison, the United Nations Environment Programme’s Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee defined alternatives as “those non-chemical or chemical treatments and/or procedures that are technically feasible for controlling pests, thus avoiding or replacing the use of methyl bromide”.³

RECOMMENDATIONS

To reduce the risk of introduction of some quarantine pests, the need for methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure remains until a range of equivalent alternatives has been developed. Contracting parties are encouraged to put in place a strategy that will help them to reduce the use of methyl bromide for phytosanitary measures and/or reduce emissions of methyl bromide. This may include the following areas for action:

- replacing methyl bromide use
- reducing methyl bromide use
- physically reducing methyl bromide emissions
- accurately recording methyl bromide use for phytosanitary measures.

In developing and implementing strategies to replace and/or reduce methyl bromide use and reduce emissions, contracting parties should also take into account any international obligations to which they may be subject and relevant IPPC principles. These principles are described in ISPM No. 1 (*Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade*).

² This document refers to some terms used by the Montreal Protocol as follows: QPS (quarantine and pre-shipment) purposes, National Ozone Units. These are not IPPC terms and should not be interpreted as such.

³ Methyl Bromide Technical Options Committee, 1998.

1. Replacement of Methyl Bromide Use as a Phytosanitary Measure

In recognition of the desire to minimize the use of methyl bromide, contracting parties should, where possible, take actions to replace methyl bromide usage by increasing the application of alternative phytosanitary measures. Where methyl bromide fumigation is currently used as a phytosanitary treatment for regulated pests it may be replaced by an alternative phytosanitary measure in which no methyl bromide is used. This may involve the implementation of systems approaches, pest free areas (PFAs), areas of low pest prevalence (ALPPs), pest free places of production, pest free production sites and equivalence.

The following are examples of phytosanitary measures that may be implemented independently or in conjunction with other phytosanitary measures to replace methyl bromide as a phytosanitary treatment when equivalent:

- use of other chemicals such as treatments mentioned in Appendix 1 (e.g. sulfuryl fluoride)
- application of physical treatments (e.g. heating, cooling, irradiation)
- immediate commodity processing (e.g. grain being milled into flour on arrival)
- methods of production (e.g. soil-free growing media, tissue culture, sterile culture).

In situations where consignments are identified as non-compliant at the point of import, the use of methyl bromide should be avoided where possible (appropriate actions to be taken in the case of non-compliance are described in section 5.1.6.1 of ISPM No. 20: *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*).

The CPM, largely through the provisions of ISPM No. 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*), is actively pursuing adoption of treatments that are viable alternatives to methyl bromide. As these alternatives become recognized, contracting parties are encouraged to use them in place of methyl bromide, where appropriate.

Where an ISPM contains options for various treatments for a commodity, and one of the options is methyl bromide (currently the only ISPM for which this is the case is ISPM No. 15: *Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*) and others are considered to present less of an adverse environmental impact, parties are encouraged to use the lower-impact option(s).

Appendix 1 contains a list of articles that have historically been treated with methyl bromide and presents possible alternative phytosanitary treatments that could be used to replace or reduce the use of methyl bromide.

2. Reducing Volumes of Methyl Bromide Use as a Phytosanitary Measure

The reduction of methyl bromide emissions can be achieved through the use of reduced dosages of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure or decreased treatment frequency. In addition, existing methyl bromide use should be analysed carefully to determine if the treatment is appropriate and necessary.

The following approaches may, where appropriate, be pursued to reduce the use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure:

- inspection-based fumigation instead of mandatory fumigation (i.e. to detect and identify the quarantine pest of concern)
- avoidance of unjustified re-fumigation with methyl bromide (i.e. re-fumigation should be used only when a quarantine pest situation is evident)
- improvement of treatment facilities as appropriate to maximize efficiency of fumigation, thus reducing replenishment or re-fumigation requirements
- increasing exposure time with a view to reducing dosage, where technically feasible
- compliance with phytosanitary requirements for exporting commodities
- avoidance of application in situations where efficacy is doubtful or marginal
- reassessment of doses and exposure times in order to reduce them
- use of optimal temperatures when fumigating
- use of appropriately sized treatment facilities
- evaluation of pest risk and treatment efficacy (through a pest risk analysis) to determine if a more appropriate dose or alternative treatment is possible.

3. Physically Reducing Methyl Bromide Emissions

Contracting parties should aim to minimize or eliminate the release of methyl bromide to the atmosphere by physical means. This may be achieved by upgrading facilities as appropriate to increase efficiency of methyl bromide application to improve:

- methyl bromide emissions control, e.g. by recapture, and/or reuse or destruction, through the use of leak-proof chambers and containment/capture bubbles, etc.
- fumigation performance, e.g. by use of bioassay controls where appropriate in lieu of concentration × time products, use of higher temperatures during fumigation through supplemental heat when necessary combined with air circulation, pressure testing etc., reduction of leakage

- gas circulation, e.g. by use of a carrier gas such as CO₂
- gas and temperature monitoring including proper calibration of equipment.

4. Recording Methyl Bromide Use as a Phytosanitary Measure

To measure progress in reduction of methyl bromide emissions arising from use of methyl bromide as a phytosanitary measure, NPPOs are encouraged to accurately record and collate data on current usage and share this data with their country's National Ozone Unit⁴ (the national body responsible for the implementation of the Montreal Protocol).

The information on methyl bromide use for phytosanitary measures should contain:

- quantities of methyl bromide used in kilograms
- description of the articles⁵ fumigated where appropriate
- whether the use was on import or export commodities
- target pests.

5. Guidelines for Appropriate Use of Methyl Bromide as a Phytosanitary Measure

NPPOs are encouraged to be involved in the coordination of the following actions:

1. Review and consider how to change phytosanitary policies (e.g. phytosanitary import requirements) to replace and/or reduce methyl bromide where it is required and where an equivalent, technically feasible, practical and economically viable alternative exists. This may also require review and revision of bilateral agreements between countries.
2. Ensure that methyl bromide fumigation is used only for quarantine pests and that it is authorized or performed by the NPPO, including fumigation as emergency action for pests not previously assessed (as described in section 5.1.6.2 of ISPM No. 20: *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*).
3. Provide guidance to those responsible for methyl bromide fumigations for quarantine purposes on the importance of pursuing feasible alternative phytosanitary measures.
4. Develop and utilize phytosanitary measures that are equivalent, viable and feasible alternatives to methyl bromide.
5. Communicate to other NPPOs where there are viable alternatives to methyl bromide use.
6. Submit phytosanitary treatments that are effective, efficacious, documented, feasible and applicable alternatives to the use of methyl bromide to the IPPC Secretariat using the guidelines in ISPM No. 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).
7. Give highest priority to the development of alternative treatments for those commodities for which methyl bromide usage is high.
8. Liaise with research groups and funding bodies to develop alternative treatments as appropriate.
9. Coordinate with the National Ozone Unit, as appropriate, to facilitate the annual collection and reporting of methyl bromide usage data.
10. Post or link details of NPPO-approved alternatives for methyl bromide treatment on the International Phytosanitary Portal (<https://www.ippc.int>) for exchange of information.
11. Cooperate with the National Ozone Unit to implement a strategy to replace and reduce methyl bromide usage.
12. Exchange information on alternatives to methyl bromide usage between the NPPO and the National Ozone Unit.
13. Identify current treatments where methyl bromide is the only option, and provide sufficient information to the appropriate IPPC body for consideration in the development of potential viable alternatives (e.g. identify the commodity, pests associated with it for which methyl bromide is used, required efficacy).
14. Evaluate or re-evaluate pest risk (via pest risk analysis) to determine if the treatment prescription is appropriate and whether less rigorous treatment or alternative measures may be used.

⁴ Obligations for recording and reporting on methyl bromide usage exist under the Montreal Protocol.

⁵ The first column of the table in Appendix 1 provides a list of articles commonly fumigated.

APPENDIX 1

**EXAMPLES OF POTENTIAL PHYTOSANITARY TREATMENTS TO REPLACE
OR REDUCE METHYL BROMIDE**

Listed in the table below are treatments that may be considered and validated as alternatives to methyl bromide and that are currently registered, where necessary, and used in at least one country⁶. These treatments may be employed to replace or reduce methyl bromide use in certain circumstances. Alternatively, phytosanitary measures may be considered, including PFA, ALPP and system approach, as alternatives for some of the treatments listed below. The use of the names of the articles presented in this appendix may be helpful for ensuring consistency in reporting QPS use.

The following considerations affect the choice of a measure:

- combination of crop type (flowers, fruits, foliage etc.) and/or species and pest species (insects, bacteria, fungi, virus etc.)
- lack of a national registration or existing equivalency agreement between countries, which may preclude use of particular treatments in particular countries
- economic factors that may affect use of the treatment in particular countries
- processes in the supply chain that may reduce pests to an acceptable level (e.g. washing, freezing, dicing)
- occurrence of resistance of a pest towards the envisaged alternative, which may change the necessary dosage schedule or preclude the alternative
- irradiation (it may not kill immature stages but it rather inhibits development to maturity)
- intended use of the commodity
- undesirable effects of chemical residues for operators
- provisions in relevant ISPMs
- other treatments that may be agreed to by countries based on bilateral agreements.

List of articles fumigated	Examples of potential phytosanitary treatments to consider to replace or reduce methyl bromide
Commodities	
Bulbs, corms, tubers and rhizomes (intended for planting)	Hot water, pre-plant quarantine soil sterilization (steam or chemical), pesticide dip, or a combination of these treatments
Cut flowers and branches (including foliage)	Controlled atmosphere (CO ₂ , N ₂) + combination treatment, hot water, irradiation, phosphine, phosphine/carbon dioxide mixture, pyrethroids + carbon dioxide, ethyl formate + carbon dioxide
Fresh fruit and vegetables	Cold treatment, high-temperature forced air, hot water, irradiation, quick freeze, vapour heat treatment, chemical dip, phosphine, combination of treatments
Grain, cereals and oil seeds for consumption including rice (not intended for planting)	Heat treatment, irradiation, ethyl formate, carbonyl sulphide, phosphine, phosphine + carbon dioxide, controlled atmosphere (CO ₂ , N ₂)
Dried foodstuffs (including herbs, dried fruit, coffee, cocoa)	Heat treatment, carbon dioxide under high pressure, irradiation, ethyl formate, ethylene oxide, phosphine, phosphine + carbon dioxide, controlled atmosphere (CO ₂ , N ₂), sulfuryl fluoride, propylene oxide
Nursery stock (plants intended for planting other than seed), and associated soil and other growing media	Hot water, soil sterilization (steam or chemical e.g. methyl isothiocyanate (MITC) fumigants), pesticides dip, phosphine, combination of any of these treatments
Seeds (intended for planting)	Hot water, pesticide dip or dusting, phosphine, combination treatments
Wood packaging materials ⁷	Heat treatment (contained in Annex 1 of ISPM No. 15). Further alternative treatments may be added in the future.
Wood (including round wood, sawn wood, wood chips)	Heat treatment, kiln-drying, removal of bark, microwave, irradiation, MITC/sulfuryl fluoride mixture, methyl iodide, chemical impregnation or immersion, phosphine, sulfuryl fluoride
Whole logs (with or without bark)	Heat treatment, irradiation, removal of bark, phosphine, sulfuryl fluoride

⁶ The treatments indicated in the table below may not have been adopted by CPM.

⁷ It is noted that ISPM No. 15 (*Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*) is the only ISPM currently listing approved treatments for wood packaging material. Wood packaging material is the only commodity for which specific treatments are currently described in an ISPM.

List of articles fumigated	Examples of potential phytosanitary treatments to consider to replace or reduce methyl bromide
Hay, straw, thatch grass, dried animal fodder (other than grains and cereals listed above)	Heat treatment, irradiation, high pressure + phosphine, phosphine, sulfuryl fluoride
Cotton and other fibre crops and products	Heat treatment, compression, irradiation, phosphine, sulfuryl fluoride
Tree nuts (almonds, walnuts, hazelnuts etc.)	Carbon dioxide under high pressure, controlled atmosphere (CO ₂ , N ₂), heat treatment, irradiation, ethylene oxide, ethyl formate, phosphine, phosphine + carbon dioxide, propylene oxide, sulfuryl fluoride
Structures and equipment	
Buildings with quarantine pests (including elevators, dwellings, factories, storage facilities)	Controlled atmosphere (CO ₂ , N ₂), heat treatment, pesticide spray or fogging, phosphine, sulfuryl fluoride
Equipment (including used agricultural machinery and vehicles), empty shipping containers and reused packaging	Controlled atmosphere (CO ₂ , N ₂), heat treatment, steam, hot water, pesticide spray or fogging, phosphine, sulfuryl fluoride
Other items	
Personal effects, furniture, crafts, artefacts, hides, fur and skins	Controlled atmosphere (CO ₂ , N ₂), heat treatment, irradiation, ethylene oxide, pesticide spray or fogging, phosphine, sulfuryl fluoride

HIERARCHY OF TERMS FOR STANDARDS

Term	Use	Example
Technical area	CPM establishes a Technical panel (TP) to work on a specified <i>technical area</i> (reflected in the title of the TP and described in its specification)	Technical Panel on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - diagnostic protocols (TPDP), - forest quarantine (TPFQ) - pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) - phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) - glossary (TPG).
Topic	Calls for <i>topics</i> are made biennially and a <i>topic</i> is added to the work programme by the CPM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - revision to ISPM No. 15 - diagnostic protocols for bacteria - irradiation treatments - areas of low pest prevalence for fruit flies
Subject	<i>Subjects</i> require approval by the SC. The concept of <i>subject</i> applies only to TPs. The lists of subjects may be revised by the CPM. ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - individual treatment within an approved <i>topic</i> - individual diagnostic protocols for a specific pest within an approved <i>topic</i> - new glossary term

¹ Contracting parties or other interested parties, in accordance with the *Procedure and criteria for identifying topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme*, may contribute to the list of subjects in response to calls.

PROCEDURE AND CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFYING TOPICS FOR INCLUSION IN THE IPPC STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME

In establishing topics for standards to be included in the IPPC standard setting work programme, the following procedure should be used¹ :

1. The IPPC Secretariat calls for submissions for topics to be included in the standard setting work programme. A call is made every two years. It is sent to contracting parties, NPPOs, RPPOs and the WTO-SPS Secretary, and is also posted on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP, www.ippc.int). Other organizations (such as the Convention on Biological Diversity) and CPM technical panels can also respond to the call.
2. Detailed proposals for new topics or for the revision of existing ISPMs are submitted to the Secretariat (IPPC@fao.org) no later than the 31 July of the year the call for topics is made, using the submission form for CPM standard setting work programme topics available on the IPP. Submissions should address the applicable criteria for justification of the proposed topic (as listed below). Where possible, information in support of the justification and that may assist in the prioritization should be indicated. Submissions should preferably be made in an electronic format.
3. A list of topics is compiled by the IPPC Secretariat from the submissions received. Submissions from previous years which were not added to the standard setting work programme are not included in this compilation. They may be re-submitted, as appropriate.
4. The compiled list of detailed proposals is presented to the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) and posted on the IPP. The SPTA reviews these submissions and identifies strategic priorities taking into account the criteria for justification of proposed topics (as listed below).
5. The Standards Committee, taking into account the SPTA strategic priorities and using the criteria listed below, reviews the existing work programme and the compiled list of detailed proposals. It proposes a revised work programme (including subjects²), adding topics from the compiled list, deleting or modifying topics from the existing work programme as appropriate, giving each topic a recommended priority (high or normal), and identifying those topics that may be processed under the special standard setting process.
6. The CPM reviews the work programme proposed by the Standards Committee. The CPM adjusts and adopts the standard setting work programme, including for each topic its priority and whether the topic may be processed under the special standard setting process. A revised standard setting work programme is attached as an appendix to the CPM meeting report.
7. In any year, when a situation arises in which a standard is required urgently, the CPM may insert such a topic (or subject) into the standard setting work programme.

¹ Other than proposals for subjects related to topics previously adopted by the CPM related to annexes and appendices to be worked on by technical panels.

² For details on the terms "technical area", "topic" and "subject", see the *Hierarchy of terms for standards*.

Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics

Core criteria

1. Contribution to the purpose of the IPPC as described in article I.1.
2. Feasibility of implementation at the global level (includes ease of implementation, technical complexity, capacity of NPPOs to implement, relevance for more than one region).
3. Clear identification of the problems that need to be resolved through the development of the standard.
4. Availability of, or possibility to collect, information in support of the proposed standard (e.g. scientific, historical, technical information, experience).

Supporting criteria

Practical

1. Feasibility of adopting the proposed standard within a reasonable time frame.
2. Stage of development of the proposed standard (is a standard on the same topic already widely used by NPPOs, RPPOs or a relevant international organization).
3. Availability of expertise needed to develop the proposed standard.

Economic

4. Estimated value of the plants protected.
5. Estimated value of trade affected by the proposed standard (e.g. volume of trade, value of trade, the percentage of Gross Domestic Product of this trade) if appropriate.
6. Estimated value of new trade opportunities provided by the approval of the proposed standard.
7. Potential benefits in terms of pest control or quarantine activities.

Environmental

8. Utility to reduce the potential negative environmental consequences of certain phytosanitary measures, for example reduction in global emissions for the protection of the ozone layer.
9. Utility in the management of non indigenous species which are pests of plants (such as some invasive alien species).
10. Contribution to the protection of the environment, through the protection of wild flora, and their habitats and ecosystems, and of agricultural biodiversity.

Strategic

11. Extent of support for the proposed standard (e.g. one or more NPPOs or RPPOs have requested it, or one or more RPPOs have adopted a standard on the same topic).
12. Frequency with which the issue addressed by the proposed standard emerges as a source of trade disruption (e.g. disputes or need for repeated bilateral discussions, number of times per year trade is disrupted).
13. Relevance and utility to developing countries.
14. Coverage (application to a wide range of countries/pests/commodities).
15. Complements other standards (e.g. potential for the standard to be used as part of a systems approach for one pest, complement treatments for other pests).
16. Foundation standards to address fundamental concepts (e.g. treatment efficacy, inspection methodology).
17. Expected standard longevity (e.g. future trade needs, suggested use of easily outdated technology or products).
18. Urgent need for the standard.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR STANDARD SETTING

As part of the standard setting procedure, general considerations should be kept in mind when developing specifications and drafting standards, when providing and considering comments, and when adopting standards.

