Regional workshop for the review of phytosanitary surveillance in the context of the IPPC Standard (ISPM 6) - Identification of challenges and best practice in the Caribbean Sub-region
24-26 January 2012
UN House, Hastings, Barbados

FINAL REPORT

1. Opening of the session

The Workshop was held under the auspices of the FAO Sub-Regional Office for the Caribbean (SLC). It was facilitated by the SLC Plant Production and Protection Officer (Ms. Vyjayanthi Lopez) who is also the Reporting Officer (RO). Fifteen representatives from 14 FAO Members participated in the activity (Annex 1): Antigua & Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados (two participants), Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts/Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname and Trinidad & Tobago. In addition, Ms. Carol Thomas, Agricultural Health and Food Safety Specialist, InterAmerican Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA-Barbados) was invited and participated in the activities on 24 and 26 January.

The Opening Session was addressed by the Sub-Regional Coordinator (SRC) for the Caribbean, Mrs. Florita Kentish, who set the context of the Workshop and provided the background of the IPPC Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS) Programme (Annex 2). In summary: the IRSS has two components: the *Implementation review system* (IRS) and the *Implementation support system* (ISS), to be used along with other information collected by the IPPC and other relevant organizations. The expected product of the IRSS is the *Implementation review response* (IRR) which summarizes the situation of the implementation of the IPPC and its standards by contracting parties every three years. This serves to generate pragmatic action plans for the IPPC that would guide development of the work programme. The IRR has a strategic value and is to be used by the subsidiary bodies of the IPPC, in particular those concerned with approving the IPPC strategic plan and capacity building strategy.

2. Purpose of the workshop

The RO noted that this agenda item would be subsumed under Agenda Item 3 “IPPC Overview”.

3. IPPC overview

3.1 Progress with ISPM development

The RO provided an overview of the IPPC (the Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) and its administrative framework: the Bureau, the IPPC Secretariat, the Standards Committee and the Expert Working Groups and Technical Panels), including the progress with ISPM development.

Several matters were discussed arising from the presentation, as follows.

Ms. Carol Thomas of IICA noted that it is very important to be involved in the CPM Meeting and also in the various sub-committee meetings. The RO noted that this was the reason why the FAO, as far as possible, facilitates regional participation in IPPC activities. Ms. Thomas informed the meeting that IICA had been selected to manage a four-year project, funded by the European Union (EU) as a component of the Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA). The project is scheduled to begin in 2012 and seeks, among other things, to support (1) the presence of the region at international meetings such as the CPM, and (2) training at various levels. Ms. Thomas noted that the EU-CARIFORUM project will shortly be officially announced. On this matter, Dominica noted that there is a specific need for regional standards which should also be addressed through this project.

4. Adoption of Agenda

The participants unanimously elected the Representatives from Barbados (Mr. Bret Taylor) and Antigua & Barbuda (Ms. Janil Gore Francis) as the Chair and the Rapporteur, respectively. Dominica moved the motion for the adoption of the Agenda (Annex 3) and this was seconded by Trinidad and Tobago.

5. ISPM 6

5.1. Overview of ISPM 6

5.1.1 General surveillance

5.1.2 Specific surveillance

Having presented the content of ISPM 6, the RO remarked that much information is generated through research but that the information is largely unavailable or inaccessible. Several issues emanated from the subsequent discussion on this item, namely:-

- Countries must be transparent with respect to declaration of the status of pests of quarantine importance
- The confidence of trading partners will be increased once a country's practices are consistently transparent
- Regarding voucher specimens, it was noted that many countries have insect specimens but few maintain pathogen samples. Storage and maintenance was reportedly a major problem. Jamaica noted the practice of the University of the West Indies to copyright theses for three years before the information can be widely available within which time usefulness of the information is diminished. It was suggested that representative samples from Jamaica could be deposited with the Institute of Jamaica and that each country could seek similar arrangements. Increased funding could then be sourced for maintenance of the collection.

5.2 Summary of results of the questionnaire

5.2.1 In the region

5.2.1 Internationally

The presentation on ISPM6, focusing on General and Specific surveillance, set the backdrop for the review of the standard in the Caribbean sub-region. Several points of interest were raised in the ensuing discussion and included the following.

- There is a 20-point programme for laboratory accreditation which countries can access through the respective Bureau of Standards at the national level (or CROSQ at the regional level) and of which they should take advantage.
- The results of the questionnaire could be used as justification for applying for funding to address some of the common issues.
- Several countries experienced problems accessing the IPP website to complete the questionnaire online. A Word version was subsequently provided to facilitate completion of the questionnaire by those countries which experienced this problem.

