

# Report of the 14<sup>th</sup> APPPC Regional Workshop for the Review of Draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures

## 28 Oct.-1 Nov., 2013

### Seoul, Republic of Korea



## Summary

The meeting was opened by the Commissioner of the Korean Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency, Dr Yong Ho Park and with updates on the IPPC business and standard setting changes.

The participants discussed and made comments on the following draft ISPMs:

- Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade. It was suggested that the first section of the requirements be reorganised into two sections – pest risk analysis and pest risk management options.
- Phytosanitary procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) management. Minor amendments were proposed. As this document presents information it was thought suitable as an appendix.
- Management of pest risks associated with the international movement of wood. Participants felt that ISPM 15 should deal with WPM, not this ISPM.
- Minimizing pest movement by sea containers. The difficulty with this subject was noted particularly in having an equivalent level of implementation in all countries.
- Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms. It was suggested that the “point of entry” definition be modified.

Presentations were made and discussions held on the following additional subjects: ePhyto, National reporting obligations, Phytosanitary technical resources, Participation in the standard setting process, the Implementation review and support system, Invasive alien species, and the Single window.

## **Report**

### **1. Opening Session**

The participants introduced themselves. Dr Piao Yongfan noted that participants will be asked to update their details on the APPPC web site.

#### ***Welcome address by Republic of Korea***

Commissioner Yong Ho Park addressed the meeting. He welcomed participants to Korea. The crucial role of Asia in agriculture, trade and environmental protection was stressed. He then said that Korea will try to continue to support this workshop and other work of the IPPC and APPPC.

Commissioner Park hoped that participants would enjoy their stay in Korea with the beautiful seasonal colours.

#### ***Opening address by FAO***

Dr Piao welcomed participants to the meeting. He thanked QIA of Korea for its hosting of the meeting for the 8<sup>th</sup> time. The workshops are important to share and develop viewpoints on the draft ISPMs and allow countries to prepare their consultation comments on the drafts. There are more and more comments being submitted by Asian countries. More of the younger officials of Asian country NPPOs are becoming familiar with the IPPC and its work. These workshops are also including discussion on more regional aspects of the plant protection work in the region.

Dr Piao noted that the recent APPPC session had suggested that there would be a regional meeting on the ePhyto system at some time during the next two years. He also stated that the information systems are most important and that the information on NPPOs needs to be constantly updated.

### **2. Presentation of updates**

#### ***IPPC Business***

This was introduced by Dr Kyu Ock Yim. The update had been prepared by the IPPC Secretariat. The discussions on the Bureau chair and the new standard setting process used in CPM 8 were noted. Further work on the registering of the ISPM 5 symbol is needed. Funds are available to assist with this. The work on a number of standards was discussed at CPM 8 including the drafts on sea containers, the specification for the ISPM on grain, and the work on ePhyto. A clear financial report was presented at CPM 8. The national reporting obligations of contracting parties are to be developed with a special advisory group.

The responsibility for the IPPC in FAO has moved to the ADG Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department. The relationships with more organisations was described (CBD, CABI, WCO). The financial support of the IPPC is still a matter for concern.

The SPG meeting was held recently. Matters discussed included implementation of the IPPC and ISPMs. As surveillance is a fundamental activity, this will be used as the subject for a

pilot system. This will be presented at CPM 9. The work on ePhyto was presented including considerations on and evaluation of the hub system. This is likely to involve a user fee and is a potential financial resource for the IPPC. The results of the ePhyto hub study will be presented to CPM 9.

The funds of the Trust fund are being used for IPPC activities but some funds will be carried over to the following year. The IPPC is acting in a more coordinated way but still procedures could be improved. It is essential that Asian countries have a good understanding of the IPPC activities.

### ***Standard setting process***

Dr Hedley introduced this item. The presentation developed by the IPPC Secretariat was used. Dr Piao described the stages for consultation and development of the ISPMs.

