



REGIONAL IPPC WORKSHOP FOR THE REVIEW OF DRAFT INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES (ISPMs)

MEETING REPORT



**Spanish Court Hotel, Kingston, Jamaica
September 22 – 25, 2014**

1.0 OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

1.1 Welcome and Prayer

Ms. Carol Thomas, International Agricultural Health and Food Safety Specialist with the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), welcomed invited guests and workshop participants, following which she said the opening prayer. The proceedings were then handed over to Dr. Elizabeth Johnson, IICA Representative in Jamaica and chairperson of the Opening Ceremony. Dr. Johnson welcomed all present and outlined the agenda for the workshop, reiterating IICA's continued support of the activity. She offered apologies for the absence of Sonya Hammons, Capacity Development Officer of the IPPC, who, due to circumstances beyond her control was not able to be present at the workshop. She further stated that she was confident that Carol Thomas, IICA's Agricultural Health and Food Safety Specialist and Shelia Harvey, Jamaica's Chief Plant Quarantine/Produce Officer were very able to facilitate and manage the meeting. Additionally, she noted that the level of expertise and experience present among the workshop participants would contribute significantly in making this a very successful workshop.

1.2 Opening Remarks

Dr. Jerome Thomas, Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) Representative for Jamaica, the Bahamas and Belize, in his opening remarks noted that the FAO acts as the Secretariat for the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). He stated that the IPPC standard-setting process is currently viewed as the most open, transparent process of standard setting in the world. As such the process is a long and extremely involved one. He also offered apologies on behalf of Sonya Hammons and mentioned that she sent her best wishes for a successful workshop. Dr. Thomas reminded everyone of the importance of each country submitting national comments in the On-line Comment System by the deadline.

1.3 Remarks

Mr. Donovan Stanberry, Permanent Secretary – Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Jamaica, noted Jamaica's support of the draft standard review process. He, however, encouraged participants to focus not only on international trade but also on regional trade, due to the importance of food security and self-sufficiency and the need to ensure wholesomeness of food produced in the region. He said he was pleased to see the strong representation of CARICOM countries present and expressed best wishes for a successful workshop.

1.4 Closing Remarks

Dr. Johnson wished all a successful workshop, promising to return on the final day of the workshop to hear the outcomes and recommendations from the deliberation on the agenda items.

2.0 WORKSHOP PROCEDURE

2.1 Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted with an agreement that participants would review the three draft standards consecutively. The capacity building presentations would be delivered after. The revised agenda was prepared and circulated (See Appendix I).

2.2 Election of Chair and Rapporteur

Participants (See Appendix II – Participants List) engaged in the process of election of chair and rapporteur for the meeting. By consensus, Mr. Michael James of Barbados was elected to chair the meeting and Dr. Janil Gore-Francis of Antigua and Barbuda was elected rapporteur.

2.3 Overview of Workshop Objectives

Ms. Carol Thomas stated that the workshop was aimed at line-by-line review of the three draft standards followed by discussion of other areas of interest as stated in the agenda. The desired outcome would be the entry of regional comments on the draft standards into the Online Commenting System (OCS) with final, official, national comments being entered by each country by the deadline of November 30, 2014. Regional comments entered into the OCS are attached in Appendices III (a), III (b) and III(c).

3.0 PRESENTATION ON THE STANDARD SETTING PROCESS

A presentation on the standard setting process was done by Ms. Carol Thomas. The presentation elicited discussion on the need for greater participation and representation in the Standards Committee (SC) of the Caribbean region in the Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) grouping. It was noted that of the four members of the SC representing LAC there was no member from the Caribbean. Countries were urged to participate in the process so that the Region can have a voice.

NOTE:

A review for correctness of IPPC Contact Points listed on the IPPC website was done. Haiti, St. Kitts and Nevis and St. Lucia are to follow up to ensure update of the listed Contact Points for their countries.

4.0 REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT STANDARDS

4.1 Draft Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)

4.1.1 A summary presentation on this draft was made by Shelia Harvey, Jamaica.

4.1.2 Several comments were made on the terms to be amended as follows:

4.1.2.1 Bark (as a commodity)

4.1.2.1.1 Countries generally agreed to the addition of this definition;

4.1.2.1.2 A substantive comment was made in paragraph [8] regarding the acceptance of bark as a commodity, given the widely traded nature of the commodity in the region for the making of spices, beverages and for medicinal purposes;

4.1.2.1.3 Trinidad and Tobago, in their national comments, will add a qualifying statement based on the risk and intended use of the bark.

4.1.2.2 Additional Declaration

4.1.2.2.1 All agreed to the addition of this definition and an explanation was given to the effect that it was more inclusive and relevant to current trade practices (e.g., soil is a regulated article and not a pest).

4.1.2.3 Grain vs. Seed

4.1.2.3.1 This was unanimously accepted as it was seen to offer clarity as with the addition of bark (as a commodity).

4.1.2.4 Mark

4.1.2.4.1 There was general agreement for this addition;

4.1.2.4.2 There was some discussion on the use of the word “attest” in the definition rather than “attest to”;

4.1.2.4.3 Any amendment would be left to each country to determine and submit in national comments.

4.1.2.5 Visual examination

4.1.2.5.1 All agreed to this addition although Barbados thought the definition was somewhat abrupt and appeared unfinished.