These general considerations, although not presented as part of the standard setting procedure, form an integral part of the standard setting process. They are taken into account in order to ensure that:

- The standard setting procedure follows a transparent process (including for example publishing relevant documents as laid out in “Provisions for the availability of standard setting documents”, consulting with contracting parties, etc.)
- ISPMs are of high quality and science based.
- ISPMs are developed according to CPM agreed priorities.
- All contracting parties have a chance to be involved and to participate in the process, which includes appropriate funding mechanisms for participation in meetings. Domestic stakeholders are involved through the contracting parties.
- The standard setting procedure follows a consistent process.
- The standard setting programme is carried out within the available IPPC standard setting resources and national or regional funding mechanisms.
- ISPMs are presented to CPM for adoption after all stages are completed and when no extensive discussion is needed.
- The hierarchical relationship between all groups, panels and committees involved in standard setting process is clear.
- The standard setting procedures and processes facilitate the development and adoption of standards; they are flexible and periodically reviewed.
- Unnecessary bureaucratic steps, which reduce efficiency without improving output, are avoided.

IPPC STANDARD SETTING PROCEDURE (ANNEX 1 of the RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE CPM)

The process for the development of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) is divided into four stages:

- Stage 1 - developing the IPPC standard setting work programme,
- Stage 2 - drafting,
- Stage 3 - member consultation,
- Stage 4 - adoption and publication.

Relevant ICPM/CPM decisions on many aspects of the standard setting process have been compiled in the IPPC Procedural Manual which is updated annually.

STAGES

Stage 1: Developing the IPPC standard setting work programme

Step 1: Call for topics

A call for topics is made by the IPPC Secretariat every two years. Detailed proposals for new topics or for the revision of existing ISPMs are submitted to the IPPC Secretariat.

Step 2: Adjustment and adoption of the IPPC standard setting work programme

The CPM adjusts and adopts the IPPC standard setting work programme, taking account of the strategic priorities identified by the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance and the revised work programme proposed by the Standards Committee.

Stage 2: Drafting

Step 3: Development of a specification

For each topic or technical panel, the Standards Committee appoints a steward(s), who, in collaboration with the Secretariat, drafts a specification, taking into account the proposal(s) for the topic.

The draft specification is reviewed by the Standards Committee and, once approved for member consultation, is then made available on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) for a 60 day consultation period. Comments received by the IPPC Secretariat are compiled, posted on the IPP and submitted to the steward(s) and Standards Committee for consideration. The specification is amended as necessary, finalized and approved by the Standards Committee, and published on the IPP.

Step 4: Preparation of a draft ISPM¹

The standard is drafted or revised by an expert drafting group (expert working group or technical panel) in accordance with the relevant specification.

<p>Regular process:</p> <p>The resulting draft standard is submitted to the Standards Committee.</p>	<p>Special process:</p> <p>The resulting draft standard is submitted to the Standards Committee at any time by e-mail.</p>
--	--

¹ This procedure refers to "draft ISPMs" and "standards" to simplify wording, but also applies to any part of an ISPM, including annexes, appendices or supplements.

<p>The Standards Committee or SC-7 reviews the draft at a meeting and decides whether to send it for member consultation, or to return it to the steward(s) or to an expert drafting group, or to put it on hold. In the case where only the SC-7 meets, comments from any SC members will also be taken into account.</p>	<p>As far as possible the Standards Committee decides by e-mail whether to send it for member consultation, or to return it to the steward(s) or to an expert drafting group, or to place it on the Standards Committee agenda for a decision on how to proceed.</p>
--	--

Stage 3: Member consultation

Step 5: Member consultation

Following clearance by the SC, the draft standard is sent for member consultation by the IPPC Secretariat to contracting parties, National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) and relevant international organizations for consultation. The draft standard is also posted on the IPP. The length of the consultation period is 100 days. Comments are submitted through the IPPC contact point. Comments are by written submission to the Secretariat (preferably by electronic means, e.g. e-mail) following guidelines.

<p>Regular process:</p> <p>Comments are compiled by the Secretariat and submitted to the steward and the Standards Committee for consideration.</p>	<p>Special process:</p> <p>Comments are compiled by the Secretariat and submitted to the technical panel and the Standards Committee for consideration (possibly by e-mail).</p>
---	--

Compiled comments are posted on the IPP at the time of submission to the SC.

Step 6: Review of the draft ISPM prior to CPM

<p>Regular process:</p> <p>The draft standard is revised by the SC-7 and Standards Committee taking comments into account.</p> <p>The Standards Committee decides whether to forward the modified draft to the CPM for adoption, or to put it on hold, return it to the steward or to an expert drafting group, or submit it for another round of member consultation.</p> <p>A summary of major issues discussed and of SC reactions to substantive comments that were not incorporated into the standard is produced as part of the SC report and posted on the IPP.</p>	<p>Special process:</p> <p>If no one changes the draft text, the draft standard is submitted to the CPM for adoption.</p> <p>If the draft standard is changed as a result of comments, the draft is submitted to the Standards Committee. In consultation with the relevant technical panel, the Standards Committee examines the draft standard and if appropriate modifies it. The SC decides (possibly via e-mail) whether to forward the modified draft standard to the CPM for adoption, or some other action such as to put it on hold, return it to the steward or to a technical panel, or submit it for another round of member consultation.</p>
--	--

Draft ISPMs should be posted on the IPP in the languages of the organization as soon as possible and at least 6 weeks prior to the opening of the CPM.

Stage 4: Adoption and publicationStep 7: Adoption

<p>Regular process:</p> <p>Following approval by the Standards Committee, the draft standard is included on the agenda of the CPM for adoption.</p> <p>Comments on standards are sent to the IPPC Secretariat at least 14 days before the CPM meeting following guidelines.</p>	<p>Special process:</p> <p>The draft standard is included on the agenda of the CPM for adoption.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if no formal objection² is received up to 14 days prior to the CPM, the draft standard will be adopted without discussion - if a formal objection is received at least 14 days prior to the CPM, the draft standard is returned to the SC. The SC decides, possibly via electronic means, how to proceed, including the possibility of submitting it to the CPM for adoption through the regular process. <p>Formal objections should be posted on the IPP as soon as possible to ensure that contracting parties are aware of them before CPM.</p>
---	--

The ISPM is formally adopted by the CPM according to Rule X of the Rules of Procedure of the CPM.

Step 8: Publication

The ISPM is appended to the report of the CPM and published by the IPPC Secretariat, including posting on the IPP.

² A formal objection should be a technically supported objection to the adoption of the draft standard in its current form, sent through the official IPPC contact point. The Secretariat would not make any judgement about the validity of the objection – an objection with some technical discussion of the issue would be accepted as a formal objection.

TERMS OF REFERENCE AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR TECHNICAL PANELS

Terms of reference

1. Scope of Technical Panels

Technical Panels (TPs) assist the SC in the development of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) in their specified technical areas¹ on topics which have been determined by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).

2. Objective

The main objective of TPs is to develop specific draft standards, annexes, supplements, amendments or additions to standards on topics in their specified technical areas requiring continuous work, as well as advising the Standards Committee (SC) on scientific or technical matters.

3. Structure of Technical Panels

TPs should consist of 6-10 members with the necessary scientific expertise representing a wide geographic area (including proportional developing country participation). In specific cases and depending on the technical area, a TP may consist of more or less members according to the SC's decision.

4. Functions of Technical Panels

TPs operate under the guidance and supervision of the SC, and serve as a forum for providing:

- draft standards, annexes, supplements, amendments or additions to standards in their specified technical areas
- advice on member comments in their technical area
- advice on subjects, topics and priorities for technical standard development in their technical area, and
- other tasks as requested by the SC within its mandate and to progress the objectives of the TP.

5. IPPC Secretariat

The Secretariat provides administrative, technical and editorial support as required by TPs. The Secretariat is responsible for reporting and record keeping.

6. Establishment of Technical Panels

TPs are established by the CPM and work on an ongoing basis until disestablished by the CPM on the recommendation of the SC.

Rules of procedure

Rule 1. Membership

Members of TPs should have the necessary scientific expertise and subject matter experience, and should be able to participate and contribute to the proceedings. The steward of the TP is considered a member.

Membership of TPs should be reviewed by the SC on a regular basis and may be adjusted as necessary, taking into account, in particular, changes in the needs of scientific or other expertise required and in the professional duties of the experts.

¹ For details on the terms "technical area", "topic" and "subject", see the *Hierarchy of terms for standards*.

Rule 2. Procedure for Nomination and Selection of Technical Panel Members

Members of TPs are nominated and selected according to the following:

- nominations are requested by the Secretariat as directed by the SC;
- contracting parties, NPPOs, RPPOs or, exceptionally, the IPPC Secretariat, submit nominations of experts;
- the Secretariat summarizes and comments on the nominations, and submits them to the SC and the Bureau. The SC selects the members based on their demonstrated expertise and communicates this to the Secretariat; and
- lists of Technical Panel members are maintained on the IPP.

Rule 3. Period of Membership

Members of TPs may serve for a 5 year period, after which, with the member's agreement, the SC may extend membership for additional terms. The SC may, in accordance with Rule 1 of these Rules of Procedure, change or amend the membership of TPs at any time. Membership should be reviewed regularly by the SC, and membership may be confirmed. Extension of membership does not require the application of the nomination procedure according to Rule 2. Members may at any time withdraw from the TP.

Rule 4. Chair

The Chairpersons of TPs are elected at each meeting by their members.

Rule 5. TP Steward

Each TP should have a TP steward, selected by the SC. Where possible, that TP steward should be a member of the SC. The TP steward is responsible for liaison between the SC and the TP, ensuring the TP follows the guidance given by the SC.

Rule 6. Other stewards

Stewards assigned by the SC to work on a specific standard, annex or supplement referred to the TP may also participate in that TP meeting.

Rule 7. Observers and participation of non-members of the Technical Panel

TPs should not allow observers.

In specific cases, with prior agreement of the TP members and without objection of the SC, the TP may invite individuals with specific expertise to participate on an *ad hoc* basis at a specified meeting or part of a meeting of a TP, as invited experts.

A representative of the host country and/or organization may participate in the meeting of a TP, and assist the IPPC Secretariat in the organization and efficient running of the meeting.

Decisions of TPs are taken by their members only.

Rule 8. Sessions

TPs should meet as necessary, generally once a year. E-mail, teleconferencing and other modern communication methods should be used where possible to prepare and supplement face to face meetings of TPs.

TP members should work according to the specification for each TP approved by the SC and the procedures of the TP, which are included in the IPPC Procedural Manual and which should be in accordance with other procedures approved by the SC.

Rule 9. Approval

Approvals relating to draft documents and agreement on advice provided to the SC should be by consensus and communicated to the SC by the relevant steward. If consensus is not reached, contentious issues should be bracketed in the text of the draft document, positions explained in the report and brought to the attention of the SC.

Rule 10. Reports

The report of each TP meeting should be published on the IPP. Major discussion issues should be noted in the report and the rationale for conclusions should be recorded.

The report should be presented to the SC by the TP steward advising the SC of the specific actions that they are requested to take.

Rule 11. Working Language

English should be the working language of TP meetings.

Rule 12. Amendments

Amendments to the Terms of reference and Rules of procedures, if required, should be adopted by the CPM.

PROVISIONS FOR THE AVAILABILITY OF STANDARD SETTING DOCUMENTS

Type of document	Level of access*	Notes
Expert drafting groups (EWGs**, TPs)		
Working documents	Relevant expert drafting group	As currently
Reports	Not restricted (public)	Once approved by the expert drafting group
Standards Committee: input		
Agenda and list of participants	Contracting parties, RPPOs and SC	
List of SC documents	Contracting parties, RPPOs and SC	Indicating who has access to each document
Draft ISPMs and draft specifications presented to the SC	Contracting parties, RPPOs and SC	Duly marked as a draft and numbered as an identifiable version.
Compiled member comments on draft specifications	Contracting parties, RPPOs and SC	
Compiled member comments on draft ISPMs	Not restricted (public)	
Detailed stewards' reactions to member comments	SC only	
A summary of major issues discussed and of SC reactions to substantive comments that were not incorporated into the standard (for both draft ISPMs and draft specifications)	Not restricted (public), as annexes to SC report	
Other SC documents	- Contracting parties, RPPOs and SC, or - SC only	This will be determined on a case by case basis. SC to consider at its next meeting how this case-by-case decision will be made.
Standards Committee: output		
All documents approved by the SC during its meetings	Not restricted (public), as annexes to the SC report	Documents approved to be processed further are included as annexes to the SC report, and will therefore be available without restriction.
SC report	Not restricted (public)	As currently
Others		
Compiled list of detailed proposals for topics for inclusion in the IPPC standard setting work programme	Not restricted (public)	Posted once the topics have been compiled for the SPTA
Any document whose access is restricted according to the above	Group concerned	In this case, a SC member or a contracting party could request access to the document. This document would be made available with the prior agreement of the SC and, if applicable, of the person or group preparing the document.

* "Contracting parties" means that the contact points and IPP editors of contracting parties will have access to the relevant work area and documents on the IPP. Bureau members currently have access to all restricted work areas on the IPP; the Bureau is therefore not mentioned here.

** List of abbreviations: EWG - expert working group; IPP - International Phytosanitary Portal (<https://www.ippc.int>); ISPM - International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures; RPPO -Regional Plant Protection Organization; SC - Standards Committee; SPTA - Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance; TP - Technical Panel.

IPPC STANDARD SETTING WORK PROGRAMME

Rows are numbered for reference purposes only. Titles given are working titles only and may further evolve during the development of the specification and ISPM.

Topics being developed by an expert working group (with a draft ISPM)

The following drafts are being developed under the regular standard setting process. Bracketed text indicates if the draft was developed by an expert working group (EWG) or consultant, and the number of meetings held.

Row	Priority	Topic	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
1	High	Appropriate level of protection (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008	2009
2		Classification of commodities by level of processing, intended use and phytosanitary risk (2 EWGs, 1 FAO expert, 1 TPPT)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008	2009
3		Export certification for potato minitubers and micropropagative material (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008	2009
4		Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM No. 5: <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>) (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008	2009
5		Plants for planting (including movement, post-entry quarantine and certification programmes) (2 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008	2009
6		Revision of ISPMs No. 7 and 12 (1 EWG)	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	Draft developed by EWG in February 2008	2010
7	Normal	Post-entry quarantine facilities (1 EWG)	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008	2009

Topics to be developed by an expert working group (currently without a draft ISPM)

The following drafts will be developed under the regular standard setting process.

Row	Priority	Topic	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
8	High	Inspection manual	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification in draft form	Unknown
9		Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification adopted	2011
10		Pre-clearance for regulated articles	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification adopted	2010
11		Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification to be drafted	Unknown
12		Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification to be drafted	Unknown
13		Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification to be drafted	Unknown

¹ Abbreviations used in this annex: SC - Standards Committee; EWG - Expert Working Group; TPG - Technical Panel on the Glossary; TPF - Technical Panel on Fruit Flies; TPDP - Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols; TPPT - Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments; TPFQ - Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine.

Topics to be developed by an expert working group (currently without a draft ISPM) - continued

Row	Priority	Topic	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
14	Normal	Guidelines for the movement of used machinery and equipment	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	Draft specification sent for member consultation	Unknown
15		Import of plant breeding material	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	Specification adopted	2011
16		Regulating stored products in international trade	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification in draft form	Unknown
17		Soil and growing media	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	Specification adopted	2011
18		Handling and disposal of garbage moved internationally	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification to be drafted	Unknown
19		International movement of cut flowers and foliage	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification to be drafted	Unknown
20		International movement of grain	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification to be drafted	Unknown
21		Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM No. 20: <i>Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system</i>)	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification to be drafted	Unknown

Technical panels

Row	Priority	Topic	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status
22	High	Technical panel on diagnostic protocols for specific pests (TPDP)	TPDP	ICPM-6 (2004)	Work ongoing
23		Technical panel on forest quarantine (TPFQ)	TPFQ	ICPM-6 (2004)	Work ongoing
24		Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF)	TPFF	ICPM-6 (2004)	Work ongoing
25		Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT)	TPPT	ICPM-6 (2004)	Work ongoing
26		Technical panel on the <i>Glossary</i> (TPG)	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing

Technical panel on diagnostic protocols (TPDP)

The TPDP is developing the following diagnostic protocols under the special standard setting process.

Row	Priority	Subject	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
		Bacteria:				-
27	High	- <i>Erwinia amylovora</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2009
28		- <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2009
29		- <i>Xyllela fastidiosa</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Authors identified	2011
30	Normal	- <i>Liberibacter</i> spp. / <i>Liberobacter</i> spp.	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2010
31		- <i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2010

Technical panel on diagnostic protocols (TPDP) - continued

Row	Priority	Subject	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
		Fungi and fungus-like organisms:				-
32	High	- <i>Fusarium moniliformis</i> / <i>moniforme</i> syn. <i>F. circinatum</i>	TPDP	SC May 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
33		- <i>Phytophthora ramorum</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2010
34		- <i>Puccinia psidii</i>	TPDP	SC May 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
35		- <i>Tilletia indica</i> / <i>T. controversa</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2010
36	Normal	- <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Authors identified	2011
37		- <i>Gymnosporangium</i> spp.	TPDP	SC November 2004	Call for authors made	Unknown
		Insects and mites:				-
38	High	- <i>Anastrepha</i> spp.	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2011
39		- <i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> complex	TPDP	SC May 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
40		- <i>Dendroctonus ponderosae</i> syn. <i>Scolytus scolytus</i>	TPDP	SC May 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
41		- <i>Ips</i> spp.	TPDP	SC May 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
42		- <i>Liriomyza</i> spp.	TPDP	SC May 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
43		- Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques	TPDP	SC November 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
44		- <i>Thrips palmi</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Formal objections to this diagnostic protocol have been submitted. The Secretariat is working in conjunction with the TPDP to try to resolve them.	2009
45	Normal	- <i>Anoplophora</i> spp.	TPDP	SC November 2004	Authors identified	2010
46		- <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2009
		Nematodes:				-
47	High	- <i>Aphelenchoides besseyi</i> , <i>A. ritzemabosi</i> and <i>A. fragariae</i>	TPDP	SC May 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
48		- <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2010
49		- <i>Ditylenchus destructor</i> / <i>D. dipsaci</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2010
50	Normal	- <i>Xiphinema americanum</i>	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2010
		Plants:				-
51	High	- <i>Sorghum halepense</i>	TPDP	SC November 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
52		- <i>Striga</i> spp.	TPDP	CPM-3 (2008)	Call for authors to be made	Unknown
		Viruses and phytoplasmas:				-
53	High	- Plum pox virus	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2009
54		- Potato spindle tuber viroid	TPDP	SC May 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
55		- Tosspoviruses (TSWV, INSV, WSMV)	TPDP	SC November 2004	Text in draft form	2010
56		- Viruses transmitted by <i>Bemisia tabaci</i>	TPDP	SC May 2006	Call for authors made	Unknown
57	Normal	- Citrus tristeza virus	TPDP	SC November 2004	Authors identified	2011
58		- Phytoplasmas (general)	TPDP	SC November 2004	Authors identified	2010

Topics being developed by the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ)

The TPFQ is developing the following draft ISPMs under the regular standard setting process.