### **3. Adoption of the agenda**

Election of chair – New Zealand nominated Dr Yim. The meeting agreed to this nomination.

Election of rapporteur – Dr Hedley was nominated. The meeting agreed to this nomination.

OCS assistance – Malaysia was nominated.

### **4. Review and discussion of draft ISPMs**

#### ***Review of Draft 1: 2005-004: Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade***

This was introduced by Mr Sakamura. He stated that the movement of soil etc with plants was a most difficult area for consideration. It is difficult to remove all growing media from plants. Many countries prohibit such material from accompanying plants. A definition of soil was proposed for this ISPM only. The factors affecting pest risk were noted. The annexes and appendices were discussed. Dr Yim questioned the purpose of this standard. Mr Sakamura said this draft offered guidance in assessing the pest risk involved.

General comments – Thailand suggested that this draft should be annex for ISPM 36. However, Mr Sakamura felt that this subject is of wide application and should be a stand-alone standard. There was no general agreement on this subject.

Later discussion led to a rearrangement of the sections in the requirements section.

Title – could delete “in international trade” as unnecessary. This is present in the titles of two

ISPMs – but is not really needed. Mr Sakamura suggested the removal of “Movement of”. Introduction in the draft document should be all capitals.

Para 9 - Scope should be consistent with the title –i.e. ...of the pest risk of growing media in association with (not accompanying) plants for planting... to facilitate pest risk management of such growing media in international trade.

Para 10 - Animal and human health risks of growing media are also not considered.

Paras 11, 12 and 13 – these could be moved to Background paras 35 and 36

Paras regarding biodiversity could be added after 34.

Para 37 - use “associated with” instead of “accompanying..”

Thailand suggested an extra sentence relating to importing and exporting countries but this was not agreed to.

It was suggested that there be two main sections – PRA and pest risk management. Par 41 – deleted and Para 44 - is now 1. Section 2 and 3 should be part of section 1 subsection 1.2 and 1.3 Para 42 to beginning of 45 and last part of 43 goes to end of 1. Para 55 section is now 2.

Regarding transport – measures to prevent contamination of growing media during transportation – this could be a new 50 or a further point added to para 49.

Para 57 – it was decided to leave this as “plants”.

Para 58 – treatment of field or planting beds in a growing facility... was suggested but not agreed to.

Add to para 71 – In cases where non-compliance occurs the importing country may take phytosanitary action as noted in section 5.1.6 of ISPM 20.

It was suggested that this be a new section – but there was no agreement on this point.

Annex 1a was discussed. It was suggested that “pest risk” column be removed, the title be changed etc. Pest risk should be assessed on a case by case basis – this could be added to the footnote. But this was not agreed to.

It was suggested Annex 1a and b be changed to Appendices.

The risk level of sphagnum moss was questioned. The experience of the experts producing the table was noted.

Appendix 1 – suggested that the first row be removed. It was agreed to leave it.

Appendix 2 – Korea suggested this be deleted as it contains very little of use. Other countries wanted to keep it and have it developed to be more comprehensive. Japan agreed that this table does not cover all pests associated with growing media and could mislead the users.

The re-organised draft was considered by the group. Mr Sakamura presented a redraft.

***Review on Draft 2: 2005-010: Phytosanitary procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) management***

Dr Ha Thanh Huong presented the information on this draft and led the discussions. Hedley noted the need for this standard, the way it is written without requirements, and the order of the techniques described (suppression first). There were no comments on this.

There was some confusion about the use of the term fruit. In this standard it should be made clear that fruit refers to fruit and vegetable.

Para 6 – The title was accepted as it is.

It was suggested that paras 12-16 be deleted as the information is repeated later. This would need para 10 to be shortened so the “Objectives of” be removed.

It was suggested that all the numbers 1, 2, etc in the following sections be deleted. The Editor can deal with this.

Dr Hedley noted that this information was really not a standard. Two other members of the group agreed that this was information was more suitable for an appendix. This could be App 2 for ISPM 26. The meeting participants agreed with this.