4.1.2.6 Wood

4.1.2.6.1 All agreed to this inclusion and there were no comments.

4.2 Draft ISPM: International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004)

4.2.1 A summary presentation on this draft was made by Ms. Carol Thomas.

4.2.2 Several comments were made and issues noted during the discussion of this draft standard and are as follows:

4.2.2.1 A general comment was made on the standard that it is relevant and applicable to the region;

4.2.2.2 There was discussion on the inclusion of “used tyres” in the title and scope of this draft standard due to the high rate of import of used tyres by countries in the region;

4.2.2.3 It was decided that it would be left to the countries to include this comment if they felt it was necessary;

4.2.2.4 A general comment was made on the draft on the need, for consistency and unambiguity, to clarify the use of the terms “phytosanitary measures” and “phytosanitary procedures” as used throughout the document;

4.2.2.5 Regarding the movement of military vehicles and the classified nature of military operations, it was generally agreed that National Plant Protection Organisations (NPPOs) should engage in

dialogue with the military regarding the attendant plant health risks of this activity;

- 4.2.2.6 Re: paragraph [37], some concerns were raised about the methodology to be used in and the impracticality of conducting PRAs on used vehicles, machinery & equipment. The point was made that such PRAs would not concentrate on individual pests present at the point of origin, but rather the ability of the article to act as a conveyance for pests in the area;
- 4.2.2.7 Re: paragraphs [44] to [49], NPPOs were urged to review to determine whether or not any changes needed to be made regarding the idea of using “measures” or “phytosanitary measures”;
- 4.2.2.8 Re: paragraph [53] – suggestion was made to state that “cleaning methods may include”; this would make it consistent with other lists included in the document (e.g., paragraphs [72] & [76]);
- 4.2.2.9 Editorial changes were made to paragraphs [59], [65], [66], [67], [68] and [83] and are captured in the regional entries in the OCS (Appendix III(b));
- 4.2.2.10 Re: paragraph [76], countries wishing to add “autoclaving” to the list could do so in their national comments;
- 4.2.2.11 Re: paragraph [83], it was suggested to use “The NPPO” as opposed to “An NPPO”;
- 4.2.2.12 Re: paragraph [89], a technical comment was made for requesting the use of “re-export” instead of “reshipment”, for consistency with the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms;
- 4.2.2.13 Regarding Appendix I, the meeting agreed that a conversation needs to be held between NPPOs and the military to foster a common understanding on phytosanitary requirements;
- 4.2.2.14 Regarding Appendix II of the draft standard, there was a concern that the ranking of the categories of articles was not reflective of the regional situation and a suggestion was made to remove all references to ranking;
- 4.2.2.15 An editorial change was made to paragraph [130] in the notes listed for category “industrial used vehicles, machinery and equipment used indoor and is not for agricultural or forestry...” – remove “A” at the beginning.

4.3 Draft ISPM: International Movement of Seeds (2009-003)

- 4.3.1 A presentation on the contents of this draft standard was made by Mrs. Shelia Harvey.
- 4.3.2 The draft was discussed at length and several comments were made as documented in Appendix III(c) of this report. A number of comments and meeting notes were made. In addition to the comments stated in the OCS, the main issues raised are as follows:
 - 4.3.2.1 The draft does not include Living Modified Organisms (LMOs). For LMOs, ISPM 11 should be referenced;
 - 4.3.2.2 Re: paragraph [30], many countries had interpretation problems due to the structure of the sentence. One suggestion for rewording this paragraph is: *“Like plants for planting, seeds may*

present a serious risk of introducing quarantine pests, as seed-transmitted pests may be introduced to an environment where they survive and may have a high likelihood of establishing and spreading”;

- 4.3.2.3 Re: paragraph [53], it was felt that the statement as is, introduced a level of doubt in the risk analysis process. It was also felt that the references for the experimental claims mentioned should be included;
- 4.3.2.4 Re: paragraphs [124] and [167], it was felt that reference should be made to ISPM 24 (2005): Guidelines for the Determination and Recognition of Equivalence of Phytosanitary Measures, and that the entry should also be made in the references section of the draft;
- 4.3.2.5 Re: paragraph [147], it was felt that countries could rephrase to say “importing countries NPPOs” if they felt it was necessary to do so;
- 4.3.2.6 Re: paragraph [149], it was perceived that some developing countries would have issues conducting the specific laboratory tests requested; hence, it was suggested that the possibility of the conduct of some training or capacity building activity be organized to address this requirement;
- 4.3.2.7 Re: paragraphs [163] to [166], Dominica felt strongly that some guidance regarding certification should be included here as well as in the scope of the draft. This was not unanimously agreed to and Dominica was advised that this could be included in the country’s national comments;
- 4.3.2.8 Re: paragraph [261], it was felt that some examples of biological treatments, seed-borne pests and seed-transmitted pests should be included in the standard, perhaps in an appendix, rather than throughout the document as exists in the draft standard.