6. Review of best practices for phytosanitary pest surveillance

6.1 Country reports on best practices

In the Country Reports, the participants presented the surveillance activities in their respective countries, highlighting some of the best practices. These encompassed pests that have posed quarantine problems in recent times, including several Fruit fly species, Giant African Snail, Pink and Papaya Mealybugs, Citrus Greening and its vector (Asian Citrus Psyllid), other citrus pests (Canker, Tristeza), Black Sigatoka in Bananas and Cotton Pests (Annex 4).

7. The use of ISPM 6 in the region

7.1 Discussions on advantages in the use of the standard

The standard:

- is useful for countries with small economies and provides a starting point for the conduct of surveillance activities, structured surveys and scientifically based PRAs
- is user-friendly and recipe-based
- has been used for pest reporting in fulfillment of trade obligations including the WTO-SPS Agreement - applying standards allow for winning and settlement of disputes
- can be used as a negotiating tool and to seek funding
- helps a country to stand up to scientific scrutiny and allows compliance with transparency
- contains suitable surveillance procedures that aid in the declaration of Pest Free Areas, Areas of Low Pest Prevalence, etc.
- is a means to an end – result used for number of purposes such as:
    - early detection of pests
    - support phytosanitary activities / interventions
    - development and updating of country pest lists through establishment of the presence or absence of a pest
    - guidance to Enquiry Points and aids in trade facilitation
    - a base for capacity building: staff, databases
    - information gathering and sharing.
- can be used as a guide in data generation aimed at dispute settlement

- helps to identify stakeholders and promotes collaboration among and with them
- provides avenues for better public awareness campaigns
- facilitates easier access to external funding and technical assistance
- promotes trust between trading partners (transparency)
- shows the need for pest surveillance manuals (assist in record keeping and integrity of data)
- facilitates the detection of entry pathways (legal, illegal)
- advises a country's legislative process in dealing with quarantine and other pests

7.2 Discussions on the difficulties in implementation of ISPM 6

- Limited resources (human, financial, other)
- Lack of political will at the country level
- Lack of resources to access scientific information to establish surveys
- Costs to implement can be monumental (incl. skilled personnel, capacity building, digitizing data, tools, equipment, diagnostic services, etc.)
- Lack of effective legislative framework
- Requires access to skilled personnel/subject matter specialists
- Lack or deficiency of capacities / skills in most countries:
    - Diagnostic capabilities / services / support
    - Data entry
- Training needs are high (survey methodology, symptom recognition, data capture and management, management skills for technical heads)
- Transparency issues (countries might not be forthcoming with pest status due to possible bans)
- Needs guidelines (Appendices) to conduct specific surveys (General, delimiting, detection)-site examples of case studies
- Establishing priority – surveillance activities/pest/political directorate i.e. other national policies/projects
- Economies of scale – effective programmes require the same resources/ capacities but Caribbean countries lack the resources to comply and the cost benefit may not be positive

- To establish survey site - need pathway analysis but lacks records/data on trade/movement of people etc. to do risk analysis for pathway of spread – also experience show that it is not the means of introduction into a country
- Difficult to conduct commodity survey – lack of resources as discussed above

8. Requirements for improving national pest surveillance

8.1 Suggested tools and technical resources needed to implement ISPM 6

- Experts in survey and experimental designs, statisticians, plant pest epidemiology and other specialists
- Equipment and tools
    - Trapping materials and supplies
    - Standard Operating Procedures; Manuals for specific pest surveys
    - Laboratory and survey equipment – microscope, digital cameras
    - Visual aids, training manuals, training in management, subject specialists, information, GIS, database, public awareness
    - Access to scientific reference material
    - Hardware & software, maps (GIS) [promotes a proactive approach]
    - Data management (computers, pen drives, software)
- Diagnostics:
    - identification keys, accredited laboratories, pest museums
    - Pathogen diagnostic equipment, materials (e.g. PCR machines)
    - GIS technology and tools
- Transportation (vehicles)
- Internet access

8.2 Recommendations for improving ISPM 6

- Reference to other ISPMs as appropriate
- An appendix of references for standard procedures for pest preservation, preparation, storage