Para 35 – considered “by NPPOs” was added to this sentence. This was agreed to.

Para 38 – it was suggested that this should be “ecobiology” or biology and ecology. This was not agreed to.

Add section 2.6 Evaluation of effectiveness – this should be done to convince importing countries – this is noted later para 102 etc.

Para 48 – remove ref to ISPM 26, as this is ISPM 26, throughout the draft.

Para 50 – add “infestation and” before preventing the development ... and change host tree to host plant. More detail could be added regarding resistant varieties and trap cropping.

It was suggested that some terms be explained by the TPFf e.g. fruit stripping (actually explained in para 51 but not under the name of fruit stripping), trap cropping. Or there could be a separate paragraph for this last sentence in para 51. And it would help if the sequence of the explanations should follow the sequence in para 50.

Para 66 - It was suggested that the last sentence be removed (concerning the altitude of flying aircraft over crops). The meeting did not disagree with this.

Para 71 - MAT should be added to the title and also Para 77 - SIT added.

Para 75 - orchard changed to commercial vegetable and fruit production site!

Para 76 - pest density changed to fruit fly density, pest changed to target fruit fly species

Para 89 - ...cool conditions....delete “less than 20 degrees C”

Para 99 - Quality control was discussed. This was not amended.

Trapping materials should be in accordance with app 1 of ISPM 26

***Review on Draft 3: 2006-029: Management of pest risks associated with the international movement of wood***

This draft was presented by Dr Hedley who also led the discussions.

There was a suggestion to amend the title – Guidelines on pest risk management of wood in international trade. This was not agreed to.

Para 8 - wood wool was proposed to be added after chips.

Para 9 - there was considerable discussion on the point that unmarked and untreated WPM could be covered under this standard. The group felt this should be reconsidered or rephrased to make the meaning clear. It was felt that this standard should not replace ISPM 15 with WPM.

Paras 10 and 11 – it was suggested that this section be moved to the background – as with normal practice.

Para 43 – it was suggested that the reference to pests in the 3<sup>rd</sup> line be limited to ...insects and wood-inhabiting nematodes. This was amended again later.

Para 59 - this could be made more clear by inserting after Table 1 including insect pests, fungi and nematodes.

Para 61 – Viet Nam suggested that the table be reconstructed under the headings of Bark, Wood without bark, Other ;green wood and soil.

Para 70 – It was suggested that the tables take account of other contaminants eg snails and weed seeds.

If the Viet Nam suggestion is followed, there would be consequential changes with table 2.

Para 87 - This should be amended to Sawdust and wood wool and para 88 would have the same change.

Para 93 - If the suggestion from Viet Nam is followed, there would be consequential changes in this table.

Para 105 – this could be rephrased – In case of fumigation is identified, NPPOs.... It was suggested that this para be moved to section 2.2.1

Paras 107-119 – it was suggested that bark related treatments were not significantly different from other treatments and should be included in a general section on treatments. Not all the group agreed with this suggestion.

Para 121 – add at the end of the para ...and Annex 1 of ISPM 15.

Para 174 – add at the end of the para – except for wood chips, sawdust, wood wool and wood residue.

Para 176 - remove “all” in second line and add at the end of the sentence “and to verify the wood species”.

***Review on Draft 4: 2008-001: Minimizing pest movement by sea containers***

This draft was presented and the discussion led by Dr Hedley.

China noted that the draft does not provide clear guidance to the sea container industry and suggested that the UN/ECE code of practice be considered when looking at the draft.

Japan provided detailed notes on the results of their considerations. It was stressed that there is a need to have the understanding of all parts of the industry. Further points included:

- The IPPC should provide workable guidance so all countries can operate at the same level
- There should be discussion with the sea container industry
- Requirements should be considered in light of real practice.

It was suggested that industry wants to use the code and not have a standard. This is the industry and government position.

In Korea the industry does not want to have government involvement. However, it was noted that if government is to be involved, industry would be forced to follow. This would increase the cost of the movement of sea containers but this would likely be fairly minimal.