5.0 DRAFT ANNEX TO ISPM 27:2006 – GENUS *ANASTREPHA* (2004-015)

- 5.1 Although it was not scheduled to be discussed at this meeting, the draft annex to ISPM 27: 2006 – Genus *Anastrepha* (2004-015), Trinidad and Tobago and Jamaica had reviewed the document and they were asked to share their comments which would also be entered in the OCS and shared with the region for reference when conducting national reviews on the document. The relevant comments on the document can be found in Appendix IV of this report.
- 5.2 In addition to entries into the OCS (Appendix IV), the following comments were made/issues raised:
 - 5.2.1 Both countries thought that the document was thorough and generally well written but that the separation of labels from the associated figures in the document needed to be rectified;
 - 5.2.2 The meeting sought and received agreement from Trinidad and Tobago and Jamaica to share their comments on the draft annex using the OCS.

6.0 WTO AGREEMENT ON TRADE FACILITATION

- 6.1** Mrs. Shelia Harvey made a presentation on this agreement.
- 6.2** Many of the participants indicated that they were either only vaguely or not familiar with the agreement. Countries who were aware of the agreement indicated that Customs or trade were the main agencies associated with the execution of the agreement and for the most part, plant health personnel were not main players. Participants were informed that the negotiations on this agreement was at the ministerial level and for some reason, it appeared that information was not filtering down to some of the relevant agencies, including the NPPOs. The meeting agreed that participants should follow up on this agreement to ensure the necessary involvement of plant health agencies in the process of implementation and execution of the agreement, preferably by addressing the issue at the highest level.
- 6.3** The identified and agreed way forward in effectively addressing the communication and coordination issues obviously associated with the implementation of this agreement at the country level was as follows:
 - 6.3.1** All participants are to emphasize the importance of the issues discussed in their back-to-office reports;
 - 6.3.2** Ms. Carol Thomas is to draft a letter to highlight the issues and the importance of the inclusion of the NPPOs in the implementation process; the letter could be submitted along with the back-to-office reports by each meeting participant;
 - 6.3.3** The issue would be communicated to the CPHD Forum as a recommendation coming out of this regional draft ISPMs review workshop, which could be included in the presentation to be made by the Chair of the CPHD at the upcoming Caribbean Week of Agriculture to be held in Suriname.
 - 6.3.4** Participants were encouraged to familiarize themselves with the contents of the Agreement and to actively engage themselves in the implementation and execution process at the national level.

7.0 NATIONAL REPORTING OBLIGATIONS

- 7.1** Ms. Carol Thomas made a presentation on national reporting obligations (NROs).
- 7.2** Several comments and recommendations were made on this subject as follows:
 - 7.2.1** Countries were again urged to ensure that the contact details of their IPPC Contact Points were current and correct as this is the main channel utilized by the IPPC to provide information to Parties. Discussion, however, revealed some concerns at the national level in some countries that some information (e.g., invitations to meetings) sent by the IPPC must be addressed to the relevant Permanent Secretary or the Minister in addition to the Contact Point.
 - 7.2.2** When the Agreement on Trade Facilitation has been institutionalized, meeting NROs to the IPPC would be a necessity.
 - 7.2.3** It was recommended that countries try as far as possible to ensure that the right persons are nominated to attend meetings and that all national approvals for travel are obtained prior to ticket issuance and other

arrangements in order to avoid financial losses to agencies funding participation due to withdrawal or change of nominees at the last minute.

- 7.2.4 The senior members of NPPOs were urged to pass on their knowledge and as much information as possible to new members of staff as knowledge was of limited worth if not shared.

8.0 PHYTOSANITARY RESOURCES WEBPAGE

- 8.1 Ms. Carol Thomas made a presentation on this agenda item.

- 8.2 Several comments and recommendations were made and include the following:

- 8.2.1 There were several calls for experts on the webpage and countries were reminded of the importance and benefits of participating in the process and strongly encouraged to submit expression of interest to be experts, including:-

- 8.2.1.1 Expert Working Group (EWG) on the Safe Handling and Disposal of Waste with potential Pest Risk Generated during International Voyages (2008-004);

- 8.2.1.2 Experts on Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE);

- 8.2.2 Countries that have used the training materials have indicated that the information is excellent and appears to have been tailor-made for the region;

- 8.2.3 Persons from the region with the relevant expertise were encouraged to upload their CVs for consideration as consultants;

- 8.2.4 Regarding the side-meeting video on disaster management, countries were urged to have a look at it and also to develop a post-disaster pest management plan for their country as this is very important. Comments included concerns regarding pest introductions that are likely to be associated with post-disaster aid when done in an unmanaged fashion;

- 8.2.5 The Chair suggested that persons take note of the video on the Seminar on International Trade and Alien Invasive Species held on July 12, 2012 which can be found on the IPPC and the Standard and Trade Development Facility (STDF) websites;

- 8.2.6 Mr. Margarito Garcia of Belize indicated that the Belize Agricultural Health Agency (BAHA) has a disaster management plan for Belize which he will share with meeting participants.

9.0 PRA ADVOCACY MATERIAL

- 9.1 Mrs. Shelia Harvey made a presentation on this topic and then presented group work on the issue of PRA. Participants were divided into three groups and asked to prepare a presentation to the Minister of Agriculture (Group 1), Minister of Trade (Group 2) and Minister of Environment (Group 3). The objective was to discuss a range of issues in 5 minutes or less about the importance of investing further resources in pest risk analysis. Consideration was to be given to how the request would contribute to the minister's priorities, how PRA would support other parts of the plant protection system and the language that a non-plant protection expert would understand.

- 9.2 Presentations made by the three groups can be found in Appendix V (i), V (ii) and V (iii).