9. Future work

9.1 Contributions to this project (symposium, preparation of training material)

9.2 Work in the region

- Development of a transparent system or mechanism for sharing resources and expertise
    - Regional databases (pest, commodity)
    - Harmonization of records including surveillance forms
- Good practices should be examined and made known to stakeholders
- Establishment of working groups to develop technical documents, manuals, pathway analysis, SOPs and the like, a process to be guided by the relevant experts
- Expansion of Guidelines for auditing /quality control
- Capacity building in GIS, management, subject specialist, information, database, public awareness
- Expand targeted surveys to include indicator plants (sentinels) in high risk areas, defining the terms with examples – high risk areas, sentinel plants, ports of entry
- Development of a mechanism for sharing technical information, methodologies, public awareness and experiences
- Assistance in updating/preparing and publishing pest lists and natural enemies – need for technical assistance from FAO and other affiliates upon request from individual countries
- Audit of Caribbean region to identify technical resources based on gaps identified and see how some of these can be addressed
- Develop harmonized manuals to facilitate transportation of biological materials in order to access external laboratory services and for diagnostic purposes
- Development and compilation of training manuals for various pest types
- Develop standard database for pest information (incl GIS)
- Request USDA for extending assistance to increase participation in the CPDN (provide digital imagery equipment, etc.)

10. Any other business

10.1. Recommendations on what needs to be revised in ISPM 4

- Cite the ISPM that speaks to the transporting produce from the PFA through infested areas to the point of export
- Cross-references with later standards should be included

10.2. Recommendations on what needs to be revised in ISPM 8

- Section 2.1 re: inclusions in a pest record: there is a suggestion to also include in the pest record the authority for the identity of the pest (reliability)
- Suggestion to move the Table – "Guidance for evaluating the reliability of a pest record" – into an Appendix rather than within the body of the standard.
- Cross-references with later standards should be included
- Re: section 3 (pest status) – recommendation made to look at the real meaning of the terms and include clearer descriptions. For example, "transient" and "present under eradication" appear to be saying the same thing. The text and glossary usage of some terms do not agree.

11. Adoption of report

The Bahamas proposed that the report be adopted and the motion was seconded by Grenada. The Report was unanimously accepted.

12. Workshop Evaluations and Close

All but one participant completed the on-line Workshop Evaluation.

Due to other commitments, the SRC was unable to officiate at the closing of the Workshop and the RO conveyed her apologies. The RO thanked the participants for their full and enthusiastic involvement in all the activities, and the spirited but cordial discussions. The Chairman expressed his appreciation of the participants for their support and in particular the Rapporteur for keeping track of the proceedings and assisting with the Report. Several representatives spoke on behalf of the participants thanking the facilitator and the FAO/UN staff who worked behind the scenes in making the activity a success. Participants also expressed their appreciation to Ms. Carol Thomas of IICA for her interventions and for the information she had shared on the EU-funded SPS project. The Workshop ended on this note.

Report submitted by:
Vyjayanthi F. Lopez, Plant Production and Protection Officer, FAO Sub-Regional Office for the Caribbean (SLC)

Annex 1. List of participants

Name of Participant Country	Designation	E-mail 1	E-mail 2	Telephone	Fax
Dr. Janil Gore-Francis Antigua and Barbuda	Plant Protection Officer	plantprotection@antigua.gov.ag	janilg@yahoo.com	268-764-1255	268-562-1923
Mr. Ryan Anselm Dominica	Head, Plant Protection and Quarantine Services	anselmpope@hotmail.com	agriquarantine@gmail.com	767-266-3803/3820	767-448-8632
Mr. Paul Graham Grenada	Head, Pest Management Unit	paulgraham@spiceisle.com	pestmanageentunitgda@spiceisle.com	473-440-0019/ 473-440-2708	473-440-4191
Ms. Jeanelle Kelly St. Kitts / Nevis	Agricultural Officer	quarantinedoastk@hotmail.com		869-465-2335	869-465-2928
Mr. Lucius Alexander St. Lucia	Crop Protection Officer	l_alexander69@yahoo.com	l_alexander69@hotmail.com	758-468-5600/ 716-8329	758-450-5206
Michael Delpeche St. Vincent & the Grenadines	Plant Protection Officer	michaeldelpy@yahoo.com		784-528-4171	
Ms. Ruth Gwendolyn Hammerton The Bahamas	Senior Agricultural Officer	gwendolynhammerton@bahamas.gov.bs	gwenhammerton@yahoo.com	242-397-7426; 242-325-7502; 242-322-7859	242-325-3960
Mr. Francisco Gutierrez Belize	Technical Director, Plant Health Services	frankpest@yahoo.com	baha@btl.net	501-824-4899	501-824-3773
Mr. Royden Glen Guyana	Plant Protection Officer (Ag.)	groyden@yahoo.com		592-220-2075/ 592-220-2456	592-220-5858
Ms. Marina Young Jamaica	Senior Plant Protection/Food Safety Officer	youngm@rada.gov.jm	marina.young@mail.ru	876-468-7019	