The difference in the level of understanding of contracting parties in the matter of contamination of sea containers at CPM 7 was noted.

Sri Lanka has an awareness programme for exporters - to get clean containers for Australia and New Zealand. Now exporters are returning the sea containers to the company if they are not clean.

Mr Sakamura noted that industry understands the need for the implementation of the code of practice but there are differences between countries. Any standard and its requirements need to be universally applicable.

Korea noted the situation with ISPM 15. This started with the export situation then was implemented with imports. If a country wants more attention be paid to the sea containers – this requires an international standard to be available.

Scope – contains reference to empty and full containers. Should not refer to full containers outside of empty and full containers. Japan would like to have just sea containers moved in international trade – remove empty or full. Others felt that this should be retained.

It was suggested that depots be mentioned in the scope if they are such an integral part of the standard. Need also to add empty to the scope.

Note some criticism of definition of visual examination – don't need stereoscope or microscope. This definition refers to all types of visual examination and not just the examination of sea containers.

It was suggested by China that “mice and snakes” be added to the list of organisms.

Second to last para of 24 – remove last sentence as this confuses the issue (Thailand).

It was noted that the draft does not clearly identify the body to carry out the certification. Regarding the auditing procedure where a CAB would be audited by an IAB, it was asked if an NPPO would be subject to the same procedure. Also, the draft lacks a statement saying whether certification from other states is by a CAB or NPPO.

Nothing is mentioned about the work of the NPPO of the exporting country. The NPPO could be involved in the coordination of the certification of shipping lines.

The standard needs to have the terms for whatever is of concern – needs to be consistent so we can use organisms. And it might be appropriate to reconsider the title. It would be better if there was a standard phrase – like pests and other organisms.

In later discussion, Japan wanted to know if it would be feasible to implement the standard in all countries. Korea noted the incidence of AGM and the request of North America to inspect ship. Korea has created a new board which employs inspectors that can inspect ships going to North America, Chile and Australia. This new system was developed for this problem over a number of years. So the container inspection could be dealt with over a period of time as well. Korea has had a survey of the systems used to clean sea containers – and the containers are cleaned on the inside using a camera to detect contamination and then steam or high water pressure cleaning. So it would be possible to add the exterior cleaning. There could be government monitoring ... each depot is monitored (not each container) and the monitoring could be increased or decreased as necessary. It was noted that if there is a government requirement then industry would follow. Costs of transferring a sea container to US is about \$4000 and cleaning is only \$5 so an examination and cleaning if necessary could possibly be managed. All these things look more difficult than they are. Japan is concerned about the cost and whether all countries can implement equally. And they would like verification by government.

Dr Piao asked if it would be possible for NPPO officials from all countries to visit depots to learn about the processes used in their local industry. Thailand has sent the draft to the council concerning sea containers. The council believes the system is not needed. It was suggested that this could be a barrier to trade.

Another comment was that this could be a difficult standard to implement for developing countries. IMO etc have provided a draft code with useful information. Countries should look at the code and see what is done already. Japan noted the visit of Dr Hedley to share information with the NPPO and the industry.

China has conducted a survey with 60% of empty containers and have listed the pests involved. The Chinese delegate suggested that the code is probably not enough to control the phytosanitary risk and the standard will be more effective. Korea noted that many countries feel there is no risk. Also it was said that a survey would be very difficult to do.



***Review on Draft 5: 1994-001: Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms***

This was presented by Dr Hedley.

Point of entry – many members wanted to have “land border point” added back into the list again. One country want to add for the mention of crew as well as passengers. It was suggested that that following be added “where passengers and crew are cleared for quarantine purposes”.

One member asked what a measure was. Another country wanted to retain occurrence in the glossary. It was felt that there is a degree of impermanence with occurrence so differing from presence.

With the clarification of the understanding of “plants”, it was suggested that the IPPC keeps up to date with new developments of the area of terminology and new techniques. Some countries would like this addition to the scope to be adopted by CPM soon.