9.3 Discussions following the group presentations and main points made include the following:

9.3.1 When involved in advocacy activities to further the plant protection cause, it is important as far as possible to strengthen the argument by speaking to the economic impact involved and to support this information with relevant data;

9.3.2 Documentation of the costs of pest management is important to quantify pest impact.

10.0 IPPC TRAINING MATERIALS

10.1 A presentation on this agenda item was done by Mrs. Shelia Harvey and an information brochure on the Implementation Review & Support System (IRSS) was circulated.

10.2 Participants were urged to make use of the training materials to conduct staff training as well as advocacy and other related public awareness and education activities.

11.0 E-PHYTO

11.1 A presentation was made on this topic by Ms. Carol Thomas who gave information on the status of the E-Phyto and the next steps in its development. It was noted that the system is not yet in place and that testing has indicated that there will be issues associated with electronic transmission (e.g., differences in Internet bandwidth) that will have to be addressed.

11.2 Participants gave additional information based on their experiences with activities regarding the E-Phyto and include:

11.2.1 Bandwidth issues need to be resolved;

11.2.2 IT personnel who will be involved with designing and management of national systems should familiarize themselves with the system and also liaise with Plant Protection personnel;

11.2.3 Countries should review the list of scientific names of crops and regulated pests for completeness;

11.2.4 Countries need to begin to source the required finances to implement the E-Phyto platform and to ensure its security;

11.2.5 Since the system is not fully implemented, all countries currently employing an E-Phyto regime do so through bilateral arrangements. It should be noted that these regimes are separate and distinct from the IPPC regime and as such countries must consider this when developing their own system;

11.2.6 Issues of intellectual property rights must be addressed in addition to acquisition of hardware and other infrastructure that might be necessary;

11.2.7 Countries should note that the E-Phyto system will be obligatory under the ATF;

11.2.8 It was strongly recommended that an IICA or FAO/IPPC-mediated webinar be hosted to give IT specialists, from the representative countries, information on the proposed E-Phyto system and related phytosanitary issues;

11.2.9 Issues related to E-Phyto and its compatibility with any e-governance system that might be put in place should be considered.

12.0 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

12.1 Registration of the ISPM 15 Symbol

Jamaica and Dominica, participants in CPM-9, reported that the matter of the non-registration by countries of the ISPM 15 symbol was again raised at CPM-9. Caribbean representatives present at the meeting met with the IPPC legal representative for advice on how such registration could be handled by the countries in the region. Dominica and Jamaica will circulate to participants the IPPC paper on the issue.

12.2 Issues surrounding the Establishment of the RPPO

It was generally thought that the region is greatly disadvantaged by the absence of a RPPO and the matter needs to be addressed with alacrity. A detailed background on the issue was discussed. It was proposed that participants encourage their ministers attending the up-coming COTED meeting to deal with this issue as a matter of priority. It was also mentioned that Dr. Vyjayanthi Lopez of the FAO Sub-Regional Office in Barbados, will be presenting a paper on the issue at the said COTED meeting.

12.3 Call for new topics for development of draft ISPMs

Dominica encouraged other countries to submit proposals of new topics for the development of draft ISPMs on issues of importance to the region. This should be done prior to CPM-10. Countries are asked to share these proposals with their counterparts in the region.

12.4 Closing Remarks by IICA Country representative, Jamaica

Dr. Elizabeth Johnson of the IICA Office in Jamaica was asked to say a few words at the end of the workshop. She noted that she had a particular interest in the E-Phyto and issues of the ATF. She encouraged participants to take these issues seriously especially since these are issue that appear to be inevitable. She further thanked the participants, rapporteur, chairperson and administrative support personnel for ensuring the success of the workshop through their full participation. Countries were encouraged to submit their national comments on the OCS by November 30, 2014. She highly commended Ms. Carol Thomas for her efforts in bringing to fruition the workshop despite the absence of the IPPC staff. She also expressed her gratitude to Mrs. Shelia Harvey and the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries for their support. She ended by wishing all participants continued good health and a safe return home.

The Chairman thanked Dr. Johnson for showing the interest by returning to the workshop to be briefed on the outcomes of the meeting.

13.0 WORKSHOP EVALUATION

The evaluation was completed and submitted by all participants

14.0 ADOPTION OF REPORT

The workshop report was reviewed and unanimously adopted by the meeting.

15.0 CLOSURE OF WORKSHOP

It was generally thought that the meeting was a resounding success due to the support, expertise and full participation of all persons present. IICA, the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Jamaica, the hotel staff were all thanked for their role in ensuring the overall success of the workshop.

