



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

## **REPORT**

# **2024 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia**

**Yerevan, Armenia**

**02–04 September 2024**

**IPPC Secretariat**

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2024



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <https://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

**Third-party materials.** Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

**Sales, rights and licensing.** FAO information products are available on the FAO website (<https://www.fao.org/publications>) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: <https://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request>. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

## CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the session.....	5
1.1	Welcome remarks.....	5
1.1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	5
1.1.2	Welcome by the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization Director General .....	5
1.1.3	Welcome by Food Safety Inspection Authority (NPPO of Armenia).....	6
2.	Meeting arrangements .....	6
2.1	Election of the chairperson and the rapporteur .....	6
2.2	Adoption of the agenda .....	6
3.	Administrative matters .....	6
3.1	Participants list .....	6
4.	Updates on IPPC governance and strategic issues.....	6
4.1	Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau) .....	6
4.2	Update from IPPC Secretariat on Communications (IDPH & Comms' networks) ....	6
4.3	Update from Standards Committee (SC) .....	7
4.4	Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).....	7
4.5	Update on Strengthening Pest Outbreak and Response Systems (POARS) and CPM Focus Groups) .....	8
4.5.1	Updates on the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues.....	9
4.5.2	Getting In Touch About CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers .....	9
4.5.3	Getting in touch about the IPPC CPM Focus Group on safe provisions of food and other humanitarian aid.....	9
5.	Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations.....	10
5.1	The IPPC standard setting process in a nutshell.....	10
5.2	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>Field inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 ( <i>Guidelines for inspection</i> ).....	10
5.3	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft revision of ISPM 26 ( <i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i> ) (2021-010).....	14
5.4	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds</i> (2018-009) to ISPM 38 ( <i>International movement of seeds</i> ) .....	15
5.5	Draft ISPM under 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood</i> (2015-004) to ISPM 39 ( <i>International movement of wood</i> ) .....	18
5.6	Draft ISPM under 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit</i> (2021-011) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> ) .....	19
5.7	Draft Specification for ISPM under consultation: Draft specification on <i>Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM</i> (2023-037) .....	20
5.8	Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Draft Specification on <i>Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid</i> (2021-020) .....	21
6.	Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs .....	23
6.1	Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities .....	23

6.2	EPPO activities.....	23
6.3	Host country NPPO activities .....	24
6.4	Phytosanitary situation in the ECA region (e.g. emerging pests, projects, other issues, phytosanitary measures for seeds, including import requirements) .....	24
6.5	Topics of interest for the region .....	25
7.	Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session).....	26
7.1	New IPPC Guides and e-learning courses.....	26
7.2	E-commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade.....	27
7.3	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments.....	27
7.4	IPPC commodity standards .....	27
7.5	National Reporting Obligations and discussion on obstacles preventing better reporting .....	28
7.6	Presentations from countries on Communications (IDPH & Comms Networks) and public relation programmes and tools .....	28
8.	Online survey of the workshop.....	29
9.	Date and venue of the next regional workshop.....	29
10.	Adoption of the report .....	29
11.	Conclusion of the workshop .....	29
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	30
	Appendix 2: Participants list .....	35

## 1. Opening of the session

- [1] Gevorg PAPOYAN, Minister of the Economy of the Republic of Armenia, expressed his gratitude to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat and the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) for organizing the workshop in Armenia. PAPOYAN recognized the importance of international cooperation in the field of controlling pests of plants and plant products as well as the preventing their introduction and spread to maintain plant health. He also highlighted the importance of the study of phytosanitary conditions which are crucial to achieve healthy and high-quality harvest.
- [2] Being a contracting party of the IPPC since 2006, PAPOYAN emphasized the importance of the IPPC Regional Workshops as a vital platform for cooperation in phytosanitary capacity, raising awareness and exchange expertise and expressed his pleasure in hosting it in Armenia and wish for future ongoing cooperation.