Row	Priority	Topic	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
59	High	Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade (revision of ISPM No. 15) (2 TPFQs)	TPFQ	CPM-1 (2006)	Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008	2009
60		International movement of forest tree seeds	TPFQ	SC November 2006	Draft specification sent for member consultation	2012
61		International movement of wood	TPFQ	SC November 2006	Draft specification sent for member consultation	2011
62	Normal	Forestry surveillance	TPFQ	SC November 2006	Draft specification sent for member consultation	2013
63		Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood	TPFQ	CPM-3 (2008)	Specification to be drafted	Unknown

Topics being developed by the Technical Panel on Fruit Flies (TPFF)

The TPFF is developing the following draft ISPMs under the regular standard setting process.

Row	Priority	Topic	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
64	High	Determination of host susceptibility for fruit flies	TPFF	SC November 2006	Specification in draft form	2012
65		Establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites for fruit flies	TPFF	SC November 2005	Specification adopted	2011
66		Suppression and eradication procedures for fruit flies	TPFF	SC November 2005	Specification adopted	2011
67		Trapping procedures for fruit flies (1 TPFF)	TPFF	SC November 2005	Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008	2009
68	Normal	Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (1 TPFF)	TPFF	SC November 2004	Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008	2009

Topics being developed by the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT)

The TPPT is developing the following phytosanitary treatments under the special standard setting process.

Row	Priority	Subject	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
		Fruit fly treatments:	TPPT	SC May 2006		-
69	High	Cold treatment of <i>Citrus limon</i> for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>	TPPT	TPPT December 2007	The TPPT has recommended these treatments to the SC	2010
70		Cold treatment of <i>Citrus limon</i> for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	TPPT			2010
71		Cold treatment of <i>Citrus paradisi</i> for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	TPPT			2010
72		Cold treatment of <i>Citrus paradisi</i> x <i>C. reticulata</i> cultivar 'Murcott' for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>	TPPT			2010
73		Cold treatment of <i>Citrus paradisi</i> x <i>C. reticulata</i> cultivar 'Murcott' for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	TPPT			2010
74		Cold treatment of <i>Citrus reticulata</i> for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>	TPPT			2010
75		Cold treatment of <i>Citrus reticulata</i> for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	TPPT			2010
76		Cold treatment of <i>Citrus reticulata</i> cultivars and hybrids for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	TPPT			2010
77		Cold treatment of <i>Citrus sinensis</i> for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>	TPPT			2010
78		Cold treatment of <i>Citrus sinensis</i> for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	TPPT			2010
		Irradiation treatments:	TPPT	CPM-1 (2006)		-
79	High	- Irradiation treatment for <i>Anastrepha ludens</i>	TPPT	TPPT September 2006	Formal objections to these phytosanitary treatments have been submitted. The Secretariat is working in conjunction with the TPPT to try to resolve them.	2008
80		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Anastrepha obliqua</i>	TPPT			2008
81		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Anastrepha serpentina</i>	TPPT			2008
82		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera jarvisi</i>	TPPT			2008
83		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i>	TPPT			2008
84		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Conotrachelus nenuphar</i>	TPPT			2008
85		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Cydia pomonella</i>	TPPT			2008
86		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Cylas formicarius elegantulus</i>	TPPT			2008
87		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Euscepes postfasciatus</i>	TPPT			2008
88		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Grapholita molesta</i>	TPPT			2008
89		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Grapholita molesta</i> under hypoxia	TPPT			2008
90		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Omphisia anastomosalis</i>	TPPT			2008
91		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Rhagoletis pomonella</i>	TPPT			2008
92		- Irradiation treatment for fruit flies of the family Tephritidae (generic)	TPPT			2008
93		- Irradiation treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i>	TPPT	TPPT December 2007	The TPPT has recommended this treatment to the SC	2010
94	High	Wood packaging material treatments (as part of revision of ISPM No. 15)	TPPT, (TPFQ)	CPM-1 (2006)	Additional information is being requested for 2006 and 2007 submissions	-

Topics being developed by the Technical Panel on the Glossary (TPG)

The TPG is developing the following draft ISPMs under both the regular and special standard setting processes (as indicated below).

Row	Priority	Topic	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
95	High	Review of adopted ISPMs (and minor modifications to ISPMs resulting from the review)	TPG	CPM-1 (2006) (special process)	Process for the review established by the SC	2010
96		Terminology of the Convention on Biological Diversity in relation to the <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> (supplement to ISPM No. 5)	TPG	SC May 2007 (regular process)	Originally developed as an explanatory document. SC May 2007 requested it be converted to a supplement to ISPM No. 5. Draft to be reviewed by SC in May 2008.	2009
97	Normal	Glossary of phytosanitary terms (update of ISPM No. 5)	TPG	ICPM-3 (2001) (regular process)	Updated annually. Draft to be reviewed by SC May 2008.	Annual

Topics that are pending

Row	Priority	Topic	Drafting body ¹	Added to work programme	Status	Projected adoption
98	High	Country of origin (minor modifications to ISPMs No. 7, 11 and 20 regarding use of the term) (1 TPG)	TPG	CPM-1 (2006) (special process)	SC decided that this would be taken up under the review of ISPMs No. 7 and 12 and the review of adopted ISPMs.	Unknown
99		Efficacy of measures (2 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-3 (2001)	Text in draft form. SC reviewed draft text and decided that work be delayed until draft ISPM on sampling and supplement to <i>Glossary</i> on appropriate level of protection are complete.	Unknown
100		Surveillance for citrus canker (<i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i>)	EWG	ICPM-4 (2002)	Text in draft form. SC decided that work be delayed until completion of standard on systems approach for citrus canker.	Unknown
101	Normal	Systems approach for management of citrus canker (<i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i>) (2 EWGs)	EWG	ICPM-5 (2003)	SC decided that work be delayed until consensus reached on a technical issue.	Unknown

PROGRAMME FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE “IPPC IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW AND SUPPORT SYSTEM”

Components to be developed

The “IPPC Implementation Review and Support System” has two major components: the *Implementation review system* (IRS) and the *Implementation support system* (ISS). These are both used along with other information from the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP - <https://www.ippc.int>), the Technical Consultation among RPPOs (TC-RPPOs), the report on the use of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool and reports from other relevant organizations, to produce the Implementation review response.

The *Implementation review response* (IRR) summarizes the situation of the implementation of the IPPC and its standards by contracting parties. From this summary, action plans are developed, for input into the proposed work programme for consideration by the CPM. The recommended action plans will be a key input into the strategic and technical assistance planning of the CPM.

The various parts of the components are listed below, and are presented in Table 1 with approximate dates for action.

Implementation review system

First element: IPPC Secretariat monitors the fulfilment of the reporting requirements of contracting parties through the IPP. This involves:

- IPPC Secretariat informs contracting parties again of their reporting requirements
- Contracting parties respond by submitting reporting requirements if not already done
- IPPC Secretariat reporting on contracting parties' difficulties with the reports annually requirements, by publishing on the IPP a list of contracting parties facing such difficulties. An annual summary report would also be presented to the CPM.

Second element: triennial review to evaluate the implementation of other obligations (non-reporting) contained in the IPPC. This involves:

- development of a questionnaire by the Secretariat to gather information from contracting parties regarding implementation of IPPC obligations, in particular in relation to Articles IV, V, VII, and VIII¹.
- review of this questionnaire by the Bureau and other experts
- distribution of the pilot questionnaire to a limited number of contracting parties representing the seven FAO regions, to evaluate and improve it
- review of the questionnaire by the Bureau and other experts for possible improvement
- distribution of the questionnaire to contracting parties for completion
- collation and analysis of the data
- establishment of a triennial review group
- analysis of questionnaire replies by a meeting of the triennial review group. This would include suggestions for improvement of the questionnaire prior to its next use
- submission of the report of the triennial review to the Bureau for the purpose of ISS. Note the Bureau also uses the triennial review as part of the Implementation review response
- submission of the report of the triennial review to SPTA
- submission of the report of the triennial review to CPM.

Implementation support system

¹ This mechanism could also deal with significant elements involved in undertaking the global review of status of plant protection in the world as per IPPC.

IPPC Secretariat to establish an IPPC Help Desk. This would involve the appointment of a Standards Implementation Officer to the IPPC Secretariat. This officer would coordinate the implementation activities of the Secretariat's activities so as to:

- help with finding assistance for those contracting parties requesting help with the implementation of ISPMs
- provide advice relating to the implementation of ISPMs
- monitor, identify and report implementation difficulties
- ensure that contracting parties requesting assistance are put in contact with potential donors
- provide a summary report of IPPC Help Desk activities to the CPM.

This officer would use the services, as appropriate, of the IPPC Secretariat, the CPM Bureau, the CPM subsidiary bodies, the FAO legal office and other units in discharging these functions

Implementation review response

The Bureau will develop an Implementation review response every three years. This will be based on:

- the report of the triennial review
- a summary report of the IPPC Help Desk activities
- a report on implementation difficulties from the Technical Consultation among RPPOs
- a summary report on implementation trends from the PCE
- the annual Secretariat IPP reports on the fulfilment of contracting reporting requirements
- reports from other relevant international organizations.

The implementation review response (which will be in the form of a report) will include appropriate action plans. On the basis of this response, recommendations for future activities to enhance implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs could be developed for incorporation into the CPM work programme, and these should be a key input for the IPPC strategic and technical assistance planning. In addition, this response could address a number of recommendations of the report of the Independent Evaluation of the IPPC, specifically the review of the state of plant protection in the world and the development of procedures to monitor the implementation of standards.

The response will be considered by the SPTA then the CPM.

As noted earlier this response will provide recommendations for future activities to enhance the implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs for incorporation into the operational work programme of the CPM.

Table 1: A three year work plan with proposed milestones and dates

Proposed dates	Actions	Component
Year 1		
April	IPPC Secretariat annual report to the CPM on: contracting parties' difficulties with reporting requirements based on reporting through the IPP; and the IPPC Help Desk activities.	Implementation Review System (first element)
May	IPPC Secretariat informing contracting parties again of their reporting requirements (first time in 2008)	IRS (first element)
June	Appointment of the Standards Implementation Officer	Implementation Support System (ISS)
August	Development of a questionnaire by the Secretariat to gather information from contracting parties regarding implementation of other (non-reporting) IPPC obligations, in particular in relation to Articles IV, V, VII, and VIII	IRS (second element)
September	Review of the questionnaire by the Bureau and other experts	IRS (second element)
September	Initiation of IPPC Help Desk	ISS
October	Distribution of pilot questionnaire	IRS (second element)
November	Review of the questionnaire by the Bureau and other experts	IRS (second element)
December	Evaluation (plus comments) by limited number of contracting parties followed by second review by the Bureau and other experts	IRS (second element)
Year 2		
March	Distribution of questionnaire to contracting parties	IRS (second element)
March	Collation and analysis of data for the IPPC Secretariat report.	IRS (first element)
April	IPPC Secretariat annual report to the CPM on: contracting parties' difficulties with reporting requirements based on reporting through the IPP; and the IPPC Help Desk activities.	IRS (first element)
April	Establishment of a triennial review group	IRS (second element)
May	Analysis of questionnaire replies and suggestions for improvement of the questionnaire by a meeting of the triennial review group	IRS (second element)
June	Reports on implementation by the TC-RPPOs and other relevant international organizations	Implementation Review Response (IRR)
Reports received by Secretariat June	Report prepared	IRR
Prepared by CPM Bureau July-August	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • based on the following elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the report of the triennial review - a summary report of the IPPC Help Desk - a report on implementation difficulties from the TC-RPPOs - a summary report on implementation trends from the PCE - reports from other relevant international organizations • and containing action plans. 	
October	Review by the SPTA	IRR and IRS
November	Prepare paper (IRR response) for the CPM	IRR

Proposed dates	Actions	Component
Year 3		
March	Collation and analysis of data for the IPPC Secretariat report.	IRS (first element)
April	Present report of the triennial review (first time at CPM-5 in 2010)	IRS (second element)
April	IPPC Secretariat annual report to the CPM on: contracting parties' difficulties with reporting requirements based on reporting through the IPP; and the IPPC Help Desk activities.	IRS (first element)
April	Report of the IRR considered by CPM	IRR

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE OPEN-ENDED WORKING GROUP ON BUILDING NATIONAL PHYTOSANITARY CAPACITY

The purpose of the OEWG is to produce:

- i) a draft concept paper on national phytosanitary capacity for consideration by the SPTA in 2008 for presentation to CPM-4.
- ii) a draft strategy for national phytosanitary capacity building for consideration by the SPTA for presentation to CPM.
- iii) a proposed operational plan for implementing the strategy over the first six years of its operation.

The OEWG will develop a framework with the constituent elements of the strategy. The IPPC Secretariat will supply relevant detailed information.

The strategy will propose actions to deliver the essential elements of national phytosanitary capacity building with reference to:

- the responsibilities of contracting parties of the IPPC for the protection of plant resources
- the importance of the IPPC and its standards in relation to facilitation of trade
- critical areas listed in the Business Plan
- the role of the PCE along with other such tools for identifying the need for capacity development
- the development programme of the IPPC Implementation review and support system including development of the Help Desk
- funding and administration of the IPPC technical assistance programme including
 - developing relationships with potential donors
 - coordination of technical assistance activities by the Secretariat.

In its discussions the OEWG should consider definitions and capacity building concepts used by other organizations to see if these concepts may be applicable to capacity building under the IPPC.

Given the complexity of the task, the OEWG may decide to recommend that the elements of the strategy be developed further by working groups or experts.

OEWG

The OEWG participants shall be from contracting parties and should have good knowledge of:

- the capacity and capability needed to deliver the elements of a phytosanitary system
- planning, funding and delivery of technical assistance
- the IPPC, its objectives and its structures
- the specific technical assistance needs of their regions
- strategic planning and management and appropriate experience.

In addition, the IPPC Secretariat and the CPM Bureau may invite appropriate experts to participate at the OEWG.

The IPPC Secretariat will consider funding assistance for participants from developing countries within available resources.

**MODEL TEXT FOR LETTER ON ACCEPTANCE OF CORRESPONDENCE IN
ELECTRONIC FORMAT**

Subject: Acceptance of correspondence in electronic format from the IPPC Secretariat to all IPPC contact points

On behalf of NPPO/contracting party [name] or RPPO: [name]

We will download electronic copies of documents published on the IPP for IPPC Secretariat correspondence sent to all contracting parties. No hard copies need be mailed. We understand that notifications of availability of documents will still be sent to us by e-mail with a distinct link to the relevant documents.

.....
Name of IPPC Contact Point

.....
Date

.....
Signature

Please send letter to:

IPP Secretariat
AGPP-FAO
viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy
Fax: +39-06-570 54819
e-mail: ippc@fao.org (scanned copy with signature please).

**COMPOSITION OF THE CPM BUREAU
(TERM 2008-2010)**

FAO region	Country	Name	
Africa	Kenya	Mr. Chagema KEDERA	Vice-Chairperson
Asia	Indonesia	Mr. Arifin TASRIF	
Europe	United Kingdom	Mr. Steve ASHBY	
Latin America and Caribbean	Belize	Mr. Francisco Adrián GUTIERREZ	
Near East	Jordan	Mr. Mohammad KATBEH BADER	Vice-Chairperson
North America	Canada	Ms. Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE	Chairperson
Southwest Pacific	Australia	Mr. Bill ROBERTS	

STANDARDS COMMITTEE: MEMBERSHIP AND POTENTIAL REPLACEMENTS

A-Standards Committee Membership

FAO region	Country	Name	Nominated	Current term / Duration	End of current term
Africa	Nigeria	Ms Olofunke AWOSUSI	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
	South Africa	Mr Michael HOLTZHAUSEN	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Uganda	Mr Robert KARYEIJA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Zambia	Mr Arundel SAKALA	CPM-1 (2006)	acting as replacement	2009
Asia	China	Mr Fuxiang WANG	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	India	Mr Prabhakar CHANDURKAR	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Indonesia	Mr Dwi Putra SETIAWAN	CPM-1 (2006)	acting as replacement	2009
	Japan	Mr Motoi SAKAMURA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
Europe	Denmark	Mr Ebbe NORDBO	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
	Germany	Mr Jens-Georg UNGER	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Israel	Mr David OPATOWSKI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	United Kingdom	Ms Jane CHARD	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
Latin America and Caribbean	Argentina	Mr Diego QUIROGA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Brazil	Mr Odilson RIBEIRO E SILVA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Costa Rica	Ms Magda GONZALEZ	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Uruguay	Ms Beatriz MELCHO	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 3 years	2010
Near East	Egypt	Mr Safwat Abd-Elhamid EL-HADAD	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
	Jordan	Mr Mohammad KATBEH BADER	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Sudan	Mr Khidir GIBRIL MUSA	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Yemen	Mr Abdullah AL-SAYANI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
North America	Canada	Ms Marie-Claude FOREST	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
	USA	Ms Julie ALIAGA	CPM-1 (2006)	acting as replacement	2009
Southwest Pacific	Australia	Mr David PORRITT	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	New Zealand	Mr John HEDLEY	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	Tonga	Mr Sione FOLIAKI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009

B- Standards Committee Potential Replacements

FAO region	Order	Country	Name	Nominated	Current term / Duration	End of current term
Africa	1	Senegal	Mr Mame Ndene LO	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	2	Morocco	Mr Lahcen ABAHA	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 3 years	2010
Asia	1	Thailand	Mr Udorn UNAHAWUTTI	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	2	Republic of Korea	Ms Kyu-Ock YIM	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
Europe	1	Poland	Mr Piotr WŁODARCZYK	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
	2	Turkey	Mr Birol AKBAS	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
Latin America and Caribbean	1	Guatemala	Mr Jaime SOSA LEMMUS	CPM-1 (2006)	1st term / 3 years	2009
	2	Jamaica	Ms Shelia HARVEY	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 3 years	2010
Near East	1	Syria	Mr Abdel-Hakim MOHAMMAD	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
	2	Iran	Mr. Mohammad Reza ASGHARI	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
North America	to replace Canada	Canada	Mr Steve CÔTÉ	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 3 years	2011
	to replace USA	USA	Mr Nancy KLAG	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 3 years	2010
Southwest Pacific	1	New Zealand	Ms Susan COOPER	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 3 years	2010
	2	Fiji	Mr Hiagi FORAETE	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 3 years	2010