**5. Discussion on other topics related to IPPC**

**- ePhyto update**

This was presented by Mr Sakamura. This process would add to the single window mechanism. The system proposed would be a multilateral scheme and not be based on bilateral arrangements. This would use an ePhyto cloud with a standardised information structure. There is a feasibility study being conducted. Some countries are suggesting that the use of codes for ePhyto goes beyond the obligations of the standard. This will need to be discussed. Korea noted the complications involved with preparing bilateral arrangements for electronic systems. The use of a standard information arrangement with a hub system would be easier to use.

**- National reporting obligations**

This was presented by Dr Piao. He discussed how the single window needs to be related to the ePhyto system. CPM 9 will be an important meeting when these issues will be discussed. The role of the contact points was stressed in national reporting. In many countries the contact point is the DG and this means that considerable internal communication is needed to have an effective national reporting system. It is useful to have the Editor to supplement the role of the Contact point. It is essential that the role of CP is filled by the right person at the right level. The IPPC has established a National reporting advisory body. Tasanee is the representative from Asia.

**- Phytosanitary technical resources**

This was presented by Mr Kitahara of the IPPC Secretariat

**- Participation in the standard setting process**

This was presented by Dr Hedley.

**- Implementation Review and Support System**

This was presented by Dr Hedley

Some countries noted their experience with IRSS – this was mostly involvement with the surveys.

**- Invasive alien species**

This was presented by Mr Kitahara. The activities by countries in this area is limited. The links with the CBD were noted. Dr Piao stated that CPs need guidance on how CPs should relate to the CBD representatives in countries as well as analytical reference on both conventions' risk analysis. The areas of work and how collaboration might be achieved requires some support information.

**- Single window**

This was presented by Mr Kitahara. Because the development of single windows is based mainly with customs, NPPOs are encouraged to ensure they become involved in discussions. Some countries are moving in this direction. Pakistan noted that corruption was a problem when all powers were put in one area. Stringent audit procedures are needed. China has joint inspections. Viet Nam has developed a system which is coming into action shortly. There is a special arrangement with China regarding the acceptance of inspections. Sri Lanka has problems with imports with the single window system.

**6. Tentative date and venue for the 2014 consultation on draft ISPMs**

Dr Yim asked if participants if they can provide some financial contribution in following years to fund the transport or hotel accommodation as the budget for Korea's funding will not be increased so probably insufficient to fully fund all members.

It is proposed to hold the next meeting in the last week of October, 2014.

**7. Any other business**

Dr Piao noted that there were more substantive comments this year than in other years. This could be because of the later time of the meeting. He noted that all comments should be submitted individually by countries to the IPPC. Countries cannot assume that regional comments will be submitted and accepted by the IPPC Secretariat.

It was felt that the agenda items on the IPPC activities were useful. As long as this section of the meeting is not too long, it should be retained. Some regional workshops discuss prospective RSPMs.

**8. Closing of the meeting**

Dr Piao thanked the QIA for all the work they had put into the meeting. Dr Yim thanked the participants for their input into the meeting.

**Agenda**

**Monday**

- 8.30 - 8.55 am      Registration
- 8.55 - 9.20 am      **Agenda 1: Opening Session**  
- Welcome address by Republic of Korea  
- Opening address by FAO  
- Local and logistical information
- 9.20 - 10.00 am    **Agenda 2: Presentation of update**  
- Update IPPC business  
- Update on standard setting process
- 10.00 - 10.10 am    - Group photo

**10.10 - 10.30 am      Coffee break**

- 10.30 - 10.40 am    **Agenda 3: Adoption of agenda**  
- Election of chair  
- Election of rapporteur  
- Adoption of agenda
- 10.40 - 12.30 pm    **Agenda 4: Review and discussion on draft ISPMs**  
Review on Draft 1: 2005-004: Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade  
**OCS website:** <http://ocs.ippc.int/index.html>