### 1.1 Welcome remarks

#### 1.1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [3] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter referred to as “the secretariat”) welcomed all participants to the 2024 IPPC regional workshop for Europe and Central Asia.
- [4] Artur SHAMILOV, agricultural officer of FAO, thanked Gevorg PAPOYAN for the commitment and availability to host the workshop in Armenia, which highlighted the importance of the work of IPPC community, National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs, FAO Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia (FAO REU) and FAO Representation in Armenia. He also emphasized the long membership of the Republic of Armenia to the IPPC and informed that the Director General of FAO will be visiting the country in the next days. SHAMILOV thanked FAO REU for covering travel and accommodations costs of some workshop participants and the costs related to the simultaneous interpretation, EPPO for the translation of draft ISPMs into Russian and VNIIKR for translation of the presentation into Russian.
- [5] SHAMILOV thanked the host country, EPPO and FAO REU for the co-organizing the 2024 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia.

#### 1.1.2 Welcome by the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization Director General

- [6] Nico HORN, the Director-General of EPPO welcomed all participants to the 2024 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia. He thanked Gevorg PAPOYAN for the welcoming words and the Republic of Armenia for hosting the regional workshop and providing the setting for good discussions. HORN thanked EPPO for co-organizing the workshop with the IPPC Secretariat and the FAO REU. He emphasized the importance of cooperation in maintaining plant health, not only between neighbouring countries but also the countries that are trade partners.
- [7] HORN wished all workshop participants good discussions and concluded his intervention by inviting the Republic of Armenia to join EPPO.

### **1.1.3 Welcome by Food Safety Inspection Authority (NPPO of Armenia)**

- [8] Armen HAYRAPETYAN, Head of the Food Safety Inspection Authority, welcomed all the participants at the workshop and in Armenia. He emphasized the importance of finding effective ways to improve knowledge and make agricultural development more sustainable and healthier.
- [9] HAYRAPETYAN highlighted the efforts put into organizing events such as the IPPC Regional workshops and wished that, through this platform, knowledge is shared and brought home.
- [10] HAYRAPETYAN concluded his speech by thanking again the participants and wished for a fruitful meeting.

## **2. Meeting arrangements**

### **2.1 Election of the chairperson and the rapporteur**

- [11] Ringolds ARNITIS (Latvia) was elected as chairperson. ARNITIS thanked the participants for nominating him as chairperson.
- [12] Anahit HOVSEPYAN (Armenia) was elected as rapporteur.

### **2.2 Adoption of the agenda**

- [13] Following few proposals by the participants, the agenda was rearranged, adopted and attached to this report as appendix 1.

## **3. Administrative matters**

### **3.1 Participants list**

- [14] The chairperson invited participants to notify EPPO of any information that required updating in the latter.
- [15] Two observers from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) International Services, attended the 2024 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia.
- [16] The secretariat informed that the participants list will be distributed after the end of the meeting and it is attached to this report as appendix 2.

## **4. Updates on IPPC governance and strategic issues**

### **4.1 Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)**

- [17] SHAMILOV presented the updates on the IPPC governance and strategy, providing an overview of the IPPC, its vision, mission, objectives and core activities. He continued reporting what the governing and subsidiary bodies of the IPPC are and their role. Moreover, he outlined the decisions of the Eighteenth meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) held in 2024 regarding the CPM Focus Groups (FGs) – including the new FGs formed on Global Phytosanitary Research Coordination, Laboratory Diagnostic Networking and One Health -, Africa Phytosanitary Programme (APP), the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 and the implementation of the Development Agenda Items as well as the relative communication strategy.
- [18] SHAMILOV updated the participants also on other topics such as the latest developments regarding the antimicrobial resistance (AMR), including the side session held alongside the CPM-18 meeting.
- [19] The chairperson thanked SHAMILOV and closed the agenda item.

### **4.2 Update from IPPC Secretariat on Communications (IDPH & Comms' networks)**

- [20] Daniel TORELLA, phytosanitary standard setting support specialist of the secretariat, provided updated on IPPC Communications Strategy 2023-2030, which outlines the roadmap to raise global awareness

on plant health, advocate for investments and support and mobilize and engage stakeholders. Moreover, the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) was redesigned to make the interface more agile and tools, materials and resources easy to find as well as increased communication material posted on the IPP and social media strategy.

