

IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW AND SUPPORT SYSTEM

Review of the Implementation of ISPM13

Cataloguing Challenges and Opportunities

**International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Via delle Terme di Caracalla 00153
Rome, Italy**

July 2012

Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)

ISPM13 Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) Questionnaire Results

Background

As requested by the Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement (SBDS) in response to issues raised at CPM-6, the IRSS study of ISPM13 will contribute to the overall review by the SBDS of its roles and functions. Together with members of the SBDS and the IPPC community at large, the IPPC Secretariat developed a brief questionnaire consisting of 10 questions targeted to 9 Regional Plant Protection Organizations. The questionnaire was sent to the Asia and the Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC), Comunidad Andina (CA), Comité de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE), Caribbean Plant Protection Commission (CPPC), European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO), Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC), North American Plant Protection Convention (NAPPO), Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA) and the Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) and the Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO).

Scope

The questionnaire was developed in consultation with several staff members of the IPPC Secretariat and in consultation with members of the SBDS. The questionnaire consists of 10 questions which cover potential areas of support that NPPOs may or may not receive from RPPOs in issues under the scope of ISPM13.

Results

Comprehensive feedback was received only from the following 2 RPPOs.

- COSAVE
- APPPC

NEPPO declined to respond as it is in its formative stages of its development and does not yet have the capacity to support countries on issues where ISPM13 applies. The responses did not show any

commonalities. In the case of the APPC, it has been noted that member countries have not requested its support on any issues pertaining to ISPM13. Consequently, the RPPO does not provide guidance to its members. In the case of COSAVE, the respondent lists a number of actions taken by the RPPO, which suggests strong support for its members on issues pertaining to ISPM13.

According to the responses, the RPPOs do not get involved in the bilateral processes between NPPOs as notifications are purely exchanged between NPPOs which, themselves, determine the cases considered to be significant. Hence, no guidance is sought or given in this regard.

In terms of actions taken by RPPOs in support of resuming normal trade between members, a number of actions have been described. Namely:

1. Training workshops on PRA
2. Training on ISPMs
3. Training on inspection and diagnostics
4. Implementation of projects for capacity developed in phytosanitary measures
5. Development of RSPMs
6. Training on the use of the IPP

In regard to resuming trade between members of the RPPO and other countries from other regions, the actions given by the APPPC, include but are not limited to:

1. Development of PRA on South American Leaf Blight (SALB)
2. Development of RSPM No. 7 (for SALB)
3. Revised regional agreement of plant protection (relating to SALB)
4. Collaboration with Brazil NPPO for SALB
5. Development of contingency plan for SALB
6. Development of importation requirements (phytosanitary) for preventing introduction of SALB into the region
7. Training workshop on SALB
8. Development of training materials for phytosanitary measures for SALB

For all the questions pertaining to RPPO assistance to members in the reaction, investigation, and proposed corrective actions to take in instances of significant non-compliance, the RPPOs indicated

1. Training on ISPMs

2. Advice on using IPPC SBDS

In regard to the estimation of potential disputes having been resolved through bilateral means by respective RPPO members in the past three years, RPPOs did not have access to this information from members and, in addition, indicated that almost all potential disputes were resolved through bilateral means.

Conclusion

There was very limited response by the RPPOs to this first IRSS questionnaire directed specifically to the RPPOs. However, based on the information presented by the two that responded, there seems to be little engagement between the IPPC and RPPOs, and markedly low level of exchange of information relating to issues under the scope of ISPM13 between those RPPOs and their members. Only one RPPO indicated the existence of concrete examples of the provision of support to its members.