



EUROPEAN AND MEDITERRANEAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION  
ЕВРОПЕЙСКАЯ И СРЕДИЗЕМНОМОРСКАЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИЯ ПО КАРАНТИНУ И  
ЗАЩИТЕ РАСТЕНИЙ  
ORGANISATION EUROPEENNE ET MEDITERRANEENNE POUR LA PROTECTION DES  
PLANTES

to: Mr Avetik Nersisyan  
FAO REU Plant Production and Protection Officer

13/18911

Paris, 14 August 2013

**TECHNICAL REPORT**  
**ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE WORKSHOP FOR CENTRAL ASIAN AND**  
**EASTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES ON DRAFT INTERNATIONAL**  
**STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

**Date and place of the Workshop**

---

The Workshop was held from Tuesday 16 July to Friday 19 July 2013 in Bykovo, Moscow region, Russia

**FAO-supported speaker**

---

1. Mr Avetik Nersisyan (FAO Office for Europe and Central Asia)

**IPPC-supported speaker**

---

1. Mr Craig Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)

**EPPO-supported speaker**

---

1. Mr Ringolds Arnitis (EPPO Secretariat)
2. Mr Andrei Orlinski (EPPO Secretariat)

**PowerPoint presentations, submitted by the FAO-supported speaker (in Russian)**

---

1. Draft ISPM on “Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood” (2006-029) - R. Arnitis (EPPO Secretariat)
2. Preliminary draft ISPM on “Minimizing pest movement by sea containers” (2008-001) – R. Arnitis (EPPO Secretariat)
3. Draft ISPM on “Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade” (2005-004) - R. Arnitis (EPPO Secretariat)
4. Draft ISPM on “Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management” (2005-010) – A. Orlinski (EPPO Secretariat)
5. Draft amendments to ISPM 5 “Glossary of phytosanitary terms”(1994-001) – A. Orlinski (EPPO Secretariat)
6. Draft Annex to ISPM 28:2007: “Irradiation for *Dysminococcus neobrevipes* BEARDSLEY, *Planococcus lilacinus* (COCKERELL) and *Planococcus minor* (MASKELL) (HEMIPTERA: PSEUDOCOCCIDAE):” (2012-011) – A. Orlinski (EPPO Secretariat)
7. National reporting obligations – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)
8. Invasive Alien Species and the IPPC – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)

9. Update on use and management of the phytosanitary resources page – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)
10. Single windows and customs unions – C. Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)

### **Information about the Workshop**

---

The Workshop lasted 4 days, according to the programme. Ten presentations (see above) were made, followed by questions and discussions.

The Workshop was attended by 42 participants coming from 19 countries including speakers and observers. Participants' background included management, inspection, research and regulation in the field of plant quarantine. The comments received regarding the organization and content of the Workshop have been largely positive.

The material distributed to the participants of the Workshop included dissemination material in English and Russian provided by EPPO, IPPC and FAO.

### **Publication of presentations**

---

There are no plans to publish proceedings of the Workshop as a separate publication. All presentations were made available to participants, speakers and observers.

### **Summary overview of draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) and summary of discussions**

---

The agenda for the Workshop prepared by the IPPC Secretariat was primarily focused on engaging Russian-speaking experts and experts from countries of former Yugoslavia in generating comments on the IPPC draft standards (and/or amendments to standards) currently open for review and comment under IPPC country consultation procedure. The Workshop also aimed to discuss the implementation of some international phytosanitary issues: national reporting obligations, invasive alien species and the IPPC, update on use and management of the phytosanitary resources page and single windows and customs unions. These discussions were intended to ensure that Russian-speaking experts and experts of former Yugoslavia countries were fully informed of the details of these issues. The meeting was conducted in Russian and English languages.

Six draft ISPMs (and/or amendments to ISPMs) has been discussed at the Workshop, all comments were made in Word format and included in the IPPC's on-line comment system (OCS).