M. Pierre Charlemagne Charles Haiti	Assistant Director, Plant Protection	piecharles1055@yahoo.com	piecharles1055@gmail.com	509-37801321	
Sadhana Jankie Suriname	2nd Head Plant Protection Division	ppsur@sr.net	sadjan349@yahoo.com	597-402040	597-403912
Sumattie Gosine Trinidad and Tobago	Agricultural Officer I, Research Div, Min. of Food Production, Land & Marine Affairs	gsumattie@hotmail.com		868-646-4335,6,7; Cell: 868- 731-1577	868-642-0718
Mr. Bret Taylor Barbados	Agricultural Officer	bmtay@hotmail.com		246-310-2821	246-428-7777
Mr. Ian Gibbs Barbados	Entomologist	ianhgibbs@yahoo.com		246-434-5103	246-428-7777

Annex 2. Opening Address by Mrs. Florita Kentish, Sub-Regional Coordinator (SRC) for the Caribbean

It gives me great pleasure to Welcome you to Barbados and to the *Regional workshop for the Global review of phytosanitary surveillance in the context of the IPPC Standard (ISPM6) – identification of challenges and best practice.* A special welcome to Ms. Carol Thomas of IICA who has worked tirelessly for many years to support the development and implementation of plant health standards in the Caribbean.

The Workshop is is being held under the Implementation Review and Support System" (IRSS) Programme of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). It is being facilitated by the Sub-Regional Office (SLC) of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in conjunction with the Secretariat of the IPPC, which as you know is housed at the FAO HQ in Rome.

In 2008, at its Third Session, the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM-3) adopted the Programme for the Development of the Implementation Review and Support System" or IRSS. In 2009 and 2010, the IPPC Secretariat focused on obtaining funding to initiate the three-year IRSS programme using the project funding approach agreed to by CPM-3. In 2011, the European Union generously provided USD 540,900 (€ 400,000) and the IRSS activities began formally on 1 January 2011. The IRSS has the primary objective of facilitating and promoting the implementation of the IPP Convention and ISPMs, and is expected contribute to a number of goals of the IPPC strategic plan.

The IRSS has two major components: the *Implementation review system* (IRS) and the *Implementation support system* (ISS), to be used along with other information collected by the IPPC and other relevant organizations. The expected product of the IRSS is the *Implementation review response* (IRR) which will summarize the situation of the implementation of the IPPC and its standards by contracting parties every three years. This will serve to generate pragmatic action plans for the IPPC that would guide development of the work programme.

In preparation for the current review, a detailed questionnaire on ISPM 6 was prepared for inputs from NPPOs. The Steward for the review of ISPM6 will use the data to update the standard. Furthermore, the survey was conducted as part of a general global study on the implementation challenges and best practices for pest surveillance which aims to collect baseline data. The survey was conducted in December and the deadline for its completion had to be extended twice due to low response levels. In addition, the survey did not reach all NPPO Contact Points due to out-of-date or missing contact information.

The IRSS team is collaborating closely with the field resources of FAO to implement the study on ISPM6 and is relying on the goodwill of the Regional Plant Protection Organizations to ensure their members completed the IRSS questionnaires. As there is no functional Regional Plant Protection Organization in the Caribbean, SLC provided the necessary support to the IRSS team in obtaining responses from the Caribbean.

It is anticipated that the baseline data will presented at the 7th CPM in March 2012 and further analysis will be conducted by experts in a symposium hosted by the Asia Pacific Plant Protection Convention (APPPC) shortly after CPM. I can see that you have a full Agenda and that you are all prepared and ready to begin the activities. I wish you fruitful deliberations and anticipate that the outcomes from this activity will benefit you all in the long run.

Annex 3. Agenda Regional workshop for the review of phytosanitary surveillance in the context of the IPPC Standard (ISPM6) – identification of challenges and best practice, 24-26 January 2012, UN House, Barbados