**12.30 - 2.00 pm      Lunch break**

- 2.00 - 3.30 pm      Continuation of review on the draft 1

**3.30 - 4.00 pm      Coffee break**

- 4.00 - 5.30 pm      Review on Draft 2: 2005-010: Phytosanitary procedures for Fruit Fly (Tephritidae) management

**Tuesday**

- 8.30 - 10.30 am      Continuation of review on the draft 2

**10.30 - 11.00 am      Coffee break**

11.00 - 12.30 pm Review on Draft 3: 2006-029: Management of pest risks associated with the international movement of wood

**12.30 - 2.00 pm Lunch break**

2.00 - 3.30 pm Continuation of review on the draft 3

**3.30 - 4.00 pm Coffee break**

4.00 - 5.30 pm Review on Draft 4: 2008-001: Minimizing pest movement by sea containers

**Wednesday**

8.30 - 10.30 am Continuation of review on the draft 4

**10.30 - 11.00 am Coffee break**

11.00 - 12.30 pm Review on Draft 5: Review on Draft 5: 1994-001: Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms

**12.30 - 2.00 pm Lunch break**

2.00 - 3.30 pm Continuation of review on the draft 5

**3.30 - 4.00 pm Coffee break**

4.00 - 5.30 pm **Agenda 5: Discussion on other topics related to IPPC**

- ePhyto update
- National reporting obligations
- Phytosanitary technical resources
- Participation in the standard setting process
- IRSS
- IPPC and IAS
- Single windows

**Thursday**

Field trip

**Friday**

8.30 - 10.30 am Continuation of **Agenda 5: Discussion on other topics related to IPPC**

- ePhyto update
- National reporting obligations
- Phytosanitary technical resources

- Participation in the standard setting process
- IRSS

**10.30 - 11.00 am** **Coffee break**

11.00 - 12.30am Continuation on Agenda5

**12.30 - 2.00 pm** **Lunch break**

2.00 - 3.30pm **Agenda 6: Tentative date and venue for the 2014 consultation on draft ISPMs**

On-line participant survey (each participant should fill the on-line form) <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/IPPCregionalworkshops>

**3.30 - 4.00pm** **Coffee break**

4.00 - 4.30 pm **Agenda 7: Any other business**

4.30 - 4.40 pm Closing Session

**List of Participants****BANGLADESH**

Md. Ahsan Ullah  
Quarantine Entomologist  
Room #, 403, rear Building  
Plant Protection Wing  
Department of Agricultural Extension  
Khamarbari, Dhaka-1215  
Cell : + 88 01715041099  
Phone : + 88 028114740  
Fax : + 88 029111554  
E. mail : [ullah61@yahoo.com](mailto:ullah61@yahoo.com); [aullah61@gmail.com](mailto:aullah61@gmail.com)

**CAMBODIA**

Dr. Preap Visarto  
Director of Plant Protection Sanitary and Phytosanitary Department  
Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries  
Phnom Penh, Cambodia  
Email: [preapvisarto777@yahoo.com](mailto:preapvisarto777@yahoo.com)

**CHINA**

1. Ms.Liu Hui  
National Agro-Tech Extension and Service Centre  
Ministry of Agriculture, P. R. China  
No. 20 Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District  
Beijing, 100026, China  
Tel: 8610-13126816387  
Fax: 010-59194526  
Email: [liu\\_hui@agri.gov.cn](mailto:liu_hui@agri.gov.cn)

2. Ms. Wu Xingxia  
General Administration of Quality Supervision  
Inspection and Quarantine of the People's Republic Of China  
No.9 Madian west Road, Beijing, China,100088  
Tel: 8610-13520592618  
Fax:010-84603817  
Email: [wuxx@aqsiq.gov.cn](mailto:wuxx@aqsiq.gov.cn)

3. Ms. CHIU Wan Yuen Alice  
Agricultural Officer  
Plant and Pesticides Regulatory Division, Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation  
Department of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region