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON DISPUTE SETTLEMENT: MEMBERSHIP AND POTENTIAL REPLACEMENTS

A- Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement Membership

FAO region	Country	Name	Nominated/ Renominated	Current term / Duration	End of current term
Africa	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr Konan Lucien KOUAME	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 2 years	2010
Asia	Korea, Rep. of	Mr Young-Chul JEONG	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-3 (2008)	2nd term / 2 years	2010
Europe	Turkey	Mr Birol AKBAS	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 2 years	2010
Latin America and Caribbean	Ecuador	Mr Carlos NIETO CABRERA	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 2 years	2009
Near East	Libya	Mr. Bashir Otman GSHERA	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 2 years	2010
North America	USA	Ms Mary Lisa MADELL	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 2 years	2010
Southwest Pacific	New Zealand	Mr John HEDLEY	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-3 (2008)	2nd term / 2 years	2010

B-Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement Potential Replacements

FAO region	Country	Name	Nominated	Current term / Duration	End of current term
Africa	Tanzania	Ms Rose-Anne MOHAMMED	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 2 years	2010
Asia	China	Ms Xiaoling WU	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 2 years	2009
Europe		Vacant			
Latin America and Caribbean	Colombia	Mr Jaime CÁRDENAS	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 2 years	2009
Near East	Lebanon	Mr Charles ZARZOUR	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 2 years	2010
North America	Canada	Ms Janet MACDONALD	CPM-3 (2008)	1st term / 2 years	2010
Southwest Pacific	Australia	Mr Rob SCHWARTZ	CPM-2 (2007)	1st term / 2 years	2009

LIST OF DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS

Chairperson : Chagama KEDERA (Kenya)

Vice-Chairpersons : Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE (Canada)
Ralf LOPIAN (Finland)

MEMBERS - MEMBRES - MIEMBROS

ALGERIA - ALGÉRIE - ARGELIA

Représentant

Mme Fatiha BENDDINE
Sous-Directeur
Direction de la Protection des Végétaux et des
Contrôles Techniques
Ministère de l'Agriculture et du Développement
Rural
12, boulevard Colonel Amirouche
Alger
Phone: +213 21 429349
Email: fbenddine@hotmail.com

ARGENTINA - ARGENTINE

Representante

Sra Diana María GUILLÉN
Gerente General de Protección Vegetal
SENASA
Paseo Colón 367, Piso 9
1063 Buenos Aires
Phone: +54 11 41215176
Fax: +54 11 41215179
Email: dnpv@sinavimo.gov.ar;
dguillenar@yahoo.com.ar

Suplente(s)

Diego QUIROGA
Director de Cuarentena Vegetal
Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y Calidad
Agroalimentaria (SENASA)
Paseo Colón 367, Piso 7
1063 Buenos Aires
Phone: +54 11 43316041; 49 Ext. 1727/728
Fax: +54 11 3425137
Email: dquiroga@senasa.gov.ar

Sra María del Carmen SQUEFF
Consejera, Representante Permanente Alternativa
ante la FAO
Embajada de la República Argentina
Piazza dell'Esquilino 2
Roma, Italia

Agustín ZIMMERMAN
Representante Permanente Alternativo ante la FAO
Embajada de la República Argentina
Piazza dell'Esquilino 2
Roma, Italia

Observers

Sr Guillermo CORTES
Coordinador General
Centro Regional Cuyo
SENASA

Guillermo GAUDIO

Coordinador
Sistema de Información y Bases de Datos de la
Dirección de Vigilancia y Monitoreo
SENASA

Sra María Laura GONZALEZ CATALINI
Inspector de Control de Gestión de la Coordinación
de Aduanas Secas y Pasos Fronterizos
SENASA
Avda. Paseo Colón 367

Carlos GRIGNOLA
Coordinador General de Centro Regional NOA Sur
SENASA

Fernando LADRÓN DE GUEVARA
SENASA

Sra María Julia PALACÍN
A cargo de la Dirección de Cuarentena Vegetal
SENASA
Avda. Paseo Colón 315, 4 B

Sra Wilda RAMIREZ
Directora de Sanidad Vegetal
SENASA

ARMENIA - ARMÉNIE

Representative

Garnik PETROSYAN
IPPC National Contact Point
Head of Plant-Breeding, Forestry and
Protection Department
Ministry of Agriculture
Government Building 3, Republic Square
Yerevan
Phone: +374 10 523411
Fax: +374 91 411938

AUSTRALIA - AUSTRALIE

Representative

Ms Lois RANSOM
Chief Plant Protection Officer
Product Integrity, Animal and Plant Health
Department of Agriculture Fisheries & Forestry
GPO Box 858
Canberra, ACT 2601
Phone: +61 2 6272 4888
Fax: +61 2 6272 5835
Email: lois.ransom@daff.gov.au

Alternate(s)

David PORRITT
Senior Manager
Plant Biosecurity
Biosecurity Australia
Department of Agriculture Fisheries & Forestry
GPO Box 858
Canberra, ACT 2601
Phone: +61 2 6272 4633
Fax: + 61 2 6272 3307
Email: david.porritt@biosecurity.gov.au

Bill ROBERTS
Principal Scientist
Biosecurity Australia
Department of Agriculture Fisheries & Forestry
GPO Box 858
Canberra, ACT 2601
Phone: + 61 2 6272 4047
Fax: + 61 2 6272 6382
Email: bill.roberts@biosecurity.gov.au

AUSTRIA - AUTRICHE

Representative

Ms Kornelia LOIDL
Department I 2
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment
and Water Management
Stubenring 1
1012 Vienna
Phone: +43 1 71100 6972
Fax: +43 1 71100 6503
Email: kornelia.loidl@lebensministerium.at

Alternate(s)

Ms Daniela NOWOTNY
Department I 2
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment
and Water Management
Stubenring 1
1012 Vienna
Phone: +43 1 71100 6697
Fax: +43 1 71100 6503
Email: daniela.nowotny@lebensministerium.at

**AZERBAIJAN - AZERBAÏDJAN -
AZERBAIJÁN**

Representative

Ms Dilzara AGHAYEVA
IPPC National Contact Point
Senior Consultant
International Coordinator
State Phytosanitary Control Service
Ministry of Agriculture
R. Aliyev 5
AZ-1025 Baku
Phone: +994 12 4902464
Fax: +994 12 4902464
Email: pqasaze@mail.ru

BANGLADESH

Representative

Samsul ALAM
Director General
Department of Agriculture Extension
Ministry of Agriculture
Building - 4
Dhaka
Phone: +88 02 9140857
Fax: +88 02 9140850
Email: dg@dae.gov.bd;
controlroomdae@yahoo.com

BELGIUM - BELGIQUE - BÉLGICA

Représentant

Lieven VAN HERZELE
Attaché
Ministère de la Santé Publique, de la Sécurité
de la chaîne alimentaire et de l'Environnement
DG4 Animaux et alimentation
Division de la Protection des Plantes
Eurostation II
Place Victor Horta 40 Box 10
B-1060 Bruxelles
Phone: +322 524 7323
Fax: +322 524 7349
Email: Lieven.VanHerzele@health.fgov.be

BELIZE - BELICE

Representative

Mr Francisco GUTIERREZ
Technical Director
Plant Health Services
Belize Agricultural Health Authority
Corner Forest Drive / Hummingbird Highway
Belmopan

BHUTAN - BHOUTAN - BHUTÁN

Representative

Thuji TSHERING
Chief Regulatory and Quarantine Officer
Quality Control and Quarantine Division
Bhutan Agriculture and Food Regulatory
Authority
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O. Box No. 1071
Thimphu
Phone: +975 2327031
Fax: +975 2327032
Email: t_tshering@moa.gov.bt;
thujitshering@yahoo.com

BOLIVIA - BOLIVIE

Representante

Sr Pedro Ernesto ZAVALETA CASTRO
 Jefe Nacional de Sanidad Vegetal
 Servicio Nacional de Sanidad Agropecuaria e
 Inocuidad Alimentaria
 Calle Cobija núm. 234
 La Paz
 Phone: +591 34628105 int. 1202
 Fax: +591 34628107
 Email: pzavaleta@senasag.gov.bo

**BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA - BOSNIE-
HERZÉGOVINE - BOSNIA Y
HERZEGOVINA**

Representative

Milad ZEKOVIC
 Director
 Plant Health Protection
 Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic
 Relations
 Trampina 4/III
 Sarajevo 71000
 Phone: +387 33 212387
 Fax: +387 33 217032
 Email: upravabihzzb@bih.nat.ba

Alternate(s)

Ms Ajla DAUTBASIC
 Expert Associate for Phytopharmacy Means and
 Mineral Fertilizers
 Plant Health Protection
 Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic
 Relations
 Trampina 4/III
 Sarajevo 71000
 Phone: +387 33212387
 Fax: +387 33217032
 Email: aj_dautbasic@yahoo.com;
 upravabihzzb@bih.nat.ba

Ms Sladjana KRESTALICA
 Expert Associate for Plant Health Protection
 Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic
 Relations
 Trampina 4/III
 Sarajevo 71000
 Phone: +387 33 212387
 Fax: +387 33 217032
 Email: sladjanakrestalica@yahoo.com;
 upravabihzzb@bih.nat.ba

BRAZIL - BRÉSIL - BRASIL

Representative

Renato MOSCA DE SOUZA
 Counselor
 Deputy Permanent Representative
 Permanent Representation of the Federative
 Republic of Brazil to FAO
 Via di Santa Maria dell'Anima 32
 00186 Rome, Italy

Alternate(s)

Jose Geraldo BALDINI
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Block D, Edificio anexo B - sala 303
 Brasilia DF

Gutemberg BARONE DE ARAÚJO NOJOSA
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Block D, 3rd floor, room 349
 Brasilia

Mr Odilson LUIZ RIBEIRO E SILVA
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Block D, Annex B, room 406
 Brasilia
 70-043-900

Ms Maria Raquel SILVA
 Adviser
 Plant Health Department
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Block D, Anexo B, Sala 314
 70043-900 Brasilia/DF
 Phone: +55 61 32182330
 Fax: +55 61 33243874
 Email: dsv@agricultura.gov.br;
 maria.raquel@agricultura.gov.br

BULGARIA - BULGARIE

Representative

Ms Sofia STAMENOVA
 National Service for Plant Protection
 Regional Service on Plant Protection
 Blagoevgrad Gramada
 P.O. Box 390
 Sofia
 Phone: +359 73831568
 Fax: +359 73831568
 Email: stamesof@mail.bg

Alternate(s)

Ms Mariya TOMALIEVA
National Service for Plant Protection
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Supply
Hristo Blvd. 17
Sofia
Phone: +359 29173734
Fax: +359 29173759
Email: m.tomalieva@nsrz.government.bg

BURKINA FASO

Représentant

Sana KOROGHO
Ingénieur d'Agriculture
Direction de la Protection des Végétaux et du
Conditionnement
Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'hydraulique et
des ressources halieutiques
B.P. 5362
Ouagadougou 01
Phone: +226 50 361915
Fax: +226 50 361865
Email: sageko2000@yahoo.fr;
dpvc@agriculture.gov.bf

Suppléant(s)

Boubakar CISSE
Representant Permanent Adjoint
Ambassade du Burkina Faso
Via XX Settembre, 86
00187 Rome, Italie
Phone: +39 0642020611
Email: bker_cisse@yahoo.fr

BURUNDI

Représentant

Eliakim SAKAYOYA
Point de Contact Officiel de la CIPV
Directeur de la Protection des Végétaux
Département de la Protection des Végétaux
Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage
B.P. 114
Gitega
Phone: +257 22402036; 79976214
Fax: +257 22402104
Email: sakayoyaeliakim@yahoo.fr;
dpvbdi@yahoo.fr

CAMEROON - CAMEROUN - CAMERÚN

Représentant

Mr Syxtus Thomas NUZA
Directeur
Réglementation du Contrôle de Qualité des
Intrants et des Produits Agricoles
Ministère de l'agriculture et du développement rural
P.O. Box 1639
Yaoundé
Phone: +237 7797887; 2316771
Email: syxnuza@yahoo.com

CANADA - CANADÁ

Representative

Ms Marie-Claude FOREST
International Standards Advisor
Plant Health Division
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
59 Camelot Drive,
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9
Phone: +1 613 221 4359
Fax: +1 613 228 6602
Email: mcforest@inspection.gc.ca

Alternate(s)

Eric ALLEN
Chairperson of the International Forestry
Quarantine Research Group, and Research
Scientist
Canadian Forests Service
Natural Resources Canada
506 West Burnside Road
Victoria, British Columbia V8Z 1M5
Phone: +1 250 363 0674
Fax: +1 250 363 0775
Email: E.Allen@pfc.cfs.nrcan.gc.ca

Ian D. CAMPBELL

Director, Science Advice
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
159 Cleopatra Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9
Phone: +1 613 221 7021
Email: campbelli@inspection.gc.ca

Ms Janet MACDONALD

Adviser; Alternative Head of Delegation
National Manager
Export/Import, Plant Health Division
59 Camelot Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9
Phone: +1 613 221 3918
Fax: +1 613 228 6602
Email: macdonaldje@inspection.gc.ca

Mr Gregory WOLFF

Adviser; Alternative Head of Delegation
National Manager
Potato Section, Plant Health Division
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
59 Camelot Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9
Phone: +1 613 221 4354
Fax: +1 613 228 6602
Email: wolffg@inspection.gc.ca

CPM Vice-Chairperson

Ms Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde
 Manager, International Plant Protection Issues
 Plant Health Division
 Canadian Food Inspection Agency
 59 Camelot Drive
 Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9
 Phone: +1 613 221 4344
 Fax: +1 613 228 6602
 Email: rbast@inspection.g.ca

CAPE VERDE - CAP-VERT - CABO VERDE

Représentant

José Eduardo BARBOSA
 Représentant Permanent auprès de la FAO
 Ambassade de la République du Cap-Vert
 Via Giosué Carducci 4 - Int. 3
 Rome, Italie

Suppléant(s)

Jorge BRITO
 Technicien Supérieur / Entomologist
 Ministère de l'Environnement et de
 l'Agriculture / INIDA
 P.O. Box 84
 Praia
 Email: jmeubrito@hotmail.com;
 mendesbrito.jorge@gmail.com

Mme Maria Goretti SANTOS LIMA
 Représentant Permanent Adjoint
 Ambassade de la République du Cap-Vert
 Via Giosué Carducci 4 - Int. 3
 Rome, Italie

**CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC -
 RÉPUBLIQUE CENTRAFRICAINE -
 REPÚBLICA CENTROAFRICANA**

Représentant

Jean-Benoît MBORHOUL
 Expert en Protection des Végétaux
 Ministère du développement rural
 B.P. 786
 Bangui
 Phone: +236 21614988, +236 72283842
 Fax: +236 21611997

CHILE - CHILI

Representante

Sra Soledad CASTRO DORECHESI
 Head, Plant Protection Division
 Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero
 Av. Bulnes 140
 Santiago
 Phone: +56 2 3451201
 Fax: +56 2 3451203
 Email: soledad.castro@sag.gob.cl

Suplente(s)

Jaime Gonzalez GONZALEZ
 Assistant Head, Plant Protection Division
 Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero
 Av. Bulnes 140
 Santiago
 Phone: +56 2 3451229
 Fax: +56 2 3451203
 Email: jaime.gonzalez@sag.gob.cl

Pablo WILLSON

Plant Protection Division
 Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero
 Av. Bulnes 140
 Santiago

CHINA - CHINE

Representative

Jianqiang WANG
 Deputy Division Director
 Department of Crop Production
 Ministry of Agriculture
 11 Nongzhanguan Nanli
 Beijing
 Phone: +86 10 64191835
 Fax: +86 10 64193376
 Email: wangjianqiang@agri.gov.cn

Alternate(s)

Kuai Tat CHEONG
 Acting Head of Division
 Civic and Municipal Affairs Bureau
 Department of Gardens and Green Areas
 Division for the Protection of Natural Areas
 Macao, SAR
 Email: ktcheong@iacm.gov.mo

Pengfei HE
 Section Chief
 General Administration of Quality Supervision,
 Inspection and Quarantine of China

Clive S. K. LAU
 Senior Agricultural Officer
 Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
 Department
 Rm 627, 6/F, Cheung Sha Wan Government
 Offices
 303 Cheung Sha Wan Road
 Kowloon, Hong Kong, SAR
 Phone: +852 21507039
 Fax: +852 21520319
 Email: clive_sk_lau@afcd.gov.hk

Chuang NIE
 First Secretary
 Permanent Representation of China to FAO
 Via degli Urali, 12
 Rome, Italy

Ms Kun PAN
Officer
Department of Treaty and Law
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2 Chaoyangmen Nandajie
Beijing

Fuxiang WANG
Division Director
National Agricultural Technology Extension
and Service Center
Ministry of Agriculture
No.20 Mai Zi Dian Street
Beijing
Phone: +86 10 64194524
Fax +86 10 64194726
Email: wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn

Ms Ming ZHANG
Second Secretary
Permanent Representation of China to FAO
Via degli Urali, 12
Rome, Italy

Lijun ZHAO
Programme Officer
Department of International Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
11 Nongzhanguan Nanli
Beijing
Phone: +86 10 64192423
Fax: +86 10 65004635
Email: zhaolijun@agri.gov.cn

Ms Wenxia ZHAO
Deputy Director
Chinese Academy of Forestry Science
Email: zhaowenxia@caf.ac.cn

COMOROS - COMORES - COMORAS

Représentant
Youssoufa Mohamed ALÍ
Coordinateur National du Programme Régional
de Protection des Végétaux
Ministère de l'agriculture, de la pêche, et de
l'environnement
B.P. 1406
Moroni
Phone: +269 339033
Fax: +269 756005
Email: youssoufa63@yahoo.fr

CONGO

Représentant
Emile ESSEMA
Deuxième Conseiller
Ambassade de la République du Congo
Via Ombrone, 8/10
00198 Rome, Italie