1. Draft ISPM on "Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood" (2006-029) (given by R. Arnitis) generated several discussions including comments on some inconsistencies of the draft text with the Glossary (ISPM 5) and a lot of technical and editorial comments. For example, the expert working group (EWG) judged that no scales could be associated with wood without bark, the term "chemical diffusion" is confusing and should be replaced or defined in the Glossary, the use of pest free places of production is doubtful concerning wood. As a general comment, the EWG believed that the draft standard is too general and is more conceptual than providing guidance: it would be useful to complete it in future by more practical annexes (on phytosanitary treatments of wood, inspection and certification of wood, debarking and bark-free wood, etc.) on the example of ISPMs 27 and 28 (on diagnostics and treatments correspondingly).

2. Preliminary draft ISPM on "Minimizing pest movement by sea containers" (2008-001) (given by R. Arnitis) also entailed discussions with a lot of editorial and technical corrections. The general comment of the EWG was that the standard should not be limited by sea containers (there are a lot of countries that do not have access to any seas) but should cover all containers moving in international trade. A lot of inconsistencies of the draft text with the Glossary (ISPM 5) have been discovered. For example the use of "certification" was not consistent with the Glossary: in some cases it meant "authorisation" and in some cases "accreditation". The EWG believed that verification of cleanliness of 100% of containers is not feasible and therefore the frequency of this verification should be defined. The EWG also believed that production of a phytosanitary document (certificate?) on each container moved in international trade

is not feasible and require the level of protection which is not adequate to the risk and much more stringent than phytosanitary measures used for plants and plant products. Therefore, the proposed system of documenting containers should be revised.

3. Draft ISPM on “Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade” (2005-004) (given by R. Arnitis) did not provoke conceptual discussions but a lot of editorial and technical changes were proposed including the reorganization of some tables.

4. Draft ISPM on “Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management” (2005-010) (given by A. Orlinski) entailed discussions with some editorial and technical corrections. The responsibility of NPPO in fruit fly management was stressed by the EWG (not adequately reflected in the draft text).

5. Draft amendments to ISPM 5 “Glossary of phytosanitary terms” (1994-001) (given by A. Orlinski) generated several discussions and a lot of technical and editorial comments. The EWG considered that the term “exclusion” is not needed in addition to “phytosanitary measure” and “eradication” and will not be used in practice. The EWG believed that the term “contaminating pest” should cover all “regulated articles” and not only “commodities”. The definitions of “production site” and point of entry were substantially edited.

6. Presentation on draft annex to ISPM 28:2007: “Irradiation for *Dysminococcus neobrevipes* BEARDSLEY, *Planococcus lilacinus* (COCKERELL) and *Planococcus minor* (MASKELL) (HEMIPTERA: PSEUDOCOCCIDAE).” (2012-011) (given by A. Orlinski) entailed discussions with some editorial and technical corrections, for example giving more clarity that the proposed treatment has only a sterilising and not killing effect and its acceptability has to be decided by the NPPO concerned.

All comments of the Workshop to the discussed documents were formulated in Russian and translated into English during the meeting.

Presentations on implementation problems of ISPMs № 13 & 15 (given by C. Fedchock) provided details to participants on the concerns on implementation of these standards and related real and potential problems. Participants are expected to react to these presentations by sending their comments to the IPPC Secretariat.

Presentations on the national reporting obligations, invasive alien species and the IPPC, update on use and management of the phytosanitary resources page and single windows and customs unions (given by C. Fedchock) were of high interest for participants and entailed discussions about these phytosanitary issues.

The organization and support provided to participants from Russian NPPO was excellent. The meeting ran consistently within the intended timeframes, and the level of participation from all participants was very high. The comments were well thought out and indicative that the participants had a good familiarity with the material being discussed.

As a final discussion point, there was a general consensus, after some discussion, that the next EPPO/FAO Workshop for Russian-speaking Central Asian and Eastern European experts should take place at the Issyk-Kul Lake in Kyrgyzstan approximately in May 2014. Several phytosanitary issues were proposed as topic of this next workshop and it was finally decided that the EPPO Secretariat should investigate interests of countries and decide about the main topic.

Ringolds Arnitis  
Director General of EPPO

Paris, 2013-08-14