5/F., Cheung Sha Wan Government Offices, 303 Cheung Sha Wan Road, Kowloon,  
Hong Kong  
Tel.: (852) 2150 7166  
Fax: (852) 2736 9904  
Email: [alice\\_wy\\_chiu@afcd.gov.hk](mailto:alice_wy_chiu@afcd.gov.hk)

### **INDONESIA**

Mr. Hermawan, MSc.,  
Head, Sub-Div. of Seed Import Quarantine  
Email: [hermawan@deptan.go.id](mailto:hermawan@deptan.go.id); [hermawan1961@gmail.com](mailto:hermawan1961@gmail.com)

### **JAPAN**

1. Motoi SAKAMURA (Mr.)  
Director General,  
Kobe Plant Protection Station,  
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)  
Address: 1-1, Hatobacho, Chuoku, Kobe 6500042, JAPAN  
Tel: +81-78-331-3430  
Fax: +81-78-391-1757  
Email address: [sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp](mailto:sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp)

2. Masahiro SAI (Mr.)  
Deputy Director,  
Plant Protection Division, Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau, MAFF  
Address: 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, JAPAN  
Tel: +81-3-3502-5978  
Fax: +81-3-3502-3386  
Email address: [masahiro\\_sai@nm.maff.go.jp](mailto:masahiro_sai@nm.maff.go.jp)

### **LAO, PDR**

Mr. Siriphonh Phithaksoun  
Director of Plant Protection Center  
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry  
Lane Xang Avenue, Patuxay Square  
P.O. Box 811, Vientiane  
Lao, PDR  
Tel: +856-21-812164  
Email: [syriphonh@gmail.com](mailto:syriphonh@gmail.com)

### **MALAYSIA**

Rozilawati binti Mohd Azman  
Plant Biosecurity Division  
Department of Agriculture Malaysia

Email: rozilawati.azman@gmail.com

**MONGOLIA**

Mrs. Byambasuren Mijidsuren  
Director of Plant Protection Research Institute  
Tel: +976-99264062  
Fax: +976-11-345212  
Email: [byamba0730@yahoo.com](mailto:byamba0730@yahoo.com)

**MYANMAR**

Dr. Nwe Nwe Yin  
Senior Research Officer  
Entomology Section  
Department of Agricultural Research  
Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation  
Yangon, Myanmar  
Email: [ppmas.moai@mptmail.net.mm](mailto:ppmas.moai@mptmail.net.mm); [nnyin86@googlemail.com](mailto:nnyin86@googlemail.com)

**NEPAL**

Mr. Dinesh Babu Tiwari  
Senior Plant Protection Officer  
Plant Protection Directorate  
Hariharbhawan, Lalitpur  
Nepal  
Tel: 00977-9841417834  
Email: [dineshtiwari21@gmail.com](mailto:dineshtiwari21@gmail.com)

**NEW ZEALAND**

Dr. John Hedley  
Principal International Advisor  
International Standards Policy Branch  
Ministry for Primary Industries  
P.O. Box 2526, Wellington, New Zealand  
Tel: 644 894 0428, Mobile: 64298940428  
Fax: 644 894 0742  
Email: [john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz](mailto:john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz)

**PAKISTAN**

Mr Malik Zahoor Ahmad  
Director General  
National Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services (NAPHIS)



Email: [malikzahoor@gmail.com](mailto:malikzahoor@gmail.com); [naphis.pk@live.com](mailto:naphis.pk@live.com); [shaziahussain46@gmail.com](mailto:shaziahussain46@gmail.com)

### **PHILIPPINES**

Mr. Joselito L. Antioquia  
Senior Agriculturist  
692 San Andres Street  
Malate, Manila, Philippines 1004  
Tel: (632) 4040409  
Fax : (632) 5243749  
Email: [banglen2001@yahoo.com](mailto:banglen2001@yahoo.com)