Suppléant(s)
Blaise GASSILA
Directeur de la Production Agricole et de la
Protection des Végétaux
Ministère de l'agriculture et de l'élevage
6, rue Louis Tréchet
B.P. 2453
Brazzaville
Phone: +242 6692542; 5642991
Fax: +242 814513
Email: blaisegassila@yahoo.fr

Mme Lydie Palchéné PALEVOUSSA
Charge de Mission à la Direction des
Programmes

COOK ISLANDS - ÎLES COOK - ISLAS COOK

Representative
Ngatoko Ta NGATOKO
Quarantine Adviser
IPPC National Contact Point
Ministry of Agriculture
Nikao
P.O. Box 96
Rarotonga
Phone: +682 28711
Fax: +682 21881
Email: nngatoko@agriculture.gov.ck

COSTA RICA

Representante
Sr Manuel ARAYA VARGAS
Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado
Ministerio de Agricultura
Estación Cuarentena
Puerto Caldera
Phone: +506 26344108
Email: maraya@protecnet.go.cr

Suplente(s)
Sra Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO
Departamento de Exportaciones
Apdo. 70-3006
Barreal-Heredia
Phone: +506 22606721
Fax: +506 22606721
Email: mgonzalez@protecnet.go.cr

Sra Delia GUTIÉRREZ
Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
Phone: +506 22606190
Email: dgutierrez@protecnet.go.cr

Sra Greta PREDELLA
Asistente
Representación Permanente de Costa Rica
Embajada ante la Santa Sede
Via G.B. Benedetti, 3
Roma, Italia

Jorge REVOLLO
Ministro Consejero
Representación Permanente de Costa Rica
Embajada ante la Santa Sede
Via G.B. Benedetti, 3
Roma, Italia

CROATIA - CROATIE - CROACIA

Representative
Ms Renata BRLEK
Plant Health Department
Ministry of Agriculture, Fishery and Rural
Development
Directorate of Agriculture
Phytosanitary Sector
Ulica grada Vukovara 78
HR-10 000 Zagreb
Phone: +385 1 610 9459
Fax: +385 1 610 9202
Email: renata.brlek@mps.hr

CUBA

Representante
Sra Ilena HERRERA CARRICARTE
Especialista
Dirección de Asuntos Internacionales y
Servicios Técnicos
Centro Nacional de Sanidad Vegetal
Ministerio de Agricultura
Ave. Independencia y Conill
Nuevo Vedado
La Habana
Phone: +537 881 5089
Fax: +537 870 3277
Email: ileana@sanidadvegetal.cu

CYPRUS - CHYPRE - CHIPRE

Representative
Gabriel ODYSSEOS
Deputy Permanent Representative to FAO
Permanent Representation of the Republic of
Cyprus to FAO
Piazza Farnese, 44
Rome, Italy

CZECH REPUBLIC - RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE - REPÚBLICA CHECA

Representative
Ms Jitka MASKOVA
Division of Protection against Harmful
Organisms
State Phytosanitary Administration
Drnovska 507
161 06 Prague
Phone: +420 233 022 258
Fax: +420 233 022 226
Email: jitka.maskova@srs.cz

Alternate(s)

Ms Gabriela CERVENA
Division of Diagnostic
State Phytosanitary Administration
Slechtitelv 23
Omolovc 77900
Phone: +420 585 570 139
Fax: +420 585 227 790
Email: gabriela.cervena@srs.cz

Zdenek CHROMY
Head of Regional Division
State Phytosanitary Administration
Smetanovo namesti 279
580 01 Havlickuv Brod
Phone: +420 569 429 711
Fax: +420 569 421 158
Email: zdenek.chromy@srs.cz

Ms Svetla KOZELSKA
Head of Division of Diagnostic
State Phytosanitary Administration
Slechtitelu 23/773
779 00 Olomouc
Phone: +420 585 570 110
Fax: +420 585 227 790
Email: svetla.kozelska@srs.cz

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

Représentant
Konan Lucien KOUAMÉ
Directeur
Direction de la Protection des Végétaux, du
Contrôle et de la Qualité
Ministère de l'agriculture
Abidjan
Phone: +225 20222260
Fax: +225 20212032
Email: l_kouame@yahoo.fr; isysphyt@aviso.ci

**DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF
KOREA - RÉPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE
DÉMOCRATIQUE DE CORÉE - REPÚBLICA
POPULAR DEMOCRÁTICA DE COREA**

Representative

Jong Sun WON
Deputy Representative to FAO
Councilor
Embassy of the Democratic People's Republic
of Korea
Viale dell'Esperanto, 26
Rome, Italy

Alternate(s)

Ri Song CHOL
Alternate Representative to FAO
Second Secretary
Embassy of the Democratic People's Republic
of Korea
Viale dell'Esperanto, 26
Rome, Italy

DENMARK - DANEMARK - DINAMARCA

Representative

Ebbe NORDBO
Head of Section
Plant Directorate
Skovbrynet 20
DK-2800 Lyngby
Phone: +45 45263891
Fax: +45 45263613
Email: eno@pdir.dk

Alternate(s)

Egill BOCCANERA
Attache
Royal Danish Embassy
Via dei Monti Parioli, 50
Rome, Italy
Phone: +39 06 9774830
Fax: +39 06 97748399
Email: egilboc@um.dk

Søren SKAFTE

Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO
Royal Danish Embassy
Via dei Monti Parioli, 50
Rome, Italy
Email: sorska@um.dk

**DOMINICAN REPUBLIC - RÉPUBLIQUE
DOMINICAINE - REPÚBLICA
DOMINICANA**

Representante

José DE LA CRUZ HERASME
Secretaria de Estado de Agricultura
Departamento de Sanidad Vegetal
División de Cuarentena Vegetal
Aut. Duarte, Km. 6-1/2
Los Jardines del Norte
Santo Domingo
Phone: +809 5473888 Ext.4104; 905 4706
Fax: +809 5628939
Email: jherasme72@yahoo.com

Suplente(s)

Sra Yanina GATERAUX
Ministra Consejera
Representante Alterna
Misión Permanente de la República
Dominicana ante la FAO
Via Baldassare Peruzzi 10
Roma, Italia
Phone: +39 06 97613679; 340 7652435
Fax: +39 06 97256408
Email: yaninag2000@hotmail.com

Héctor MARTÍNEZ

Ministro Consejero
Representante Alterno
Misión Permanente de la República
Dominicana ante la FAO
Via Baldassare Peruzzi 10
Roma, Italia
Email: hemafer09@hotmail.com

ECUADOR - ÉQUATEUR

Representante

Sra Mónica MARTÍNEZ
Consejero
Embajada de la República del Ecuador
Via Antonio Bertoloni, 8
Roma, Italia

Suplente(s)

Francisco SALGADO
Tercer Secretario
Embajada de la República del Ecuador
Via Antonio Bertoloni, 8
Roma, Italia

Sr José Eduardo VILATUÑA RODRÍGUEZ
Coordinador de Investigación Fitosanitaria
Servicio Ecuatoriano de Sanidad Agropecuaria
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería,
Acuicultura y Pesca
Avda. Amazonas y Eloy Alfaro
Quito

EGYPT - ÉGYPTE - EGIPTO

Representative

Safwat Abd El-Hamid EL-HADDAD
 Head of Sector
 Agricultural Services
 Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation
 5, Nadi El Seid Street, Dokki
 Cairo
 Phone: +202 33372881
 Fax: +202 33363582
 Email: safwat.el_haddad@e-mail.com;
 safwat@epq.gov.eg

EL SALVADOR

Representante

Helmer Alonso ESQUIVEL
 Jefe
 Division de Sanidad Vegetal
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
 Calle y Cantón El Matazano
 Soyapango
 San Salvador
 Phone: +503 2297 8423; 2297 8441
 Email: helmer_esquivel@yahoo.com

Suplente(s)

Sra Maria Eulalia JIMENEZ
 Ministro Consejero
 Embajada de la República de El Salvador
 Via Gualtierio Castellini, 13
 00197 Roma, Italia

ERITREA - ÉRYTHRÉE

Representative

Tekleab MESGHENA
 Director General
 Regulatory Services Department
 Ministry of Agriculture
 P.O. Box 1162
 Asmara
 Phone: +291 1 120395; 158847
 Fax: +291 1 127508
 Email: mtekleab@eol.com.er

ESTONIA - ESTONIE

Representative

Ms Helis VARIK
 Counsellor
 Plant Health Department
 Estonian Ministry of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture
 39/41 Lai Street
 Tallinn
 Phone: +372 625 6536
 Fax: +372 625 6200
 Email: helis.varik@agri.ee

ETHIOPIA - ÉTHIOPIE - ETIOPIÁ

Representative

Fikre MARKOS
 Deputy Coordinator, APHRD
 Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
 P.O. Box 62347
 Addis Ababa
 Phone: +251 11 6478596; 0911 250651
 Email: fikrem2001@yahoo.com

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (MEMBER ORGANIZATION) - COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE (ORGANISATION MEMBRE) - COMUNIDAD EUROPEA (ORGANIZACIÓN MIEMBRO)

Représentant

Roman VÁGNER
 Biotechnologies et santé des végétaux
 Direction Générale Santé et protection des consommateurs
 European Commission, DG Sanco
 232 rue Belliard
 Brussels, Belgium
 Phone: +32 22959664
 Fax: +32 22969399
 Email: Roman.Vagner@ec.europa.eu

Suppléant(s)

Michael KURZWEIL
 Biotechnologies et santé des végétaux
 Direction Générale Santé et protection des consommateurs
 European Commission, DG Sanco
 232 rue Belliard
 Brussels, Belgium

FINLAND - FINLANDE - FINLANDIA

Representative

Ms Tiina-Mari MARTIMO
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 Department of Food and Health
 Unit for Plant Production and Animal Nutrition
 Mariankatu 23, P.O. Box 30
 Helsinki, FI-00023
 Phone: +358 9 1605 2700
 Fax: +358 9 1605 2443
 Email: tiina-mari.martimo@mmm.fi

CPM Vice-Chairperson

Ralf LOPIAN
 Ministry for Agriculture and Forestry
 Department of Food and Health
 Mariankatu 23
 P.O. Box 30
 Helsinki
 Phone: +358 40 3527262
 Email: ralf.lopian@myllylanmylly.inet.fi

FRANCE - FRANCIA

Représentant

Mme Laure LE BOURGEOIS
 Chef du bureau de la santé des végétaux
 Ministère de l'agriculture et de la pêche
 251, rue Vaugirard
 73732 Paris cedex 15
 Phone: +33 1 49558188
 Fax: +33 1 49555949
 Email: laure.le-bourgeois@agriculture.gouv.fr

Suppléant(s)

Mme Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC
 Chargée au mission au bureau de la santé des végétaux
 Ministère de l'agriculture et de la pêche
 251, rue Vaugirard
 73732 Paris
 Phone: +33 1 49558437
 Fax: +33 1 49555949
 Email: laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr

GEORGIA - GÉORGIE

Representative

Bezhan REKHVIASHVILI
 Senior Specialist
 Plant Protection Department
 National Service of Food Safety
 Veterinary and Plant Protection
 Ministry of Agriculture
 15a, Tamarashvili Street
 0177 Tbilisi
 Phone: +995 32 397 069
 Fax: +995 32 397 498
 Email: dpp@fvp.ge

GERMANY - ALLEMAGNE - ALEMANIA

Representative

Jens-Georg UNGER
 Head of Institute
 Julius Kuehn Institute (JKI)
 Institute on National and International Plant Health
 Messeweg 11/12
 38104 Braunschweig
 Phone: +49 531 299 3370
 Fax: +49 531 299 3007
 Email: ag@jki.bund.de; jens-georg.unger@jki.bund.de

GHANA

Representative

Jack Vesper SUGLO
 Director
 Plant Protection and Regulatory Services
 Directorate
 Ministry of Food and Agriculture
 P.O. Box M.37
 Accra
 Phone: +233 24 4388275; 21 290404
 Email: jackvesper@yahoo.com

GREECE - GRÈCE - GRECIA

Representative

Nikolaos KOULIS
 Regulatory Expert
 Ministry of Rural Development & Food
 150 Sygrou Avenue
 176 71 Kallithea
 Phone: +30 210 9287233
 Fax: +30 210 9212090
 Email: syg059@minagric.gr

GUATEMALA

Representante

Francisco BONIFAZ RODRÍGUEZ
 Embajador
 Embajada de la República de Guatemala
 Via dei Colli della Farnesina, 128
 Roma, Italia

Suplente(s)

Agostino PIZZO
 Asistente
 Embajada de la República de Guatemala
 Via dei Colli della Farnesina, 128
 Roma, Italia

Sra Ileana RIVERA APARICIO

Ministro Consejero
 Embajada de la República de Guatemala
 Via dei Colli della Farnesina, 128
 Roma, Italia

GUINEA - GUINÉE

Représentant

Abdourahamane Kindy BALDE
 Chef
 Service Nationale de la Protection des Végétaux
 Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'élevage, de l'environnement et des eaux et forêts
 B.P. 576
 Conakry

Suppléant(s)

Jean-Luc FABER
 Chef
 Section Gestion des pesticides et agréments
 professionnels
 Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'élevage, de
 l'environnement et des eaux et forêts
 B.P. 576
 Conakry
 Email: elsabang@yahoo.fr

Carl Benny RAYMOND
 Représentant Permanent Suppléant
 Ambassade de la République de Guinée
 Via Adelaide Ristori, 9b/13
 00197 Rome, Italy

Abdoulaye TRAORE
 Conseiller économique
 Ambassade de la République de Guinée
 Via Adelaide Ristori, 9b/13
 00197 Rome, Italy

HAITI - HAÏTI - HAITÍ

Représentant

Pierre Charlemagne CHARLES
 Assistant Directeur
 Protection de Végétaux/MARNDR

Suppléant(s)

Pierre Guito LAURORE
 Directeur de Protection des Végétaux
 Ministère de l'agriculture, des ressources
 naturelles et du développement rural
 Route Nationale No. 1, Damien
 Port-au-Prince
 Email: guitolaurore@yahoo.fr

HUNGARY - HONGRIE - HUNGRÍA

Representative

Lajos SZABÓ
 Counsellor
 Department of Food Chain Control
 Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
 Kossuth Lajostér 11
 1055 Budapest
 Email: szaboL@fvm.hu

INDIA - INDE

Representative

Pankaj KUMAR
 Joint Secretary
 Department of Agriculture & Cooperation
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Room no. 224, Krishi Bhawan
 New Delhi
 Email: pankajkumar@nic.in

Alternate(s)

D.D.K. SHARMA
 Deputy Director
 RPQS, Haji Bunder Road,
 Sewrice
 Mumbai
 Email: ddk.sharma@nic.in

INDONESIA - INDONÉSIE

Representative

Mr Syukur IWANTORO
 Director General
 Indonesia Agricultural Quarantine Agency
 Jl.Harsono RM3
 GDE.LT.1 Ragunan
 Jakarta Selatan
 Phone: +62 21 7816481
 Fax: +62 21 7816481
 Email: syukur@deptan.go.id

Alternate(s)

Tasrif ARIFIN
 Adviser; Head
 International Cooperation Division in the
 Agency of Agricultural Quarantine
 Jl.Harsono RM 3
 Ragunan, Jakarta
 Phone: +62 21 7816482
 Fax: +62 21 7816482
 Email: caqsps@indo.net.id

Setiawan DWI PUTRA
 Adviser
 Deputy Director
 Plant Quarantine Export and inter area
 Jl.Harsono RM 3
 Ragunan, Jakarta
 Phone: +62 21 7816482
 Email: setiawan@deptan.go.id

Abdul MUNIF
 Adviser
 Secretary of Agriculture Minister
 Jl.Harsono RM 3
 Ragunan, Jakarta
 Phone: +62 21 7804265
 Fax: +62 21 7816780

Erizal SODIKIN
 Agriculture Attache
 Embassy of Indonesia in Rome
 Via Campania 53-55
 00187 Rome, Italy
 Phone: +39 06 42009121
 Fax: 39 06 4880280
 Email: erizalsodikin79@yahoo.com

SUKIRNO

Adviser
 Director General of Horticulture
 Jl. AUP Pasar Minggu
 Jakarta
 Phone: +62 21 7819117
 Email: ditlinhort@deptan.go.id

Ms Ati WASIATI

Adviser
 Director General of Food Crop
 Jl. AUP Pasar Minggu
 Jakarta
 Phone: +62 21 7806760
 Email: atiwasati@deptan.go.id

**IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF) - IRAN
 (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D') - IRÁN
 (REPÚBLICA ISLÁMICA DEL)**

Representative

Javad S. TAVAKOLIAN
 H.E. Ambassador
 Permanent Representative to FAO
 Permanent Representation of the Islamic
 Republic of Iran to FAO
 Via Aventina, 8
 Rome, Italy

Alternate(s)

Alireza MOHAJER
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO
 Permanent Representation of the Islamic
 Republic of Iran to FAO
 Via Aventina, 8
 Rome, Italy

Seyed Morteza ZAREI
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO
 Permanent Representation of the Islamic
 Republic of Iran to FAO
 Via Aventina, 8
 Rome, Italy

IRAQ**Representative**

Mr Basim MUSTAFA KHALIL
 Director
 Ministry of Agriculture
 State Board of Plant Protection
 Plant Quarantine
 Phone: +964 1 5411193
 Email: bmustafa52@yahoo.com

IRELAND - IRLANDE - IRLANDA**Representative**

Michael HICKEY
 Chief Plant Health Officer
 Horticulture and Plant Health Division
 Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
 Maynooth Business Campus
 Maynooth, Co Kildare
 Phone: +353 1 5053354
 Fax: +353 1 5053564
 Email: michael.hickey@agriculture.gov.ie

ITALY - ITALIE - ITALIA**Représentant**

Fabrizio OLEARI
 Director General
 Ministry of Health
 Via Ribotta 5
 00144 Rome

Suppléant(s)

Antonio CONSOLINO
 Ministry of Health
 SNURCA
 Via Ribotta, 5
 00144 Rome
 Phone: +39 659946844
 Email: a.consolino@sanita.it

Maurizio DESANTIS
 Senior Officer
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Via XX Settembre, 20
 Rome

Bruno Caio FARAGLIA
 Technical Coordinator
 Central Phytosanitary Service
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Via XX Settembre, 20
 Rome
 Phone: +39 06 46656088
 Fax: +39 06 4814628
 Email: b.faraglia@politicheagricole.gov.it