The meeting ended at 3PM

APPENDIX I. AGENDA of the Regional IPPC Workshop 2014

Monday, September 22	
08.30 hs.	Registration
09:00 hs.	Official Opening of the workshop
09:20 hs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adoption of the agenda - Election of chair and rapporteur - Overview of objectives of the workshop – Carol Thomas (IICA)
10:00 hs	Standard Setting process - Carol Thomas (IICA)
10:30 hs.	Coffee break
10:45 hs	Draft amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms</i> (1994-001) – Shelia Harvey (Jamaica)
12:30 hs.	Lunch
13:30 hs.	Review and discussion of draft standards. Continuation of previous topic.
15:15 hs.	Coffee break
15:30 hs.	Draft ISPM: International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004) – Carol Thomas(IICA)
14:00 hs.	Review and discussion of draft standards. Continuation of previous topic.
18:00 hs	End of Work Day

Tuesday, September 23	
09:00 hs.	Draft ISPM: International movement of seeds (2009-003) – Shelia Harvey (Jamaica)
10:30 hs.	Coffee break
10:45 hs	Review and discussion of draft standards. Continuation of previous topic.
12:30 hs.	Lunch
13:30 hs.	Review and discussion of draft standards. Continuation of previous topic.
15:30 hs.	Coffee break
16:00 hs.	Review and discussion of Draft Annex to ISPM 27:2006 – Genus <i>Anastrepha</i> .
17:00 hs.	End of the work day.

Wednesday, September 24	
09:00 hs.	WTO agreement on trade facilitation – Shelia Harvey (Jamaica)
09:45 hs	Questions and comments
10:15 hs	National Reporting obligations – Carol Thomas (IICA)
10:45 hs.	Coffee break
11:00 hs	Questions and comments
11:30 hs	Phytosanitary resources webpage – Carol Thomas (IICA)
12:00 hs.	Questions and comments
12:40 hs	Lunch
14:00 hs	PRA advocacy material – Shelia Harvey (Jamaica)
14:30 hs	Questions and comments
15:00 hs	PRA Groups Activity – Shelia Harvey and participants
16:30 hs	End of Day Work

Thursday, September 26	
09:00 hs.	IPPC Training Material – Shelia Harvey (Jamaica)
09:30 hs	Questions and comments
10:00 hs	E-Phyto – Carol Thomas (IICA)
10:30 hs.	Coffee break
10:45 hs	Questions and comments
11:15 hs.	Workshop evaluation https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/regionalippcworkshop2014
11:45 hs	Other matters
13:00 hs	Lunch
14:00 hs	Adoption of report
15:00 hs	Close of meeting

APPENDIX II. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ANTIGUA & BARBUDA

Janil Gore-Francis
Plant Protection Officer
Plant Protection Unit
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Fisheries and
Barbuda Affairs
Tel 1 (268)-764-1255 / 562-2776
E-mail address: janil.gore-francis@antigua.gov.ag
plantprotection@antigua.gov.ag
janilg@yahoo.com

BARBADOS

Michael James
Senior Agricultural Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries and
Water Resource Management.
Tel. (246) 4345112 / 5114
E-mail address: patology_mar@caribsurf.com;
spoonoe@yahoo.com

BELIZE

Margarito Garcia
Quarantine Director
Belize Agricultural Health Authority
Tel: (501) 824-4899/4872
E-mail address:
margargarciabzkind@gmail.com
margar.garcia@baha.org.bz

DOMINICA

Ryan Anselm
Head of Plant Protection and Quarantine
Services
Division of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Tel. 1(767)266-3803 / 3820
E-mail address: anselmr@dominica.gov.dm;
anselmpope@hotmail.com

GUYANA

Ansel Todd
Senior Plant Protection Officer
National Plant Protection Organisation

National Agricultural Research & Extension
Institute
Tel. (592) 220-5858 / 628-1718
E-mail address: anseltodd@yahoo.com
nppo.gy@gmail.com

GRENADA

Thaddeus Peters
Agricultural Officer
Pest Management Unit
Ministry of Agriculture
Tel. 1 (473) 440-2798 / 0019
E-mail address:
pestmanagementunitgda@spiceisle.com /
thadpet@hotmail.com

HAITI

Pierre Charlemagne Charles
Plant Health Deputy Director
Ministry of Agriculture
Tel. (509) 34793515 / 37801321
E-mail address: piecharles1055@yahoo.com

JAMAICA

Karen Barrett-Christie
Entomologist / Identifier
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Norman Manley International Airport
Tel: 1 (876) 924-8906 / 3245694 / 441-8986
Email address: kbfox_2000@yahoo.com

Juliet Goldsmith
Manager, Pest Risk Analysis Unit
Plant Quarantine / Produce Inspection Branch
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Tel. 1 (876) 477-9989 / 576-9966
E-mail address: jvgoldsmith@moa.gov.jm
julietgoldsmith@gmail.com

Shelia Harvey
Chief Plant Quarantine/Produce Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Tel: 1 (876) 977-0637 / 507-7951
Email address: syharvey@moa.gov.jm
orangehillgirl18@gmail.com

Cigale Hyman
Plant Quarantine / Produce Inspector

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Tel. 1 (876) 560-5333 / 360-3041
E-mail address: morsig@yahoo.com

Camille Marks Kelly
Entomologist/Identifier
Pest Risk Analysis Unit
Plant Quarantine / Produce Inspection
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Tel. 1 (876) 977-7160
E-mail address: camille.marks@gmail.com

La-Tanya Richards
Entomologist / Identifier
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
Sangsters International Airport, Montego Bay
Tel. 1 (876) 442-0198 / 349-2994
E-mail address: latanya_richards@yahoo.com
lsrichards@moa.gov.jm

SAINT LUCIA

Hannah Dupal-Romain
Agronomist
Ministry of Agriculture, Food Production,
Fisheries and Rural Development
Tel. 1 (758) 486-4387 / 468-5600
E-mail address: hanadee24@yahoo.com