- [21] TORELLA updated the participants regarding the IPPC Regional Communications Network, approved by CPM-18 in 2024, with the aim to establish a more focused set-up so that different communication and advocacy needs, capacities and opportunities can be more aptly customized and addressed in each region. The objectives of the Network are to widen the reach and strengthen the impact of communications on plant health, facilitate information and knowledge sharing, collaboration, cooperation, and capacity development between RPPOs and NPPOs in their respective regions and between RPPOs, the IPPC Secretariat, with other RPPOs, FAO regional and national offices and with relevant organizations.
- [22] TORELLA updated on the several activities related to the International Day of Plant Health (IDPH) carried out by the secretariat and invited participants to share the initiatives carried out by the NPPOs of their own countries. Some countries' representatives shared their projects and activities, which are reported under the agenda item 7.6.
- [23] The chairperson emphasized the importance of communicating the activities in the plant health sector, not only between colleagues but also to the general public.

### 4.3 Update from Standards Committee (SC)

- [24] Stavroula IOANNIDOU, an SC member, provided an overview of the role and activities of the IPPC's Standard Setting Unit (SSU), its members and the planned work for 2024. Then, IOANNIDOU reported the draft Specifications for ISPMs and the draft ISPMs that were approved for consultation and for first and second consultation, respectively.
- [25] **E-decisions.** A participant asked what the difference is between e-decision and regular decision and the presenter replied that some decisions taken by the Standards Committee (SC), for example regarding Diagnostic Protocols (DPs), can be decided by the SC online as this allows the SC member to consult with relevant experts in their region during the discussion. However, if there are divergent ideas or comments, the topic is brought to the face-to-face meeting of the SC for discussion. The presenter concluded by stating that e-decisions are a very useful tool.

### 4.4 Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)

- [26] ARNITIS, chairperson and IC Member, explained the role of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC), its members, responsibilities and tasks.
- [27] The presenter explained that the IC oversees four Strategic Framework's DAIs:
- strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS);
  - management of E-commerce postal and courier pathways;
  - developing guidance on the use of third-party entities; and
  - harmonization of electronic data exchange.
- [28] The presenter reported on some IC teams established to work on specific topics and tasks (e.g., National Reporting Obligations (NROs), Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE), Fusarium TR4, e-commerce and IPPC guides and training materials) and their main achievements.
- [29] Regarding Fusarium TR4, ARNITIS added the simulation exercises were developed to cover all stages from preparation to response to a first outbreak or positive case, to containment of infected plants.
- [30] ARNITIS then showed also that the IC established some subgroups, in particular the one on the IPPC Observatory, which oversees the processes of the IPPC. ARNITIS reported the main activities of the IPPC Observatory:

- study on e-commerce, which the IC considered to be the priority for 2024 given its importance;
- surveys on antimicrobial resistance (AMR) launched to gather information from countries on the antibiotic and fungicide products used in plant protection, whose results were presented during CPM-18 as well as the decision to extend the surveys for another year;
- IPPC third General Survey and the Strategic Framework mid-term evaluation are expected for 2025; and
- the call for IPPC Observatory topics for studies and surveys will be merged with the main IPPC Call for Standards and Implementation in 2025.

[31] A participant asked the presenter to report on the outcomes of the meetings between the IPPC IC, European Union (EU), Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) and Committee Linking Entrepreneurship-Agriculture-Development (COLEAD) as well as some examples of the activities carried out. The presenter reported several examples:

- training courses, developed in collaboration with COLEAD, targeted for a pool of phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE) facilitators on how countries' PCE capacities can be assessed by taking into account not only aspects related to plant health but also to food safety and animal health;
- training courses on how to prepare capacity building process developed in collaboration with COLEAD and STDF; and
- the programme developed by STDF to show countries can elaborate and submit their requests to STDF.

[32] The presenter also reported on examples where loans to countries were based on phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE) results. For example, a PCE was carried out in Uzbekistan and, based on the results, the country identified areas where capacities need to be strengthened and requested STDF to grant loans to elaborate capacity building projects.

[33] ARNITIS concluded the presentation and explained the participants how to get involved within IC's activities.

#### **4.5 Update on Strengthening Pest Outbreak and Response Systems (POARS) and CPM Focus Groups)**

[34] SHAMILOV outlined what the Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) is, the link to the relative IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030's Development Agenda Item (DAI) on "Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS)" as well as the establishment of the CPM Focus Group on POARS and its mandate.

[35] The presenter reported the outcomes of the FG such as the "Internal study on POARS existing systems and recommendations for optimal functioning", which studied the existing national, regional and global systems to determine their overall components, strengths and weaknesses, and the "Recommendations for an Effective Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System", which consisted of several recommendations on its components, legal frameworks etc. The presenter reported also that CPM-16, in 2022, agreed to establish a POARS Steering Group (SG POARS) and listed its functions.