Roberto LOMOLINO
 Veterinary Officer
 Ministry of Health
 SNURCA
 Via Ribotta 5
 00144 Rome

Stefano MORICONI
 Medical Officer
 Ministry of Health
 SNURCA
 Via Ribotta 5
 00144 Rome

Mme Rita SAIU
Ministry of Health
SNURCA
Via Ribotta 5
00144 Rome

JAMAICA - JAMAÏQUE

Representative

Ms Shelia Yvonne HARVEY
Chief
Plant Quarantine/Produce Officer
Ministry of Agriculture
193 Old Hope Road, Hope Gardens
Kingston 6
Phone: +1 876 9770637
Fax: +1 876 9776992
Email: syharvey@moa.gov.jm; ppq@moa.gov.jm

JAPAN - JAPON - JAPÓN

Representative

Kazuhiko SHIMADA
Director, Plant Quarantine Office
Plant Protection Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo
Phone: +81 3 3502 5978
Fax: +81 3 3502 3386
Email: kazuhiko_shimada@nm.maff.go.jp

Alternate(s)

Hajime KATSUMATA
Senior Researcher
Yokohama Plant Protection Station
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-16-10, Shinyamashita, Naka-ku
Yokohama
Phone: +81 45 622 8693
Fax: +81 45 621 1685
Email: katsumatah@pps.go.jp

Yuji KITAHARA
Officer
Yokohama Plant Protection Station
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-1, Furugome, Furugomeaza
Narita-shi, Chiba
Phone: +81 76 34 2352
Fax: +81 76 34 2354

Ryosuke OGAWA
Director, International Affairs Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo
Phone: +81 3 3502 8732
Fax: +81 3 3507 4232
Email: ryosuke_ogawa@nm.maff.go.jp

Koji ONOSATO
Section Chief, International Affairs Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo
Phone: +81 3 3502 2291
Fax: +81 3 3507 4232

Dou OZAKI
Associate Director, International Affairs
Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo
Phone: +81 3 3502 2291
Fax: +81 3 3507 4232
Email: dou_ozaki@nm.maff.go.jp

Motoi SAKAMURA
Principal Officer
Kobe Plant Protection Station
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-1, Hatoba-cho, Chuou-ku
Kobe
Phone: +81 78 331 1350
Fax: +81 78 391 1757
Email: sakamuram@pps.go.jp

Hiroshi YOKOCHI
Deputy Director, Plant Protection Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo

JORDAN - JORDANIE - JORDANIA

Representative

Mohammad Rabah KATBEH BADER
Head
Phytosanitary Division
Ministry of Agriculture
Amman
Phone: +962 795895691
Email: Katbehbader@moa.gov.jo

KENYA

CPM Chairperson

Chagema John KEDERA
 Managing Director
 Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service
 Oloolua Ridge, Karen
 Nairobi
 Phone: +254 020 882308; 884545; 882933
 Fax: +254 020 882265; 3536171/2; 3536175
 Email: director@kephis.org

Representative

Mr Abed KAGUNDU
 Officer in Charge - Quarantine
 Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service
 Oloolua Ridge, Karen
 P.O. Box 49592
 Nairobi 00100

**LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC -
 RÉPUBLIQUE DÉMOCRATIQUE
 POPULAIRE LAO - REPÚBLICA
 DEMOCRÁTICA POPULAR LAO**

Representative

Phaydy PHIA XAYSARAKHAM
 Director
 Plant Quarantine Division
 Department of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 Lane Xang Avenue, Patuxay Square
 P.O. Box 811
 Vientiane
 Phone: +856 21 412350
 Fax: +856 21 412349
 Email: doag@laotel.com; phaydy8@yahoo.com

LATVIA - LETTONIE - LETONIA

Representative

Ringolds ARNITIS
 State Plant Protection Service
 Republikas Lauk 2
 Riga, LV-1981
 Phone: +371 67027098
 Fax: +371 67027302
 Email: ringolds.arnitis@vaad.gov.lv

LEBANON - LIBAN - LÍBANO

Représentant

Charles ZARZOUR
 Chef, Département d'Exportation, d'Importation
 et de la Quarantine Agricole
 Ministère de l'agriculture
 Rue des Ambassades
 Bir Hassan, Henri Chehab Caserne
 Beyrouth
 Phone: +961 3 666676
 Fax: +961 1849635
 Email: chzr@vitesse racing.com;
 czarzour@agriculture.gov.lb

LIBERIA - LIBÉRIA

Representative

Peter N. KORVAH
 Deputy Minister
 Technical Services
 Ministry of Agriculture
 P.O. Box 10-9010
 1000 Monrovia

**LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA -
 JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBYENNE -
 JAMAHIRIJA ÁRABE LIBIA**

Representative

Bashir Otman GSHERA
 Director
 Locust and Agricultural Pests Control Center
 Tripoli
 Phone: +218 21 4626722
 Fax: +218 21 3613936
 Email: bashir_gshera@yahoo.com

Alternate(s)

Omar Essyah EKILANI
 Phone: +218 927918505
 Email: oalkilany@yahoo.co.uk

Abdulmagid Ibrahim FAZZANI
 Phone: +218 925457470
 Email: Alfzani-2000@yahoo.com

Mr Hesham HUWISA

LITHUANIA - LITUANIE - LITUANIA

Representative

Edmundas MORKEVICIUS
 Head
 State Plant Protection Service
 Kalvariju St. 62
 09304 Vilnius
 Phone: +370 5 2752750
 Fax: +370 5 2752128
 Email: vaated@vaat.lt

Alternate(s)

Ms Regina GIRDVAINYTE
 Deputy Permanent Representative to FAO
 Embassy of the Republic of Lithuania
 Viale di Villa Grazioli, 9
 Rome, Italy
 Phone: +39 06 8559052
 Fax: +39 06 8559053
 Email: reginag@zum.lt

MADAGASCAR

Représentant

Jean Armand RANDRIAMAMPINANINA
 Chef
 Service de la Quarantaine
 Direction de la Santé Animale et du
 Phytosanitaire
 Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'élevage et de la pêche
 Nanisána-ladiambola
 Antananarivo 101
 Phone: +261 20 2241678
 Email: sqi_jar@yahoo.fr; sq@maep.gov.mg

MALAWI

Representative

Charles T. KISYOMBE
 Deputy Director
 Agricultural Research Services Headquarters
 Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
 P.O. Box 30779 - Capital City
 Lilongwe 3
 Phone: +265 9337618
 Fax: +265 1707374
 Email: ctkisyombe@yahoo.co.uk

Alternate(s)

Charles SINGANO
 Plant Protection Officer
 Bvumbwe Agricultural Research Station
 P.O. Box 5784
 Limbe
 Phone: +265 9 307474
 Fax: +265 1 471323
 Email: chasinga2001@yahoo.co.uk

MALAYSIA - MALAISIE - MALASIA

Representative

Sulaiman bin Md. ZAIN
 Deputy Director-General of Agriculture
 Department of Agriculture
 Level 17, Lot 4G2, Presint 4
 Pusat Pentadbiran Kerajaan Persekutuan
 62632 Putrajaya
 Phone: +603 88703005; 88703006
 Fax: +603 88888284

Alternate(s)

Amri BIN ISMAIL
 Embassy of Malaysia
 Via Nomentana, 297
 00162 Rome, Italy

Johari RAMLI

Agricultural Attaché and Alternate Permanent
 Representative to FAO
 Embassy of Malaysia
 Via Nomentana 297
 00162 Rome
 Phone: +39 068419296; 068411339
 Fax: +39 068555110
 Email: joharis5@hotmail.com

Kin San YIP

Principal Assistant Director of Agriculture
 Department of Agriculture Sabah
 Enforcement and Crop Protection Section
 Aras 1, Wisma Pertanian Sabah
 Phone: +603 6 088 283264
 Fax: +603 6 088 239046
 Email: KinSan.Yip@sabah.gov.my

MALDIVES - MALDIVAS

Representative

Ibrahim SHAREEF
 Deputy Director
 Ministry of Fisheries, Agriculture and Marine
 Resources
 Ghaazee Building, Ameer Ahmed Magu
 Malé
 Phone: +960 3322625
 Fax: +960 3326558
 Email: ibrahim.shareef@fishagri.gov.mv

MALI - MALÍ

Suppléant(s)

Abdrmane SIBIDE
 Chef
 Division Législation et Contrôle Phytosanitaire
 Direction Nationale de l'Agriculture
 Ministère de l'agriculture
 B.P. 1098
 Bamako
 Phone: +223 222 2877
 Fax: +223 222 4036
 Email: abdrmanesidibe@hotmail.com

Mme Fanta Diallo TOURE

Chef
 Office de la Protection des Végétaux
 Ministère de l'agriculture
 B.P. 281
 Bamako
 Phone: +223 222 24 04; 222 80 24
 Fax: +223 222 48 12
 Email: tourefantadiallo@hotmail.com

MALTA - MALTE

Representative

Ms Marica GATT
 Director, Plant Health
 Plant Health Department
 Plant Biotechnology Center
 Annibale Preca Street
 Lija, LJA 1915
 Phone: +356 2339 7201
 Fax: +356 2143 3112
 Email: marica.gatt@gov.mt

MAURITANIA - MAURITANIE

Représentant

Aly OULD HAIBA
 Ambassadeur
 Ambassade de la République islamique de
 Mauritanie
 Via Paisiello, 26 Int. 5
 00198 Rome, Italie
 Email: ouldhaiba68@yahoo.fr

Suppléant(s)

Mme Marièm MINT MOHAMED AHMEDOU
 Premier Conseiller
 Ambassade de la République islamique de
 Mauritanie
 Via Paisiello, 26 Int. 5
 00198 Rome, Italie

Moussa Mamadou SOW
 Point de Contact Officiel de la CIPV
 Direction de l'Agriculture
 B.P. 180
 Nouakchott
 Phone: +222 5257879; 660 4424
 Fax: +222 5241992
 Email: m_diolo@yahoo.fr;
 mamadoudioloosow@gmail.com

MAURITIUS - MAURICE - MAURICIO

Representative

Ms Neeta Rye LECKRAZ
 Principal Research and Development Officer
 Ministry of Agro Industry and Fisheries
 National Plant Protection Office
 Réduit
 Phone: +230 464 4872
 Fax: +230 465 9591
 Email: moa-pathology@mail.gov.mu

Alternate(s)

Denis CANGY
 Embassy of the Republic of Mauritius
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 c/o Consulate of the Republic of Mauritius
 Via G.B. Morgagni 6/A
 00161 Rome, Italy

MEXICO - MEXIQUE - MÉXICO

Representante

Javier TRUJILLO ARRIAGA
 Director General
 Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería,
 Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación
 G. Pérez Valenzuela no. 127
 Viveros de Coyoacán
 Ciudad de México
 Phone: +52 55 50903000 ext. 51323
 Fax: +52 55 36268434
 Email: trujillo@senasica.sagarpa.gob.mx

Suplente(s)

Victor FLORES
 Representante Permanente Alterno
 Embajada de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos
 Via Lazzaro Spallanzani, 16
 Roma, Italia

Mario PUENTE RAYA
 Director, Regulación Fitosanitaria
 Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería,
 Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación
 G. Pérez Valenzuela no. 127
 Viveros de Coyoacán
 Ciudad de México
 Phone: +52 55 545147
 Fax: +52 55 56580696
 Email: mpuente@senasica.sagarpa.gob.mx

MOLDOVA

Representative

Mme Tatiana BUJNITA-TRICOLICI
 Spécialist
 Inspectorat Principal d'Etat pour la Quarantaine
 Phitosanitaire
 Rue Ialoveni 100 B
 2070 Chisinau
 Phone: +373 22 284419; 069552727
 Fax: +373 22 284419
 Email: fitotat@yahoo.fr

Alternate(s)

Mme Elena GUBSCAIA
 Inspectorat Principal d'Etat pour la Quarantaine
 Phytosanitaire
 Rue Ialoveni 100 B
 2070 Chisinau

MOROCCO - MAROC - MARRUECOS

Représentant

Mekki CHOUIBANI
 Chef
 Division des contrôles techniques et phytosanitaires
 Ministère de l'agriculture et de la pêche maritime
 Avenue Hassan II Km4, Station Dbagh
 Rabat
 Phone: +212 37299931
 Fax: +212 37297544
 Email: chouibani@yahoo.fr

MYANMAR

Representative

U Myo NYUNT
 Manager
 Myanmar Agriculture Service
 Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation
 Bayintnaung Road
 Gyogon, Insein
 Phone: +95 1 644214
 Fax: +95 1 644019
 Email: pmmas.moai@mptmail.net.mm

NEPAL - NÉPAL

Representative

Suroj POKHREL
 Director
 Plant Protection Directorate
 Department of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 Singh Durbar
 Kathmandu

NETHERLANDS - PAYS-BAS - PAÍSES**BAJOS**

Representative

Harmen HARMSMA
 Director
 Plant Protection Service of the Netherlands
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food
 Quality
 P.O. Box 9102
 7600 HC Wageningen
 Phone: +31 317496600
 Fax: +31 317421701
 Email: h.a.harmsma@minlnv.nl

Alternate(s)

Ms Iris FAASSEN
 Manager International Phytosanitary Affairs
 Department of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
 P.O. Box 20401
 2500 EK The Hague
 Phone: +31 703785712
 Fax: +31 703786156
 Email: i.faassen@minlnv.nl

Ms Mennie GERRITSEN-WIELARD
 Senior Staff Officer Phytosanitary Affairs
 Department of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
 P.O. Box 20401
 2500 EK The Hague
 Phone: +31 703785782
 Fax: +31 703786156
 Email: m.j.gerritsen@minlnv.nl

Corné VAN ALPHEN

Senior Staff Officer Phytosanitary Affairs
 Department of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
 P.O. Box 20401
 2500 EK The Hague
 Phone: +31 70 3785552
 Fax: + 31 70 3786156
 Email: c.a.m.van.alphen@minlnv.nl

Ton VAN ARNHEM

Division Chief
 International Phytosanitary Affairs
 Department of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food
 Quality
 P.O. Box 20401
 2500 EK Den Haag
 Phone: +31 70385094
 Fax: +31 70386156
 Email: a.c.van.arnhem@minlnv.nl

**NEW ZEALAND - NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE -
NUEVA ZELANDIA**

Representative

John HEDLEY
 Principal Adviser
 International Coordination, MAF Biosecurity
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace
 P.O. Box 2526
 Wellington
 Phone: +64 4 8940428; 29 8940428
 Fax: +64 894 0731
 Email: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz

Alternate(s)

Peter THOMSON
 Director
 Post Border, MAF Biosecurity
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace
 P.O. Box 2526
 Wellington
 Phone: +64 4 8940353; 29 8940353
 Fax: +64 4 8940728
 Email: peter.thomson@maf.govt.nz

NICARAGUA

Representante
 Sra Monica ROBELO RAFFONE
 Embajadora
 Representante Permanent ante la FAO
 Embajada de la República de Nicaragua
 Via Brescia, 16
 Roma, Italia
 Phone: +39 06 8414693
 Email: embanicitalia@hotmail.com

NIGER - NÍGER

Suppléant(s)
 Dogo ISSOUFOU
 Chef de service Législation et Réglementation
 Phytosanitaires
 Protection des Végétaux
 Ministère du Développement Agricole
 B.P. 323
 Niamey
 Phone: +227 20742556
 Fax: +227 20741983
 Email: dpv@intnet.ne

NIGERIA - NIGÉRIA

Representative
 Mamman MAGAJI
 Executive Director
 Nigeria Agriculture Quarantine Service
 Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water
 Resources
 Area 11, Garki - P.M.B. 135
 Abuja
 Phone: +80 36770158
 Email: magajimamm@yahoo.com;
 nvqs_ngr@yahoo.com

Alternate(s)

Ms S.O. ONWUADUEGBO
 Head
 Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service
 Email: nvqs_ngr@yahoo.com

NIUE - NIOUÉ

Representative
 Ms Crispina F. KONELIO
 Senior Plant Protection and Quarantine Officer
 IPPC NPPO
 P.O. Box 74
 Department of Agriculture, Forestry and
 Fisheries
 Alofi
 Phone: +683 4032
 Fax: +683 4079
 Email: nppo_niue@mail.gov.nu

NORWAY - NORVÈGE - NORUEGA

Representative
 Ms Katrine RØED MEBERG
 Adviser/Dr.scient.
 Department of Food Policy
 Ministry of Agriculture and Food
 P.O. Box 8007 Dep.
 0030 Oslo
 Email: katrineb.meberg@lmd.dep.no

Alternate(s)

Ms Hilde PAULSEN
 Senior Adviser
 Norwegian Food Safety Authority
 P.O. Box 383
 Phone: +47 64944346
 Fax: +47 23217001
 Email: hilde.paulsen@mattilsynet.no

OMAN - OMÁN

Representative
 Sulaiman AL-TOUBI
 Director of Plant Quarantine Department
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Muscat
 Phone: +968 24698937
 Fax: +968 24692069
 Email: saltoubi@maf.gov.om

Alternate(s)

Rasmi MAHMOUD
 Adviser
 Embassy of the Sultanate of Oman
 Via della Camilluccia, 625
 00135 Rome, Italy

PAKISTAN - PAKISTÁN

Alternate(s)
 Allah RAKHA ASI
 Adviser
 Director General
 Department of Plant Protection

PANAMA - PANAMÁ

Representante
 Olehg AGUILAR
 Subdirector Nacional
 Representante de la Organización Nacional de
 Protección Fitosanitaria
 Tocumen, Río Tapia
 Ciudad de Panamá
 Phone: +507 266 4803
 Fax: +507 290 6710
 Email: oaguilar@mida.gob.pa

Suplente(s)

Humberto BERMÚDEZ
 Director Nacional de Normas para la
 Importación de Alimentos de la Utoridad
 Panameña de Seguridad de Alimentos
 (AUPSA)

Dario B. GORDÓN
 Punto Focal ante la CIPF
 Tocumen, Río Tapia
 Ciudad de Panamá
 Phone: +507 266 4803
 Fax: +507 290 6710
 Email: dgordon@mida.gob.pa

Anselmo GUERRA
 Secretario General
 Autoridad Panameña de Seguridad de Alimentos

Horacio MALTEZ
 Representante Permanente Adjunto ante la FAO
 Representación Permanente de la República de
 Panamá ante la FAO
 Viale Regina Margherita, 239 - piso 4
 00198 Roma, Italia

Gilberto REAL
 Administrador General
 Autoridad Panameña de Seguridad de
 Alimentos (AUPSA)