SAINT KITTS & NEVIS

Jeanelle Kelly
Quarantine Officer
Department of Agriculture
La Guerite, Basseterre
Tel 1 (869) 465-2335
E-mail address: quarantinedoastk@hotmail.com
agridep8@gmail.com

SAINT VINCENT & THE GRENADINES

Michael Delpeche
Agricultural Officer
Ministry of Agriculture
Tel. 1 (784) 528-4171 / 457-1283

E-mail address: michaeldelpy@yahoo.com
ppq@gov.vc

SURINAME

Rosaya Gunther-Kamit
Inspection Officer
Department of Plant Protection and Quality
Inspection
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry and
Fisheries
Tel: (597) 402040 / 402965 /851-4530
E-mail: rosayakamit@gmail.com
radebie@hotmail.com

TRINIDAD & TOBAGO

Kishore Ragbir
Agricultural Officer I
Plant Quarantine Service
Ministry of Food Production
Tel. 642-0718
E-mail address: plantquarantine.centeno@gov.tt
kishoreragbir@yahoo.com

IICA

Carol Thomas
International Agricultural Health and Food Safety
Program Specialist
Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on
Agriculture
St Michael, Barbados
Tel: (246) 2719210
E-mail address: Carol.Thomas@iica.int

Mariela Madrigal
Administrative Assistant
Agricultural Health and Food Safety Program
Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on
Agriculture
San José, Costa Rica
Tel: 506-22160184
E-mail address: Mariela.Madrigal@iica.int

APPENDIX III(a)

Comments on 1994-001: Draft ISPM - Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) 2014

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
1.	6	Technical	The term 'seeds (in botanical sense) needs to be defined.	This is similar to the definition of 'bark in the botanical sense'	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
2.	15	Substantive	<div> <div>additional declaration</div> <div>A statement that is required by an importing country on a consignment in relation to regulated pests or regulated articles</div> </div> <p>We agree with this revision.</p>	<p>This definition is more inclusive and in line with common trade practices. For example, soil is not a regulated pest but a regulated article, therefore the addition is relevant.</p>	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
3.	21	Substantive	<div> <div>grain (as a commodity class)</div> <div>A commodity class for seeds intended for consumption, but not for planting (see seeds)</div> </div> <div> <div>seeds (as a commodity class)</div> <div>A commodity class for seeds intended for planting, but not for processing or consumption or processing (see grain)</div> </div> <p>There is need for a definition of 'seeds (in the botanical sense)'</p>	<p>This is required for clarification of the term used in both definitions. This is similar to the definition for 'bark in the botanical sense'</p>	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**

APPENDIX III (b)

2006-004: Draft ISPM: International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
1.	6	Substantive	<u>There needs to be consistency in the use of the words 'measures' and 'procedures'. They are used interchangeably and are inconsistent with the definitions in the Glossary. E.g. paragraphs 7, 26, 49.</u>	There is need for consistency in the use of the terms	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
2.	21	Substantive	This standard describes measures that may be applied to used vehicles, machinery and equipment. After applying <u>those complying with these</u> measures, used vehicles, machinery and equipment should be considered clean; that is, as free as practically possible from soil, pests, plant debris, seeds and plants for planting. Used agricultural, forestry and horticultural vehicles, machinery and equipment are particularly likely to carry contaminating pests. Used earth moving machinery, surface mining equipment and waste management vehicles are also more likely to be contaminated.	This is to make the statement consistent with the definition for 'measures' in the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
3.	53	Substantive	Cleaning methods <u>may</u> include:	To make it consistent with other sections of the document e.g. paragraphs 72, 76 This change also makes it clear that the list is not exhaustive.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
4.	59	Editorial	Treatments <u>that</u> may be used in addition to cleaning:	"That" is missing	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
5.	65	Editorial	After cleaning, where used vehicles,	A comma is	Verified	English	IPPC

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
			machinery and equipment are moved to a storage area, packing area or port of loading or when they are transiting through another country measures should be taken to avoid contamination. These include, as appropriate:	missing between the words 'another' and 'country'			Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
6.	66	Editorial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usedUsed vehicles, machinery and equipment should be stored at an appropriate distance from pest habitats (the distance will depend on the pest) and in areas free of risk from contamination by vegetation, soil, free standing water or contaminated cargo. 	'used' should not be capitalized	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
7.	67	Editorial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> usedUsed vehicles, machinery and equipment should be stored or handled on fully sealed surfaces. 	'used' should not be capitalized	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
8.	68	Editorial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vegetationVegetation around port areas should be kept short by mowing or the use of weed controls to reduce the risk of contamination by airborne seeds. Consideration should also be given to the erection of barriers to stop seed movement around loading and storage areas. 	'vegetation' should not be capitalized	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
9.	83	Editorial	A An NPPO may conduct import inspections to verify that cleaning of used vehicles, machinery and equipment has occurred. Import inspections may include partial or full dismantling of used vehicles, machinery and equipment, and in some cases, collection of specimens for identification. Verification of cleanliness may involve inspection, as well as probing and flushing of hidden areas (e.g. by using water under high pressure or compressed	'A NPPO' not 'An NPPO'	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
			air).				
10.	89	Technical	Emergency actions should be limited to – as far as possible – detention, treatment or re-export reshipment of the used vehicles, machinery and equipment found to be contaminated. Where contaminated used vehicles, machinery or equipment need to be transported to another location for treatment, NPPOs should ensure that contamination is suitably contained (e.g. containerized).	Replace the word 'reshipment' with 're-export'	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**