[36] SHAMILOV concluded the presentation and invited the members of the FG POARS and SG POARS FG participating at the workshop to add any information to the presentation. A previous member of the FG POARS and current representative of the SC at the SG POARS reported that the Steering Group is meeting monthly and it is currently working on several topics, in particular the procedures to assess the criteria to consider a pest as emerging pest, as global concern or to be included in the POARS system. Moreover, the participant explained how the different categorization and criteria within POARS system and they will be soon tested on few pests, including *Bactrocera Dorsalis*. The representative explained also that SG POARS is working on the concept of "emerging pest", which is not defined in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*), and it would outline a very clear categorization of pests.



- [37] Another participant questioned how the POARS system would support the NPPOs in their daily work and the SG POARS representative replied that the goal of the POARS system is supporting NPPOs for prompt reaction and early detection, by also creating a network to support countries in case of outbreak.

#### **4.5.1 Updates on the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues**

- [38] SHAMILOV outlined the background of the CPM Focus Group on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues, pointing out that the primary role of the CPM Focus Group is to support the implementation and delivery of the IPPC's "Action Plan on Climate Change Impacts on Plant Health" over the 2022-2025 period. The presenter then proceeded to update on the activities of the Focus Group, such as:

- the participation in international and regional conferences and workshops and technical webinar activities;
- the seminars to be held in September on "climate change, plants and pests", "risk assessment" and pathways and risk management"; and
- the publication of a paper on the special issue of the EPPO Bulletin Volume 54 on the "Special Issue on Climate Change and Pest Risk Analysis", which aims to assess and manage the impacts of climate change on plant health in the framework of the IPPC, and the forthcoming publication on "Climate change impacts on plant pests: A Technical Resource to support national and regional plant protection organizations", which focuses on why climate change is important and the assessment and management of its impact on plants and plant pests.

#### **4.5.2 Getting In Touch About CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers**

- [39] SHAMILOV explained the role of the CPM FG on Sea Containers, its mandate as well as the latest updates and the outcomes.
- [40] The presenter reported the complexities identified and the options considered in incorporating safe trade into sea containers' commerce as the sea container pathway is considered a global risk.
- [41] The participants were updated also about the outcomes of the work of the FG, which includes the revised CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers (R-06), the concept of custodial responsibility, which is an industry-led proposal, the inclusion of a chapter on pest contamination into the CTU code, the non-mandatory global code of practice for handling and packing of containers developed by International Maritime Organization (IMO), International Labour Organization (ILO) and United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), and the changes to the inspection programme developed by IMO.
- [42] The presenters reported also the emerging technologies that are being applied and tested, for example eDNA and eRNA testing, Biosecurity Automated Threat Detection System and Hand-held hyperspectral camera.
- [43] The presenter informed the participants that the CPM-18 (2024), based on said outputs, extended the mandate of the FG on Sea Containers.
- [44] The presenter added that this is a very good example of how to bring together industry stakeholders, who are now organizing the international symposium on "Optimizing container design to mitigate risks of pest contamination in the international containerized supply chain" that will be held in November 2024 and inviting FG members to present and raise awareness of industry stakeholders.

#### **4.5.3 Getting in touch about the IPPC CPM Focus Group on safe provisions of food and other humanitarian aid**

- [45] SHAMILOV outlined the background of the CPM Focus Group on safe provisions of food and other humanitarian aid, pointing out the CPM Recommendation on "Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation (R-09)", which was adopted in 2021 and it applies the principle of phytosanitary preparedness and response to the provision of urgent disaster-relief assistance and encourages recipient and exporting countries to develop adequate response plans and use guidance available in adopted standards.

[46] The presenter then provided the latest updates regarding the CPM Focus Group on safe provisions of food and other humanitarian aid, in particular:

- the review and the extension of its mandate until CPM-20 in 2026 as agreed by CPM-18;
- the development of a revision of the draft Specification for an ISPM and discussions on having an IPPC standard to be presented to CPM-19 in 2025;
- the organization of a webinar on “Safe Provisions of food and other humanitarian aid”;
- the development of communications and advocacy material; and
- the development of an Action Plan in collaboration with WOA, CODEX, WFP and FAO.