Rubén SERRACÍN
 Director Ejecutivo
 Cuarentena Agropecuaria
 Ministerio de Agricultura de Panama
 Calle Manuel E. Melo, 576
 Apartado 5390

**PAPUA NEW GUINEA - PAPOUASIE-
 NOUVELLE-GUINÉE - PAPUA NUEVA
 GUINEA**

Alternate(s)

Pere KOKOA
 Chief Plant Protection Officer
 National Agriculture Quarantine & Inspection
 Authority
 P.O. Box 741
 Port Moresby
 Phone: +675 325 9977
 Fax: +675 325 9310
 Email: cqoplant@online.pg

PARAGUAY

Representante

Ernesto Raul GALLIANI GRANADA
 Director Dirección de Protección
 Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal
 y de Semillas (SENAVE)
 Entre Humaita n. 145, (calle) Nuestra Señora de
 la Asunción e Independencia Nacional
 Edificio Planeta 1 - Piso 2
 Asunción
 Phone: +595 21 445769; 441491
 Fax: +595 21 441491
 Email: secretaria-general@senave.gov.py;
 proteccionvegetal@senave.gov.py

Suplente(s)

Sra Liz CORONEL
 Representación Permanente de Paraguay ante los
 Organismos Internacionales con sede en Roma
 Embajada de la República del Paraguay
 Via Firenze, 43 Scala A, Int 17
 Roma, Italia

Sra Natalia TOLEDO BARBOZA
 Jefa
 Departamento de Cuarentena Vegetal
 Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Sanidad Vegetal
 y de Semillas (SENAVE)
 Humaita n. 145, (entre) Nuestra Sra. de la
 Asunción e Independencia Nacional
 Edificio Planeta 1 - Piso 2
 Asunción
 Phone: +595 21445769, +595 21441491
 Fax: +595 21441491
 Email: cuarentena_vegetal@senave.gov.py

PERU - PÉROU - PERÚ

Representante

Sra Gianinna ASTOLFI
 Segunda Secretaria
 Representante Permanente Alterno
 Embajada de la República del Perú
 Via Francesco Siacci, 2/B, Int. 5
 Roma, Italia

Suplente(s)

Sra Vilma GUTARRA GARCIA
 Especialista en Cuarentena Vegetal
 Servicio Nacional de Sanidad Agraria
 Av. La Molina 1915
 Lima
 Phone: +511 3133300 Anexo 2042
 Email: vgutarra@senasa.gob.pe

Manuel ÁLVAREZ
 Consejero, Representante Permanente Adjunto
 ante la FAO
 Embajada de la República del Perú
 Via Francesco Siacci, 2/B, Int. 5
 Roma, Italia

PHILIPPINES - FILIPINAS

Representative

Larry R. LACSON
 Chief
 Plant Quarantine Service
 Bureau of Plant Industry
 692 San Andres Street
 Malate, Manila
 Phone: +632 404 0409
 Email: lacsonlr@yahoo.com

POLAND - POLOGNE - POLONIA

Representative

Piotr WLODARCZYK
 Lublin Voivodeship Inspector
 State Plant Health and Seed Inspection Service
 ul. Diamentowa 6
 20 -447 Lublin
 Phone: +48 81 7440326
 Fax: +48 81 7447363
 Email: wi-lublin@piorin.gov.pl

PORTUGAL

Representative

Antonio PACHECO
 Expert
 Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development
 and Fisheries
 DGADR, Tapada da Ajuda, Edificio 1
 Lisbon
 Phone: +351 21 3613247
 Fax: +351 21 3613277
 Email: antoniopacheco@dgadr.pt

REPUBLIC OF KOREA - RÉPUBLIQUE DE CORÉE - REPÚBLICA DE COREA

Representative

Chang Yong PARK
 Director
 National Plant Quarantine Service
 Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and
 Fisheries
 433-1, Anyang 6-dong
 Mana-Gu, Anyang
 Phone: +82 31 4451223
 Fax: +82 31 4456934
 Email: cypark@npqs.go.kr

Alternate(s)

Young-chul JEONG
 Deputy Director
 National Plant Quarantine Service
 Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and
 Fisheries
 Anyang 6-Dong, Anyang
 Phone: +82 31 446 1926
 Fax: +82 31 445 6934
 Email: ycjeong@npqs.go.kr

Ms Kyu-Ock YIM
 Researcher
 National Plant Quarantine Service
 Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and
 Fisheries
 433-1 Anyang 6-ong
 Manan-gu, Anyang
 Phone: +82 31 446 1926
 Fax: +82 31 445 6934
 Email: koyim@npqs.go.kr

ROMANIA - ROUMANIE - RUMANIA

Représentant

Ms Elena LEAOTA
 Director
 Phytosanitary National Agency
 B.dul. Carol 24
 Bucarest
 Phone: +40 21 3072386
 Fax: +40 213072485
 Email: elena.leaota@mail.anf.maa.ro

Suppléant(s)

Ms Florica GOGU
 Director
 Central Laboratory of Phytosanitary Quarantine
 11 Afumati St
 Voluntari, Ilfov
 Phone: +40 21 2703254
 Fax: +40 21 2703254
 Email: gogu.florica@lccf.ro

RUSSIAN FEDERATION - FÉDÉRATION DE RUSSIE - FEDERACIÓN DE RUSIA

Representative

Nikolay TRYAKHOV
 Deputy Head
 Phytosanitary Surveillance and Surveillance in
 the Field of Grain and Grain Products Quality
 and Safety Department
 Federal Service for Veterinary and
 Phytosanitary Surveillance
 Orlikov per. 1/11
 107139 Moscow
 Phone: +7 495 9754992
 Fax: +7 495 6076602
 Email: skupova@yandex.ru

Alternate(s)

Ms Renata KAMALOVA
 Head
 Division for International Relations
 Federal State Enterprise
 "All-Russian Plant Quarantine Centre"
 32, Pogranichnaya street, P. Bykovo
 2, Ramenski Region
 140150 Moscow oblast
 Phone: +7 915 1951045
 Fax: +7 495 6078046
 Email: litprince@yandex.ru

**SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES -
 SAINT-VINCENT-ET-LES GRENADINES -
 SAN VICENTE Y LAS GRANADINAS**

Representative

Reuben ROBERTSON
 Chief Agricultural Officer
 Ministry of Trade and Agriculture
 Richmond Hill
 Kingstown

SAMOA

Representative

Pelenato FONOTI
 Assistant Chief Executive Officer
 Quarantine Division
 Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
 Government Building
 Apia
 Phone: +685 22561; 22562; 22564
 Fax: +685 24576
 Email: maffm@lesamoa.net

**SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE - SAO TOMÉ-
 ET-PRINCIPE - SANTO TOMÉ Y PRÍNCIPE**

Représentant

Alvaro Costa VILA NOVA
 Chef Département Protection des Plantes
 Direction Agricole
 Ministère de l'Agriculture
 B.P. 309
 Sao Tomé
 Phone: +239 225381; 904925
 Email: vilanovalvaro@yahoo.com.br;
 novalvaro@cstome.net

**SAUDI ARABIA - ARABIE SAOUDITE -
 ARABIA SAUDITA**

Representative

Fahad bin Mohammed AL SAQAN
 Director-General Plant Protection Department
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Riyadh

Alternate(s)

Solaiman bin Abdallah AL SAWI
 Agricultural Researcher
 Plant and Animal Quarantine Department
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Riyadh

SENEGAL - SÉNÉGAL

Représentant

Mame Ndéné LO
 Ingénieur Agronome
 Directeur de la Protection des Végétaux
 Ministère de l'agriculture, des biocarburants et
 de la sécurité alimentaire
 Phone: +221 8340397
 Fax: +221 8342854
 Email: dvp1@orange.sn

SEYCHELLES

Representative

Randy STRAVENS
 Senior Laboratory Technologist
 Plant Protection Services Section
 Department of Natural Resources
 Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
 Victoria
 Email: plantpro@seychelles.net;
 rs25goal@hotmail.com

SLOVAKIA - SLOVAQUIE - ESLOVAQUIA

Representative

Ms Katarina BENOVSKA
 Plant Commodities Department
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Dobrovicova 12
 812 66 Bratislava 1
 Phone: +421 259266357
 Fax: +421 25966358
 Email: katarina.benovska@land.gov.sk

Alternate(s)

Milan KOVÁČ
 Permanent Representative to FAO
 Embassy of the Slovak Republic
 Via dei Colli della Farnesina, 144/6
 Rome, Italy

SLOVENIA - SLOVÉNIE - ESLOVENIA

Representative

Ms Vlasta KNAPIC
 Head of Plant Health Division
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food
 Phytosanitary Administration of the Republic of
 Slovenia
 Einspielerjeva 6
 SI-1000 Ljubljana
 Phone: +386 1 3094 379
 Fax: +386 1 3094 335
 Email: Vlasta.Knapic@gov.si

Alternate(s)

Antonio ATAZ
 Council of the European Union
 General Secretariat
 DG B II Agriculture
 Bureau 40 GM 36, Justus Lipsius building
 Rue de la Loi, 175
 1048 Bruxelles
 Belgium
 Phone: +32 2 281 4964
 Fax: +32 2 281 9425
 Email: antonio.ataz@consilium.europa.eu

Ms Jozica Jerman CVELBAR
 Head of Phytosanitary Inspection
 Inspectorate of Agriculture, Forestry and Food
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food
 Parmova 33
 SI-1000 Ljubljana
 Phone: +386 1 43 45 700
 Fax: +386 1 43 45 717
 Email: jozi.cvelbar@gov.si

Ms Alenka GRIVEC
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food
 Phytosanitary Administration of the Republic of
 Slovenia
 Einspielerjeva 6
 SI-1000 Ljubljana
 Phone: +386 1 3094 379
 Fax: +386 1 3094 335
 Email: alenka.grivec@gov.si

Ms Alenka PIVK
 Inspectorate for Agriculture, Forestry and Food
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food
 Parmuva 33
 SI-1000 Ljubljana
 Phone: +386 1 4345700
 Email: alenka@pivk@gov.si

SOUTH AFRICA - AFRIQUE DU SUD - SUDÁFRICA

Representative

Ms Alice P. BAXTER
 Deputy Director
 International Plant Health Matters
 Directorate Plant Health
 Private Bag X14
 0031 Gezina
 Pretoria
 Phone: +27 12 3196114
 Fax: +27 12 3196580
 Email: AliceB@nda.agric.za;
 NPPOZA@nda.agric.za

Alternate(s)

Nolan AFRICANDER
 Deputy Director
 National Plant Health Matters
 Directorate Plant Health
 Department of Agriculture
 Private Bag X5015
 7599 Stellenbosch
 Phone: +27 21 8091625;00
 Fax: +27 21 8832570
 Email: NolanA@nda.agric.za

Ms Njabulo NDULI
 Councillor; Agricultural Affairs
 Embassy of South Africa
 Agricultural Section
 Via Tanaro 14
 00198 Rome, Italy
 Phone: +39 06 85254239
 Fax: +39 06 85254224
 Email: agriculture@sudafrica.it

SPAIN - ESPAGNE - ESPAÑA

Representante

Sra Cristina CLEMENTE MARTÍNEZ
 Subdirectora General de Agricultura Integrada y
 Sanidad Vegetal
 C/Alfonso XII, n. 62
 28014 Madrid
 Phone: +34 91 3478243
 Fax: +34 91 3478248
 Email: cclement@mapya.es

Suplente(s)

José Maria COBOS SUÁREZ
 Subdirector General Adjunto de Agricultura
 Integrada y Sanidad Vegetal
 C/Alfonso XII, n. 62
 28014 Madrid
 Phone: +34 91 3478281
 Fax: +34 91 3478248
 Email: jcobossu@mapya.es

Ignacio FONTANEDA

Técnico de la Representación Permanente ante
 la FAO y el PMA
 Embajada de España
 Largo dei Lombardi, 21
 Roma, Italia

Alberto LÓPEZ GARCÍA

Representante Permanente Adjunto ante la FAO
 y el PMA
 Embajada de España
 Largo dei Lombardi, 21
 Roma, Italia

Sra Belén MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ
 Jefe
 Servicio de Exportación a Países Terceros
 C/Alfonso XII, n. 62
 28014 Madrid
 Phone: +34 91 3478256
 Fax: +34 91 3478248
 Email: bmartin@mapya.es

Angel OROZCO GÓMEZ
 Representante Permanente Alterno ante la FAO
 y el PMA
 Embajada de España
 Largo dei Lombardi, 21
 Roma, Italia

SRI LANKA

Representative
 Hemathilake MUTHUKUDARACHCHI
 Acting Director
 Seed Certification & Plant Protection Centre
 Department of Agriculture
 P.O. Box 74
 Gannoruwa, Peradeniya
 Phone: +94 081 2388226; 2388044; 2388494
 Fax: +94 081 2388077; 2388490
 Email: scppc@sltnet.lk; pgrc@sltnet.lk

SUDAN - SOUDAN - SUDÁN

Representative
 Khidir Gibril MUSA
 Director General
 Plant Protection Directorate
 Phone: +249 185337482
 Fax: +249 185339423
 Email: khidirigibrilmusa@yahoo.com

SURINAME

Representative
 Ms Anuradha Malti MONORATH
 Head Plant Protection and Quality Control
 Division/Chief Plant Quarantine Officer
 Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and
 Fisheries
 Kankantriestraat nr.9
 Paramaribo
 Phone: +597 402 965; 402 040
 Fax: +597 403 912
 Email: ppsur@r.net; angmonorath@yahoo.com

SWAZILAND - SWAZILANDIA

Representative
 Similo MAVIMBELA
 Officer in Charge
 Phytosanitary Service
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 Malkerns Research Station
 P.O. Box 4
 Malkerns M204
 Phone: +268 5274071
 Fax: +268 5274070
 Email: mrs@realnet.co.sz

SWEDEN - SUÈDE - SUECIA

Representative
 Ms Marianne SJÖBLOM
 Senior Administrative Officer
 Animal and Food Division
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Fredsgatan 8
 SE 103 33 Stockholm
 Phone: +46 8 4051121
 Fax: +46 8 206496
 Email: marianne.sjoblom@agriculture.ministry.se

SWITZERLAND - SUISSE - SUIZA

Représentant
 Hans DREYER
 Responsable
 Section Certification, protection des végétaux et
 des variétés
 Office fédéral de l'agriculture OFAG
 Mattenhofstrasse 5
 CH-3003 Berne
 Phone: +41 31 3222692
 Fax: +41 31 3222634
 Email: hans.dreyer@blw.admin.ch

Suppléant(s)

François PYTHOUD
 Responsable
 Section Agriculture durable internationale
 Office fédéral de l'agriculture OFAG
 Mattenhofstrasse 5
 CH-3003 Berne
 Phone: +41 31 323 44 45
 Fax: +41 32 322 26 34
 Email: françois.pythoud@blw.admin.ch

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC - RÉPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE - REPÚBLICA ÁRABE SIRIA

Representative

Abdul hakim MOHAMMAD
 Ph.d (Entomologist)
 Director of Plant Protection Directorate
 Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian Reform
 Al-Abed Street
 Damascus
 Phone: +963 944369075; 112220187
 Fax: +963 1144676231
 Email: dppsyria@aloola.sy;
 wekayaham@yahoo.com

THAILAND - THAÏLANDE - TAILANDIA

Representative

Ms Oratai SILAPANAPORN
 Director
 Office of Commodity and System Standards
 National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity
 and Food Standards
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 50 Phaholyotin Rd. Chatuchak
 Bangkok 10900
 Phone: +66 2 5613390
 Fax: +66 2 5613373
 Email: oratai@acfs.go.th

Alternate(s)

Ms Sairak CHAILANGGAR
 First Secretary of Agriculture
 Office of the Agricultural Affairs Royal Thai
 Embassy
 Via Cassia 929, Villino M
 Rome, Italy
 Phone: +39 06 30363687
 Fax: +39 06 30312700
 Email: Sairkap@hotmail.com

Ms Oratai EUATRAKOOL
 Senior Agricultural Scientist
 Agricultural Regulatory
 Office of Department of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 50 Phaholyotin Rd. Chatuchak
 Bangkok 10900
 Phone: +66 2 5798576
 Fax: +66 2 5798576
 Email: orataie@hotmail.com

Ms Tritaporn KHOMAPAT
 Minister Agriculture
 Permanent Representative to FAO
 Office of Agricultural Affairs
 Royal Thai Embassy
 Via Cassia 929 Villino M
 Rome, Italy
 Phone: +39 06 30363687
 Fax: +39 06 30312700
 Email: thagri.rom@flashnet.it

Ms Tasanee PRADYABUMRUNG
 Standards Officer
 National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity
 and Food Standards
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 50 Phaholyotin Rd. Chatuchak
 Bangkok 10900
 Phone: +66 2 6512277
 Fax: +66 2 5613357
 Email: tasanee@acfs.go.th

Surapol YINASAWAPUN
 Senior Agricultural Scientist
 Plant Protection Research and Development
 Office
 Department of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 50 Phaholyotin Rd. Chatuchak
 Bangkok 10900
 Phone: +66 2 9406670
 Fax: +66 2 5610744
 Email: syin@doa.go.th

TOGO

Représentant

Yawo Sèfe GOGOVR
 Chef
 Division du Contrôle Phytosanitaire
 Direction de l'Agriculture
 Ministère de l'agriculture, de l'élevage et de la
 pêche
 B.P. 1263
 Lomé
 Phone: +228 2226125; 9090713
 Fax: +228 2226105; 2502493
 Email: gogovor@yahoo.fr

TUNISIA - TUNISIE - TÚNEZ

Représentant

Abdelaziz CHEBIL
 Directeur de la Défense des Cultures
 Responsable d'échange d'informations
 Ministère de l'agriculture et des ressources
 hydrauliques
 30 rue Alain Savary
 Tunis 1002
 Phone: +216 71840452
 Fax: +216 71784419
 Email: chebilabdelaziz@yahoo.fr

Suppléant(s)

Abdelhamid ABID
 Conseiller
 Ambassade de la République tunisienne
 Via Asmara, 7
 Rome, Italie

TURKEY - TURQUIE - TURQUÍA

Representative

Hikmet ER
 National IPPC Contact Point
 General Directorate of Protection and Control
 Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs
 Akay cad. no. 3, Bakanliklar
 Ankara
 Phone: +90 312 4180521
 Fax: +90 312 4174176
 Email: her@kkgm.gov.tr

Alternate(s)