APPENDIX III(c)

2009-003: Draft ISPM - International movement of seeds

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
1.	6	Substantive	In reference to Paragraph 30: The structure of the sentence gives rise to various interpretation. It therefore need to be revised. In addition in relation to the phrase 'further growth' it was not clear what subject it was referring to (the seed or the pest).	The paragraph is not clear. It needs amending	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
2.	6	Technical	In reference to Appendix 2 - General Classification of Seed Treatment- paragraph 261: Some examples of Biological Treatments should be given. There should be an Annex or Appendix which list examples of seed-borne or seed-transmitted pests.	This is necessary in order to provide more guidance to the reader and to make the standard more useful	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
3.	9	Technical	This standard applies to seed in the botanical sense. The standard also covers seeds for laboratory testing or destructive analysis, and seeds for planting under restrictive conditions. This standard does not apply to grain.	This clarifies the intent of the first sentence in this paragraph.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
4.	10	Technical	References Include ISPM 24: Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures (2005)	Equivalence of Phytosanitary measures occurs in paragraph 124 where it should also be referenced.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
5.	32	Substantive	A pest risk analysis (PRA) should determine if the seed is a pathway for the introduction and spread of regulated pests and may lead to establishment of regulated pests in the PRA area. The PRA should consider	This is to remove redundancy since the definition for 'introduction' means entry and establishment of	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
			the relationship between the intended use of the seeds (e.g. planting, research, testing) and the potential for pests to establish.	a pest.			
6.	38	Editorial	NPPOs face challenges associated with the international movement of seeds that are distinct from the international movement of other forms of plants for planting. For example, seeds produced in one country and exported to a second country for processing, testing and packing may then be re-exported to numerous other destinations over an extended period of time. At the time of production of the seeds, the destination country and its import requirements may not be known, especially if there are a number of years between production and export to the final destination. Moreover, breeding, selection and evaluation of seeds are is conducted internationally to develop new varieties that are adapted to a range of environments and conditions. As a result, seeds moved internationally may be subject to various phytosanitary issues, including:	'is' should be replaced by 'are' in the second to last sentence in order to be grammatically correct.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
7.	41	Editorial	This standard should help minimize the risk of the global spread of pests, including those that can be considered plants as pests, and other organisms whose pest risk has not yet been identified yet .	For grammatical correctness the sentence should not end with the word 'yet'	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
8.	53	Substantive	Many studies have documented cases in which transfer by seed of seed-borne pests occurs under laboratory conditions but then such transferral has never been observed under field	'Uncertainty' is too a strong a word to use in this context.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
			conditions. <u>This should be taken into consideration when assessing seeds as a pathway.</u> adding to the uncertainty of PRA judgements on seeds as pathways.				
9.	96	Editorial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> field selection use of resistant or less susceptible varieties 	'Use of resistant or less susceptible varieties' should be another bullet	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
10.	123	Technical	Importers may request the NPPO of the importing country to permit seeds for research or specialized commercial purposes. The NPPO may allow the entry of such seeds under an <u>import</u> permit, which should include specific conditions to prevent the introduction and spread of regulated pests. When a PRA determines that the seeds pose a high risk of becoming plants as pests, prohibition may be considered as a phytosanitary measure.	The Glossary defines 'import permit' and not 'permit'	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
11.	124	Technical	3. Equivalence of Phytosanitary Measures	ISPM 24 should be referenced in this section	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
12.	142	Technical	Testing of samples taken from small lots when statistically valid samples are required as per ISPM 31:2008 may result in the destruction of an unacceptably large proportion of the lot. In such cases, <u>other sampling methods for equivalent means of</u> meeting phytosanitary import requirements should be explored. Some examples are:	The methods described are not phytosanitary measures but alternative sampling methods.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
13.	167	Technical	In some cases, the phytosanitary import requirement for a field inspection is not known at the time of production. NPPOs of the exporting country should consider additional field inspections on the request of the producer to allow future re-export. NPPOs of the importing country should consider equivalent phytosanitary measures as options to fulfil phytosanitary import requirements when seed is already harvested. <u>(In accordance with ISPM 24 -2005)</u>	This is to make it consistent with references made to other ISPMs in the document.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**