Tuesday 24 January 2012

No.	Item	Time
1.	**Opening of the session**	**8.30 – 9.15**
	- Remarks – Sub-Regional Coordinator	8.30 – 8.45 am
	- Logistics	8.45 – 9.00 am
	- introductions	9.00 – 9.15 am
2.	**Purpose of the workshop**	**9.15 – 9.30 am**
3.	**IPPC overview** (SLC Plant Production and Protection Officer)	**9.30 – 10 am**
	- Progress with ISPM development	
4.	**Adoption of agenda**	**10.00 – 10.15 am**
	- election of chair and rapporteur	
	- times of the sessions	
	- any other business	
	Coffee Break	**10.15 – 10.45 am**
5.	**ISPM6**	**10.45 – 11.45 am**
	- Overview of ISPM6 - General surveillance - Specific surveillance	10.45 – 11.15 am
	- Summary of results of questionnaire - In the region - Internationally	11.15 – 12 noon
	- Discussion on results of questionnaire	12.00 – 12.45 pm
	Lunch Break	**12.45 – 1.45 pm**
6.	**Review of best practices for phytosanitary pest surveillance**	**1.45 – 4.45 pm**
	Coffee break	**3.30 – 3.45 pm**
	- Presentation of country best practices by each delegate (15 minutes per delegate) **15 min x 12 = 3 hours**	**(continue country presentations)**
	End of Day 1	

Wednesday 25 January

No.	Item	Time
7.	**The use of ISPM 6 in the region** (open or breakout group discussions)	**8.30 – 12.30 am**
	- Based on presentations, discussions on: - Advantages in the use of the standard - Difficulties in implementation of ISPM6	
	Coffee Break	**10.30 – 11.00 am**
	Lunch	**12.30-1.30 pm**
8.	**Requirements for improving national pest surveillance**	**1.30 – 3.30 pm**
	- The identification of the tools and technical resources needed to implement ISPM6	
	- Recommendations for improving ISPM6	
9.	**Future work**	**3.30 – 4.30 pm**
	- Contributions to this project (symposium, preparation of training material)	
	- Work in the region	
	End of Day 2	

Thursday 26 January

No.	Item	Time
10.	**Any other business**	**8.30 – 10.30 am**
	1. Consideration of what needs to be revised in ISPM 4	
	2. Consideration of what needs to be revised in ISPM 8	
	Coffee Break	**10.30 – 11.00 am**
11.	**Preparation and Adoption of Report**	**11.00 – 12.45 pm**
	Lunch	**12.45 – 1.45 pm**
12.	**Final Remarks and Close of Workshop**	**1.45 – 2.30 pm**
	End of Workshop	

Annex 4. Summary of Country Reports on Surveillance activities and benefits

Country	Surveillance activity	Benefits
Antigua & Barbuda	Cotton pests and natural enemies	Pest and natural enemy list; better crop management
Bahamas	Citrus canker in Abaco	Continued export of citrus to the United States (USA)
Barbados	Hibiscus Mealybug, Giant African Snail	Experience in surveys / surveillance
Belize	Medfly programme Pink Hibiscus Mealybug Citrus pest (HLB, Leprosis, Canker, CVC) Tuta absoluta	Establishment of pest-free areas; continued export to the USA
Dominica	West Indian Fruit fly/Exotic Fruit fly species Giant African Snails (GAS) Black Sigatoka & Moko Palm pests, including lethal yellowing Citrus Greening, Tristeza Virus and Canker Avocado Lace Bug	Confirm presence and absence of pest / pest-free areas; continued export to the USA and other countries
Grenada	Fruitfly	Establishment of pest-free areas; continued export to the USA
Guyana	Carambola Fruit fly	Establishment of pest-free areas; continued export to the USA
Haiti	Fruit fly, coffee berry borer, black sigatoka, pink mealybug	Establishment of pest-free areas; continued export to the USA; plan for general surveillance
Jamaica	Medfly and Giant African Snail (A1 pests, not present) Pink Hibiscus and Papaya Mealybugs Red Palm Mite Papaya Ringspot Virus Moko disease Ginger Rhizome Rot Citrus greening	PRA Unit monitoring of pests of local economical importance. Establishment of pest-free areas; continued export to the USA Jamaica pest list 2001 being populated and need formal updating and publishing
St. Kitts/Nevis	Cotton seed bug	Confirmation of pest freedom
St. Lucia	Black Sigatoka	Establishment of pest-free areas; integrated pest management continued export to Europe and the

		Caribbean
St. Vincent & the Grenadines	Fruit fly	Establishment of pest-free areas; continued export to the USA
Suriname	Carambola Fruit fly	Establishment of pest-free areas; continued export to the USA and other countries
Trinidad & Tobago	Pests not present: Fruit flies *Rhynchophorus ferrugineus*, red palm weevil *Cylas formicarius*, sweet potato weevil Frosty pod rot in cocoa Pests present: *Euscepes porcellus* *Boheman, nr postfasciatus* Red palm mite Giant African snail	Confirm presence and absence of pest / pest-free areas