### **REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

Dr. Kyu-Ock YIM  
Senior Researcher, Export Management Division  
Dept. of Plant Quarantine /QIA  
Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency  
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs  
178, Anyang-ro, Manan-gu, Anyang city, Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea  
Tel: 82-31-420-7664, 82-31-420-7665  
Fax: 82-31-420-7605  
Email: [koyim@korea.kr](mailto:koyim@korea.kr)

### **SINGAPORE**

1. Ms. Mei Lai Yap  
Programme Chief (Plant Health)  
Director, Plant Health Laboratory Dept  
Animal & Plant Health Centre  
No 6 Perahu Road  
718827 Singapore  
T: (65) 63165142 F: (65) 63161090  
Email: [Yap\\_Mei\\_Lai@ava.gov.sg](mailto:Yap_Mei_Lai@ava.gov.sg)

2. Mr. Eric Casiano Tulang  
Executive Manager  
Inspection Department  
Plant Health Centre  
Sembawang Research Station  
Lorong Chencharu 769193 Singapore  
T: (65) 67519816/84 F:  
Email: [Eric\\_Casiano\\_Tulang@ava.gov.sg](mailto:Eric_Casiano_Tulang@ava.gov.sg)

## **SRI LANKA**

Mr. S.C. Wanigasuriya  
Additional Director  
National Plant Quarantine Service (NPQS)  
Ministry of Agriculture  
Katunayake, Battaramulla  
Sri Lanka  
Tel: +94777787557  
Mobile 0777 787557  
Email: wanigasuriya231@gmail.com

## **THAILAND**

1. Ms. Tasanee Pradyabumrung  
Standards Officer, Senior expert  
Office of Standard Development  
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)  
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC)  
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand  
Tel. +662 561 2277 #1421  
Fax +662 561 3357  
Email: [tasanee@acfs.go.th](mailto:tasanee@acfs.go.th)

2. Mr. Prateep Arayakittipong  
Standards Officer, Professional level  
Office of Standard Development  
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)  
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC)  
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand  
Tel. +662 561 2277 Fax +662 561 3357  
Email: [prateep\\_ming@hotmail.com](mailto:prateep_ming@hotmail.com); [Prateep@acfs.go.th](mailto:Prateep@acfs.go.th)

3. Ms. Kunsiri Viengvisas  
Standards Officer, Professional level  
Office of Standard Development  
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)  
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC)  
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak, Bangkok 10900, Thailand  
Tel. +662 561 2277 Fax +662 561 3357  
Email: [pupu\\_077@hotmail.com](mailto:pupu_077@hotmail.com)

4. Mrs. Natthaporn Uthaimongkol  
Senior Agricultural Scientist  
Department of Agriculture

E-mail : [n.uthaimongkol@gmail.com](mailto:n.uthaimongkol@gmail.com)

**VIETNAM**

Dr. Ha Thanh Huong  
Vice-Head of Plant Quarantine Division  
Plant Protection Department  
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development  
149 Ho Duc Di Street, Dong Da District  
Hanoi, Vietnam  
Tel: (84-4) 8573 808  
Fax: (84-4) 8574 719/5330 043  
Email: ppdhuong@yahoo.com; ppdhuong@gmail.com

**FAO**

1. Dr. Piao Yongfan  
Senior Plant Protection Officer  
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific  
39 Maliwan Mansion, Phra Atit Road  
Bangkok 10200, Thailand  
Tel: 66 2 697 4268  
Fax: 66 2 697 4445  
Email: [Piao.Yongfan@fao.org](mailto:Piao.Yongfan@fao.org)

2. Yuji KITAHARA  
Capacity Development  
IPPC/FAO  
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla  
00153 Rome, Italy  
Tel: +39 06 570 54402  
Email: yuji.kitahara@fao.org

**Summary of comments**

All comments of the workshop on draft ISPMS are available from the OCS (<http://ocs.ippc.int/index.html>), all of the comments have been shared with all participating countries in the OCS. Please access the OCS by using country user name and password, which will be available from the IPPC contact of each country).