## 5. Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations

[47] The participants agreed that only the consultation comments on the draft standards and draft specifications for ISPMs highlighted by EPPO stewards will be discussed during the Regional Workshop.

[48] Following the Regional Workshop, the EPPO Panel on Global Phytosanitary Affairs will additionally review the consultation comments proposed by the countries of the region and decide which comments will be submitted into the IPPC Online Commenting System (OCS) as regional comments.

### 5.1 The IPPC standard setting process in a nutshell

[49] TORELLA explained the participants and the importance of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) through a video and a presentation, providing an overview of the Standard Setting Procedure (SSP), through which ISPMs are developed and adopted. In particular, the presenter underlined the significance of the Call for Topics for Standards and Implementation for CPs and RPPOs, what topics can be submitted and the importance of seeking support from other CPs and RPPOs for the topics submitted to indicate a global need for the proposed topic.

[50] An overview of the deadline and the objection procedure to the adoption of draft ISPMs was given following questions of the participants.

[51] The EPPO Director General recalled that the deadline to submit topics to the Call for Topics for Standards and Implementation was extended following the request of EPPO so that topics could be discussed at the Regional Workshops, which usually take place from mid-August until mid-September.

### 5.2 Draft ISPM under 1<sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex *Field inspection* (2021-018) to ISPM 23 (*Guidelines for inspection*)

[52] Mariangela CIAMPITTI, assistant steward for this draft annex and SC member, provided the background information on the draft and outlined its structure, in particular the concept of field inspection and how it differs from “specific surveillance”, the scope, how to conduct field inspection, the requirements, the assumptions that need to be taken into consideration when field inspection is carried out, the outcomes as well as the importance of documentation and the responsibilities of the NPPOs in the process.

[53] **Field inspection as phytosanitary measure and voluntary export-inspection programmes.** The chairperson questioned whether the concept of field inspection as phytosanitary measure and as activity in voluntary export-inspection programmes might be contradictory. The assistant steward agreed and stated the need of harmonization of both concepts and terms throughout the text.

[54] **Revision and structure of the draft annex to ISPM 23.** The presenter reported that some consultation comments addressed the structure of the draft annex to ISPM 23, in particular it was proposed a full revision of the draft annex as the ISPM 23 refers only once to field inspection.

- [55] **Controlled environments.** A consultation comment questioned the meaning of the term “controlled environments” which is not present in other ISPMs and therefore suggested that it might be needed clarification or replaced with the term “greenhouses”.
- [56] **Sampling and laboratory testing.** It was proposed to further include in the concept that field inspection may include sampling and laboratory testing and participants agreed with the proposal. It was also clarified that the term “inspection” is defined in ISPM 5 and it refers to visual examination.
- [57] **NPPO or authorized entities.** The participants discussed the proposal of a consultation comment to delete “on behalf of” in the scope, which allows authorized entities to conduct field inspections on behalf of NPPOs as these activities should be handled by NPPOs only. However, some participants were not in favor of the deletion as the NPPO can decide to authorize third parties to carry out tasks on its behalf.
- [58] **Target pests, regulated pests or pests.** The presenter reported a consultation comment that proposed the pest of concern during field inspection be referred to as “target pest” throughout the text as used in ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*). The participants discussed the proposal to refer to “pests” throughout the draft annex as the text refers to regulated pests only and, as reminded by a participant, the definition of the term “inspection” in ISPM 5 refers to pests only.
- [59] **Infestation of commodity derived from infested plants.** One participant questioned if the assumption in the draft annex that if a pest is detected on or in the plants then the commodity for international trade derived from those plants may be infested is correct. The chairperson added that this assumption might be contradictory because if a product is processed, then it should be less risky according to ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*). The chairperson intervened stating that that field inspection is carried out to avoid that the commodity is infested. The participants agreed that the assumption might need some refining as it does not refer to processed products but it simply states that if field inspection is carried out in the field and pests are detected, there is a risk of the commodity being infested. The assistant steward clarified that this assumption is in addition to the ones contained in section 1.2 of ISPM 23, which clearly states that “some probability of pests being undetected is recognized and the secretariat added that the Expert Working Group, during the drafting of the text, included this assumption based on such assumption. Eventually, the participants suggested several proposals:
- the deletion of “the commodity for international trade derived from those plants may be infested” from the assumption, making it lose its meaning;
  - clearly define that the commodity is not processed in accordance with ISPM 32 as if it were processed, then the risk would be reduced; or
  - the rewording of the assumption to clarify that field inspection is carried out for a commodity because of the risk of association of the pest with such commodity.
- [60] **Pest biology.** The presenter reported a consultation comment that proposed either to specify which aspects of pest biology are considered or remove this factor from the list.
- [61] **Inspection method, including timing and frequency.** It was discussed the proposal of consultation comment of removing this factor from the list as it is considered the outcome of the list rather than an input.
- [62] **Specific objectives of the field inspection.** The presenter proposed the deletion as there is already a section on the specific objectives of field inspection and a consultation comment considered it quite vague.
- [63] **Technical equipment.** The presenter reported a consultation comment that proposed the inclusion of technical equipment (e.g. suitable vehicle, GPS devices, magnifying glasses, cutting tools for sections and taking samples, sampling equipment, antiseptics, camera, etc.) in the specific requirements for field inspection as it could affect its outcomes. Although the presenter did not consider them as components