APPENDIX IV

2004-015: Draft annex to ISPM 27:2006 - Genus *Anastrepha*

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
1.	6	Substantive	<p>The standard is well-written and detailed in terms of diagnostics. The keys are relevant and they work.</p> <p>This standard is very relevant to the Caribbean</p> <p>Paragraph 46: It is recommended that another clearing agent other than xylene be used</p> <p>It is recommended that the labels on the Figures are consistent with the characters mentioned in the keys. E.g. [204] Figure 2</p> <p>The captions for the Figures should be placed beneath the relevant diagram</p>	The use of xylene is being phased out due to its carcinogenic property. The diagrams appear after the captions and usually on the other page.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
2.	9	Technical	The introduction of some cultivated exotic species such as <i>Mangifera indica</i> and <i>Citrus</i> spp. have allowed some pest species of <i>Anastrepha</i> to expand their original areas of distribution and enhance their reproductive potential. However, they still have marked preferences for certain native hosts, which is probably indicative of their original host relationships. In this regard, the species <i>A. suspensa</i> , <i>A. fraterculus</i> and <i>A. striata</i> breed mainly in hosts belonging to the family Myrtaceae, <i>A. ludens</i> in the Rutaceae, <i>A. obliqua</i> in the Anacardiaceae, <i>A. serpentina</i> in the Sapotaceae, and <i>A. grandis</i> in the Cucurbitaceae (Norrbon, 2004b).	The 's' is missing from <i>A. striata</i>	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
3.	38	Substantive	For permanent slides, proceed as described in section 4.1.2.1, avoiding the NaOH solution. Wing characters can usually be observed without mounting, so mounting is not recommended as a general practice. It may be necessary for morphometric studies, but it is not necessary for observation of the characters used in the key in section 4.3.2. If permanent mounts are made, it is recommended to cut off one of the wings from its base (the right wing is preferred because it facilitates comparison with images reported in the literature and this diagnostic protocol).	Section 4.1.2.1 does not have any information applicable to the preparation of wings for microscopic examination.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**
4.	42	Technical	Morphological examination of larvae (section 4.2.2) can be performed on unmounted larvae using a stereomicroscope, on slide-mounted larvae using a compound microscope, or on critical-point dried larvae using a scanning electron microscope (SEM). Slide mounting larvae can preclude subsequent analysis of morphological characters. On slide-mounted larvae it is possible to examine external morphology (e.g. anterior and posterior spiracles, oral ridges) as well as internal structures such as the cephalopharyngeal skeleton (Figures 21–44), using an optical microscope with objective 20×, 40× or higher. Detailed, high resolution observation of the external morphology of larvae is only possible using an SEM (Figures 45–61). It is therefore not recommended to slide mount all specimens representing a sample or the only larva available for diagnosis; unmounted larvae should be kept for future	Compound microscopes are used for slide mounted specimens.	Verified	English	IPPC Regional Workshop Caribbean English**

Comm. no.	Para. no.	Comment type	Comment	Explanation	Status	Language	Author
			analysis.				

APPENDIX V (i)

Pest Risk Analysis Unit Rationale

Presented to the Minister of Agriculture

Introduction

- Over the last 10-15 yrs the Caribbean region has seen the spread of various exotic species
- E.g.: Lethal, Yellowing, Pink Hibiscus Mealy Bug, Giant African Snail, Citrus Greening
- This has resulted in the following:
 - Loss of production
 - Loss of foreign exchange
 - Loss of jobs (livelihoods)
 - Reduce food security
 - Loss of indigenous foods

Introduction

- The country is a net importer of fresh fruits, vegetables and plants, approximately 70%!
- Because of the high level of imports, this has led to equally high levels of risk that can affect not only plant health, but also animal and human health.

- Because of the liberalization of trade and as signatories to the WTO agreements, we are guided by International Standards that govern trade facilitation.
- No longer can we just say NO to imports!
- We have to justify scientifically by conducting what is called a Pest Risk Analysis (PRA).

What is a PRA?

- A Pest Risk Analysis (PRA) is a scientific assesment that identifies and prioritizes the pest risk associated with trading commodities.
- This analysis would guide the phytasanitary measures our country needs to take when importing commodities.

Rationale to establish PRA Unit

- Because of all of the aforementioned Mr. Minister it is unequivocally important to establish a Pest Risk Analysis Unit.
- I am aware that there are limited resources available, however, investing in a Unit of this nature would:
- Safeguard the agriculture and other areas such as tourism, health and the environment
- Trade will be affected in the event that an exotic pest comes into the country. Our trading partners will place bans on our exports.

Resources needed

- Human-trained staff
- Financial- budget to maintain Unit
- Physical-furnished office space, computers, scientific software, field supplies, communication tools

Summary

- Food and NutritionSecurity
- Biodiversity preserved
- Job creation
- Increased exports, more market access

APPENDIX V (ii)



Pest Risk Analysis and Trade

Group 2

1

- Trade is an essential element to economic growth.
- Ministry of Trade is actively engaged in multilateral talks to facilitate trade.
- The agricultural sector is a major foreign exchange earner



2

- Trade comes with inherent risks that we must manage
- Plant pests may hitch a ride on global shipments
- The presence of these pests can significantly affect trade

3

- Countries have the right to protect their agricultural health.
- Measures must be technically justified



- Pest Risk Analysis provides the rational for implementing phytosanitary measures.
- Pest risk analysis is thus a vital tool for importers to meet their international obligations, safeguarding trade and protecting plant resources

- There is need for a cadre of dedicated individuals with adequate resources.
- Already there is support from international and regional organizations (IPPC,FAO,IICA) as well as established linkages with member countries.

- Crucially, it costs less to prevent a pest establishing than it does to deal with the aftermath.

APPENDIX V (iii)

PEST RISK ANALYSIS UNIT

Presentation to the Minister of
Environment

Pest Risk Analysis (PRA)

- Scientific Assessment used to make an informed justified decision designed to reduce the risk associated with the importation of commodities

Pest Risk Analysis

- Identify the harmful pests that may be transported through trade
- Identify the pests that may be associated with a specific commodity
 - Pink Mealy Bug
 - Giant African Snail
 - Red Palm Mite

Pest Risk Analysis