Birol AKBAS
 Plant Protection Central Research Institute
 Gayret Mah. Fatih Sultan Mehmet Bulvari no. 66
 P.O. Box 49
 06172 Yenimahalle
 Ankara
 Phone: +90 312 3445943 ext. 103
 Fax: +90 312 3151531
 Email: birol_akbas@zmmae.gov.tr;
 birolakbas40@hotmail.com

UGANDA - OUGANDA

Representative

Komayombi BULEGEYA
 Commissioner, Crop Protection
 Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and
 Fisheries
 P.O. Box 102
 Entebbe
 Phone: +256 414 320115
 Fax: +256 414 320642
 Email: kbulegeya@yahoo.co.uk

Alternate(s)

Deo RWABITA
 Ambassador
 Embassy of the Republic of Uganda
 Via Lungotevere dei Mellini, 44
 00193 Rome, Italy
 Phone: +39 334803366

**UNITED ARAB EMIRATES - ÉMIRATS
ARABES UNIS - EMIRATOS ÁRABES
UNIDOS**

Representative

Mr Mohammed Mohammad Rashid AL-NAGHI
 Ministry of Environment and Water
 P.O. Box 10811
 Khortrakkan
 Phone: +97 192444721
 Fax: +97 192446668
 Email: mohd_alnaghi@hotmail.com

**UNITED KINGDOM - ROYAUME-UNI -
REINO UNIDO**

Representative

Stephen ASHBY
 Plant Health Strategy and Bee Health Branch
 Plant Health Division
 Department for Environment, Food and Rural
 Affairs
 Foss House, King's Pool
 1-2 Peasholme Green
 York YO1 7PX
 Phone: +44 1904 455048
 Email: steve.ashby@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Alternate(s)

Paul BARTLETT
 Principal Plant Health Consultant
 Team 1, Room 02FA09A
 Central Science Laboratory
 Sand Hutton
 York YO41 1LZ
 Phone: +44 1904 462221
 Email: p.bartlett@csl.gov.uk

Ms Jane CHARD

Head, Plant Health Section
 Scottish Agricultural Science Agency
 Scottish Government
 Roddinglaw Road
 Edinburgh EH12 9FJ
 Phone: +44 131 244 8863
 Email: jane.chard@sasa.gsi.gov.uk

**UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA -
RÉPUBLIQUE-UNIE DE TANZANIE -
REPÚBLICA UNIDA DE TANZANÍA**

Representative

Ms Rose-Anne MOHAMED
Head
Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Services
P.O. Box 9071
Dar Es Salaam
Phone: +255 22 2865642
Fax: +255 22 2865642
Email: rose_mohamed@yahoo.com;
pps@kilimo.go.tz

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA - ÉTATS-
UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE - ESTADOS UNIDOS DE
AMÉRICA**

Representative

Ms Rebecca BECH
Deputy Administrator
Plant Protection and Quarantine
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
US Department of Agriculture (USDA)
Whitten Buildings
14th Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20250
Phone: +1 202 7205401
Fax: +1 202 6900472

Alternate(s)

Ms Julia E. ALIAGA
Director, International Phytosanitary Standards
Programme
Plant Protection and Quarantine
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
US Department of Agriculture (USDA)
4700 River Road, Unit 140
Riverdale, MD 20737
Phone: +1 301 7340763
Fax: +1 301 7347639
Email: julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov

Paul EGGERT
Associate Deputy Director
Plant Protection and Quarantine
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
US Department of Agriculture
Whitten Building
147th Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20250

John GREIFER
Associate Deputy
International Services
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
US Department of Agriculture
12th Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20250
Phone: +1 202 7207677
Fax: +1 202 6902861
Email: john.k.greifer@aphis.usda.gov

Peter GROSSER
USDA-APHIS Attaché
U.S. Mission to the European Union
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
PSC 82
Box 214
Brussels, Belgium
Phone: +32 2 508 2645
Fax: +32 2 511 0918
Email: Peter.M.Grosser@aphis.usda.gov

Narcy KLAG
Deputy Director, Phytosanitary Issues
Management
Plant Protection and Quarantine
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
US Department of Agriculture (USDA)
4700 River Road, Unit 140
Riverdale, MD 20737
Phone: +1 301 7348469
Fax: +1 301 7347639
Email: narcy.g.klag@usda.gov

Ms Mary Lisa MADELL
Acting Director, SPS Management Team
International Services
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
US Department of Agriculture (USDA)
1400 Independence Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20250
Phone: +1 202 7207677
Fax: +1 202 6902861
Email: Mary.L.Madell@aphis.usda.gov

Steven SHNITZLER
Director, Plant Division
Office of Scientific and Technical Affairs, FAS
Room 5957 USDA South Building
Foreign Agricultural Service
Washington, DC 20250
Phone: +1 202 720 1353
Fax: +1 202 690 3316
Email: Steve.Shnitzler@fas.usda.gov

VANUATU

Representative

Tekon Timothy TUMUKON
Principal Plant Protection Officer
Department of Livestock and Quarantine
Ministry of Agriculture, Quarantine, Forestry
and Fisheries
PMB 9095
Port Vila
Phone: +678 23519
Fax: +678 23185
Email: ttumukon@vanuatu.gov.vu;
tumukontt@gmail.com

**VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)
- VENEZUELA (RÉPUBLIQUE
BOLIVARIENNE DU) - VENEZUELA
(REPÚBLICA BOLIVARIANA DE)**

Representante

Dennys CAMEJO
Dirección de Sanidad Vegetal
Servicio Autónomo de Sanidad Agropecuaria
Av. Francisco Solano
Piso 12, Oficina SASA
Sabana Grande, Municipio Libertador
Caracas
Phone: +58 212 7053436; 414 2761707
Email: dennysacn@hotmail.com,
dennysnader@yahoo.com

VIET NAM

Representative

Dam Quoc TRU
Deputy Director General
Plant Protection Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
149 Ho Dac Di Street
Hanoi
Phone: +844 8518198
Fax: +844 5330043; 8574719
Email: trudq@fpt.vn

YEMEN - YÉMEN

Representative

Abdulla H. AL-SAYANI
Director
Plant Quarantine Department
General Directorate of Plant Protection
Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation
P.O. Box 26
Sana'a
Phone: +967 1 563328
Fax: +967 1 562749
Email: p-quarantine@yemen.net.ye

ZAMBIA - ZAMBIE

Representative

Arundel SAKALA
Coordinator
Phytosanitary Service
Zambia Agriculture Research Institute
Mount Makulu Research Station
Private Bag 7
Chilanga
Phone: +260 1 278141; 278130
Email: zatidirector@zari.gov.zm,
inforinet@zari.gov.zm

Alternate(s)

Vincent SIMWINGA
Agricultural Research Officer
Mount Makulu Research Station
Private Bag 7
Chilanga

Albert CHALABESA
Deputy Director
Zambia Agriculture Research Institute
Mount Makulu Research Bureau
Private Bag 7
Chilanga
Phone: +260 1278213, +260 1278130
Email: chala@zamnet.zm

OBSERVER COUNTRIES (NOT CONTRACTING PARTIES) - PAYS OBSERVATEURS (NON PARTIES CONTRACTANTES) - PAÍSES OBSERVADORES (PARTES NO CONTRATANTES)

ANGOLA

Représentant

Carlos Alberto AMARAL
Conseiller
Représentant Permanent Suppléant auprès de la FAO
Ambassade de la République d'Angola
Via Druso, 39
Rome, Italie

Suppléant(s)

Mme Barbara FERNANDEZ CASAMAYOR
Ministère de l'Agriculture et Développement Rural
Rue Comandante Gika
C.P. 527
Luanda
Phone: +244 222321429
Email: bfernandez57@yahoo.com.br

Mme Laurinda Maria Rosa FERNANDO
Ministère de l'Agriculture et Développement Rural
Rue Comandante Gika
C.P. 527
Luanda
Phone: +244 222 321429; 927 503879
Email: laurindafernand@yahoo.com.br

GABON - GABÓN

Suppléant(s)

Louis Stanislas CHARICAUTH
Representant Permanent Suppleant
Ambassade de la République gabonaise
Via San Marino, 36-36A
00198 Rome, Italie

LESOTHO

Representative

Mr Esaiiah TJELELE
Head, Plant Protection Section
Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
Department of Agricultural Research
P.O. Box 829
Maseru 100
Phone: +266 22 312395
Fax: +266 22 310362
Email: etjelele@yahoo.co.uk

Alternate(s)

Mamosala Semakaleng SHALE
First Secretary
Embassy of the Kingdom of Lesotho
Via Serchio, 8
00198 Rome, Italy

MOZAMBIQUE

Representative

Armando Marcos COME
Head of Phytosanitary Inspection PQS
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O.Box. 1406, FPLM AV.
Phone: +258 826253529
Fax: +258 21460591
Email: armandocome@yahoo.com.br

SINGAPORE - SINGAPOUR - SINGAPUR

Representative

Keng Ho ONG
Deputy Director (Plant Health)
Agri-Food & Veterinary Authority
Phone: +65 6316 5181
Fax: +65 6316 1090
Email: ong_keng_ho@ava.gov.sg

**REPRESENTATIVES OF UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND OBSERVERS
FROM INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
REPRESENTANTS DES NATIONS UNIES ET INSTITUTIONS SPÉCIALISÉE ET OBSERVATEURS
D'ORGANISATIONS INTERGOUVERNEMENTALES
REPRESENTANTES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS Y ORGANISMOS ESPECIALIZADOS E
OBSERVADORES DE ORGANIZACIONES INTERGUBERNAMENTALES**

**AFRICAN UNION
UNION AFRICAINE
UNIÓN AFRICANA**

Yemi AKINBAMIJO
Director
AU-IAPSC
P.O. Box 4170
Nlongkak
Yaoundé, Cameroon
Phone: +237 22 211969; 74268265
Fax: +237 22 211967
Email: au-cpi@au-appo.org; Yemi.Akinbamijo@au-appo.org

Ms Sarah OLEMBO
Senior Policy Officer
Department for Rural Economy and Agriculture
African Union Commission
Box 3243
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Email: ahono_olembo@yahoo.com

**ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION
COMMISSION PHYTOSANITAIRE POUR L'ASIE ET LE PACIFIQUE
COMISIÓN DE PROTECCIÓN VEGETAL PARA ASIA Y EL PACÍFICO**

Yongfan PIAO
Executive Secretary to APPPC and
Plant Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Asia and Pacific
39 Phra Atiti
Bangkok, 10200
Thailand
Phone: +66 2 6974268
Fax: +66 2 6974445
Email: yongfan.piao@fao.org

**CAB INTERNATIONAL – (INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR AGRICULTURE AND BIOSCIENCE)
OFFICES AGRICOLES DU CAB - INTERNATIONAL
OFICINAS DE AGRICULTURA - INTERNACIONAL**

Roger DAY
Regional Director
CABI Africa
ICRAF Complex
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
P.O. Box 633-00621
Nairobi, Kenya
Phone: +254 20 7224450
Fax: +254 20 7122150
Email: R.Day@cabi.org

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

COMITÉ DE SANIDAD VEGETAL DEL CONO SUR

Ms Ana PERALTA
Coordination Secretary
Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE)
Independencia Nacional 821, Piso 5, Aptos 4 y 5
Asunción, Paraguay
Phone: +595 21 453922
Fax: +595 21 453922
Email: aperaltaottonello@yahoo.com

**EUROPEAN AND MEDITERRANEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION EUROPÉENNE POUR LA PROTECTION DES PLANTES
ORGANIZACIÓN EUROPEA Y MEDITERRÁNEA DE PROTECCIÓN DE LAS PLANTAS**

Nico VAN OPSTAL
Director General
European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)
1 rue Le Nôtre
75016 Paris, France
Phone: +33 1 45 207794
Fax: +33 1 42 248943
Email: hq@epo.fr

FAO REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL OFFICES

Khaled AL ROUECHDI
Crop Protection Officer
FAO Subregional Office for North Africa
Tunis, Tunisia
Phone: +216 71 847553
Fax: +216 71 791859
Email: khaled.alrouechdi@fao.org

Jan BREITHAUPT
FAO Subregional Office for Eastern Africa
P.O. Box 5536
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Phone: +251 1 517233
Fax: +251 1 515266
Email: jan.breithaupt@fao.org

Ms Hannah CLARENDON
Crop Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Africa
General Abdul Nasser Road
P.O. GP 1628
Accra, Ghana
Phone: +233 21 675000 ext. 3137; 7010930 ext. 3137
Fax: +233 21 7010943; 668427
Email: hannah.clarendon@fao.org

Taher EL-AZZABI
Plant Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Near East
P.O. Box 2223
Cairo, Egypt
Phone: +20 33316000
Fax: +20 37495981; 33373419
Email: taher.elazzabi@fao.org

Allan HRUSKA
Oficial de Protección Vegetal
Oficina Regional para América Latin y Caribe
Dag Hammarskjold 3241, Vitacura
Santiago, Chile
Phone: +56 2 3372237
Fax: +56 2 3372101
Email: allan.hruska@fao.org

Ms Joyce MULILA-MITTI
Plant Production and Protection Officer
FAO Subregional Office for Southern Africa
P.O. Box 3730
Harare, Zimbabwe
Phone: +263 4 253656-8 ext. 282
Email: joyce.mulilamitti@fao.org

Gene POLLARD
Plant Protection Officer
FAO Subregional Office for the Caribbean
Bridgetown, Barbados
Phone: +1 246 427110 ext. 247
Fax: +1 246 4276075
Email: gene.pollard@fao.org

Mat PUREA
Plant Protection Officer
FAO Subregional Office for the Pacific Islands
Private Mail Bag
Apia, Samoa
Phone: +685 (0) 20710
Fax: +685 (0) 22126
Email: mat.purea@fao.org

Fawzi TAHER
Plant Production Officer
FAO Regional Office for Central Asia
Ivedik Cad. No. 55
06170 Ankara, Turkey
Phone: +90 (0) 312 3079517
Fax: +90 (0) 312 3271705
Email: fawzi.taher@fao.org

**INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE
INSTITUT INTERAMERICAIN DE COOPÉRATION POUR L'AGRICULTURE
INSTITUTO INTERAMERICANO DE COOPERACIÓN PARA LA AGRICULTURA**

Ricardo MOLINS
Director of Agricultural Health and Food Safety
Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA)
Headquarters, P.O. Box 55 2200
Coronado, Costa Rica
Phone: +506 22160184
Email: Ricardo.Molins@iica.int

**INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY
AGENCE INTERNATIONALE DE L'ÉNERGIE ATOMIQUE
ORGANISMO INTERNACIONAL DE ENERGÍA ATÓMICA**

Jorge HENDRICHS
Head
Insect Pest Control
Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture
Wagramer Stasse 5
P.O. Box 100
1400 Wien, Austria

**NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION NORD AMÉRICAINNE POUR LA PROTECTION DES PLANTES
ORGANIZACIÓN NORTEAMERICANA DE PROTECCIÓN A LAS PLANTAS**

Ian MCDONELL
Executive Director
North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)
1431 Merivale Road, 3rd Floor, Room 309
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0Y9
Phone: +613 221 5144
Fax: +613 228 2540
Email: imcdonell@inspection.gc.ca

**PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION DE PROTECTION DES VÉGÉTAUX POUR LE PACIFIQUE**

Sidney SUMA
Executive Secretary
Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO)
Land Resources Division
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
Private Mail Bag Service
Suva, Fiji Islands
Phone: +679 337 0733
Fax: +679 337 0021
Email: sidneys@spc.int

**REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR PLANT PROTECTION AND ANIMAL HEALTH
ORGANISME INTERNATIONAL RÉGIONAL CONTRE LES MALADIES DES PLANTES ET DES ANIMAUX**

ORGANISMO INTERNACIONAL REGIONAL DE SANIDAD AGROPECUARIA

Plutarco Elías ECHEGOYÉN
Plant Health Specialist
Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)
Calle Ramón Beloso, Final Pasaje Isolde
Colonia Escalón
San Salvador, El Salvador
Phone: +503 2263 1128
Email: pechegoyen@oirsa.org

**SOUTHERN AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY
COMMUNAUTÉ DU DÉVELOPPEMENT DE L'AFRIQUE AUSTRALE
COMUNIDAD PARA EL DESARROLLO DEL ÁFRICA MERIDIONAL**

Simon MWALE
Senior Programme Manager-Crop Development
SADC Secretariat
FANR Directorate
Kgale View
P/Bag 0095
Gaborone, Botswana
Phone: +267 3951863 ext. 5068
Fax: +267 3924099; 3972848
Email: smwale@sadc.int

**WORLD ORGANISATION FOR ANIMAL HEALTH
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTÉ ANIMALE
ORGANIZACIÓN MUNDIAL DE SANIDAD ANIMAL**

Ms Gillian Elizabeth MYLREA
Chargée de Mission
International Trade Department of the OIE
12, rue de Prony
75017 Paris, France
Email: g.mylrea@oie.int

**WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DU COMMERCE
ORGANIZACIÓN MUNDIAL DEL COMERCIO**

Ms Serra AYRAL
Economic Affairs Officer
Agriculture and Commodities Division
World Trade Organization
Rue de Lausanne 154
Geneve, Suisse
Phone: +41 22 7395760
Fax: +41 22 739 5760
Email: serra.ayral@wto.org

**OBSERVERS FROM NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
OBSERVATEURS D'ORGANISATIONS NON GOUVERNEMENTALES
OBSERVADORES DE ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES**

ECOPORT FOUNDATION

Rohan PUTTER
5 Kines Road
Henley-On-Thames
Oxon, RG9 2DW
United Kingdom

Tonie PUTTER
Chief Executive Officer
225 St. Patricks Road
Muckleneu, Pretoria 0002
South Africa
Email: t.putter@ecoport.org

**INTERNATIONAL SEED FEDERATION
FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE DU COMMERCE DES SEMENCES**

Bernard BOSC
Fédération Nationale des Professionnels de Semences Potagères et Florales
17 rue du Louvre
75001 Paris, France
Phone: +33 1 40 130317
Fax: +33 1 40 130671
Email: bernard.bosc@fnpsp-semence.asso.fr

Radha RANGANATHAN
Technical Director
International Seed Federation
7 Chemin du Reposoir
1260 Nyon, Switzerland
Phone: +41 22 3654420
Fax: +41 22 3652221
Email: isf@worldseed.org

INVITED EXPERT

FORMER CHAIRPERSON OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Mr Marc VEREECKE
Zwaantje 3
9940 Sleidinge
Belgium
Email: vereecke.verlodt@pandora.be