of the field-inspection process, it was agreed to find a suitable place to incorporate this proposal in the text.

- [64] **Geographical coordinates.** A consultation comment proposed the inclusion of “geographical coordinates” with GPS as an example, along with field maps, site plans and field-identity documents. However, the assistant steward informed that the SC, during the discussion of the draft annex, rejected the same proposal. A participant suggested to refer to “geographical coordinates” only as GPS is a satellite system.
- [65] **Producer records.** Several comments proposed to clarify the meaning of “producer records”, which is included as an example of document that may be associated with field inspection. It was proposed to add examples such as “records of visual examination” as in the list of examples there are previous inspection and test reports.
- [66] **Registration of field vs other terms.** The presenter pointed out that, as there is no common understanding and common term for “field registration” shared among NPPOs, it would be advisable to clarify what it refers to.
- [67] **Certificate of origin of plants and plant material.** A participant pointed out that a certificate of origin is a customs’ document and therefore proposed to refer to phytosanitary certificate to make it clear. The secretariat explained that these are two different certificates and the certificate of origin states only where the commodity comes from. A participant suggested either to refer to phytosanitary origin or to reword it as “certificate indicating the origin of the plant or plant material according to phytosanitary meaning” as there is the risk of having certificates with a different meaning of origin and reported an example that if a plant is harvested in country A and processed in country B, then country B is the country of origin.
- [68] **Confidence level of pest detection method.** The presenter reported that several CPs proposed a different wording of the paragraph as there are several terms that have not been used in ISPMs before and therefore highlighted the need for attention to the wording. The assistant steward proposed the rewording of the whole paragraph, in line with the European Union legislation, to clarify that the concept is risk-based and statistically sound by referring, for example, to method sensitivity (sampling effectiveness x diagnostic sensitivity). A participant, although agreeing in principle with the proposal, pointed out that the wording proposed would be more suitable for diagnostic protocols.
- [69] Other participants discussed about the term “confidence level” proposing, for example:
- the replacement of the terms “desired confidence level” with “desired sensitivity” given its importance along with confidence; or
  - the addition of “level of detection” alongside the desired confidence level to be consistent with ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*).
- [70] **Requirements that should be taken into consideration within the inspection method.** Alongside pest’s biology, signs or symptoms, likely distribution pattern in the field and the suitability of conditions for detection, the presenter reported the following proposals:
- refer to section of the draft annex on “Specific objectives of field inspection”, which provides more and detailed information;
  - the proposal to add “optimal time of year” along with the suitability of conditions for detection;
  - the proposal the deletion of the paragraph as it is a repetition of the factors which are already included in the section on “other considerations for field inspection”; and
  - the proposal to review the structure of the section.

- [71] It was noted a comment from a participant who pointed out the difficulty of considering all the factors for field inspection because this draft annex, although it aims to include many factors, is not guideline material.
- [72] **Transparent technical and operational criteria.** The presenter reported the comment that proposed to clarify the meaning of the term “transparent” related to technical and operation criteria, suggesting that it means accessible to the public, adding that harmonization of terms is required as, also in this case, different terms are used.
- [73] **Vicinity of the field.** Following the difficulty in translating into Russian the term “vicinity of the field”, considered a new concept, the participants discussed the meaning of it and agreed in principle with the proposal to replace “requirements in the vicinity of the field (e.g. absence of alternative hosts)” with “location of the field in relation to a required distance from any specific host plants”.
- [74] **Sanitation and hygiene requirements.** The presenter explained that these requirements are not phytosanitary requirements according to the regulation but rather related to good practices when the field inspection is carried out to avoid the contamination of the field. The chairperson raised the point on whether participants are aware of any importing country that set such practices as phytosanitary requirements, given the section referring to the phytosanitary requirements the field inspection may be conducted to verify conformity with. The participants also discussed whether it should refer to requirements only or phytosanitary requirements and agreed, in principle, to retain phytosanitary requirements. A participant added that sanitation is more related to hygienic requirements and provided an example where diseases can be spread from an infested field to a non-infested one when, for example, shoes have not been cleaned. Therefore, the participants discussed the inclusion of examples for clarity, such as the cleaning of machinery. A participant added that the term “sanitation” is used in several standards and used as an example the case of a producer who, after harvesting, has to remove the fruits from the ground and this action is not a phytosanitary measure but it rather refers to the sanitation to reduce the incidence of the pest.
- [75] **Specific objectives of field inspection.** The participants noted the proposals of reviewing the structure of the section and discussed the examples provided of specific objectives of field inspection, in particular the one on managing pest risk. It was proposed either to merge it with other examples as pest risk management is also to meet the objective of meeting phytosanitary import requirements or clarify its meaning as one of the consultation comments intended it as “to increase the likelihood of detection of a pest which is difficult to detect during inspection of consignments”.
- [76] **Inclusion of vectors.** A consultation comment proposed to include vectors in the draft ISPM. However, the inclusion was not accepted because, according to previous discussions, the concept of pest includes already the concept of vectors.
- [77] **Equivalent measures of field inspection.** One consultation comment proposed to move under the section on field-inspection methods the reference to equivalent measures, such as sampling and laboratory testing, in some circumstances, may be more suitable than field inspection to provide assurance that plants are free from the target pest, while another proposal suggested an alternative text to state that, in some circumstances listed in the section, field inspection should be combined with sampling and laboratory testing. However, the assistant steward pointed out that it should be then clarified when laboratory testing is used as a phytosanitary measure alone – or as alternative phytosanitary measure to meet the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country – and when it is combined with field inspection.
- [78] **Inspection pattern.** The presenter pointed out that the term “inspection pattern” is not present in other ISPMs and proposed to replace it with “scheme” as used in EPPO standards.
- [79] **Field inspection outcome.** The presenter highlighted a consultation comments that proposed the replacement of the verb “contribute” with “determine” with regard to the input of the result of field inspection to the decision about whether the plants meet phytosanitary requirements. The assistant



steward proposed to use “determine” when field inspection is conducted as a stand-alone phytosanitary measure and “contribute” when it is carried out as one component of a systems approach.

[80] **Roles and responsibilities of producers.** A consultation comment proposed to clarify the role of the producers with regard to field inspection and the presenter explained that the responsibility of field inspection is with the NPPOs but the process of field inspection is related to other factors, such as monitoring, that are related to the producers so there are some responsibilities in charge of producers.

[81] **Potential implementation issues.** There was a request for practical guidelines and operational indications on how to carry out field inspection. It was also highlighted the importance of including examples related to different scenarios, for example corn fields and orchards.

[82] The chairperson thanked CIAMPITTI for analysing and highlighting the main comments that required discussion and stated the satisfaction of the active participation.

### 5.3 Draft ISPM under 1<sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft revision of ISPM 26 (*Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*) (2021-010)

[83] IOANNIDOU, an SC member, provided background information on the history of the draft standard, the reasons for the revision of ISPM 26 and its annexes contained in Specification 75.

[84] In particular, the presenter reported that:

- the title was modified to include “maintenance” to more accurately reflect the content of the draft ISPM;
- the scope was revised in order to make clear what the standard should not apply to;
- terms and definitions have been updated and clarified, such as “breeding population” and “outbreak”;
- a new section under specific requirements that clarifies the criteria for the area to qualify as a fruit fly pest free area; and
- the annexes have been revised and new ones added.

[85] Regarding the annexes and appendices that were proposed to move to implementation material, the presenter reported some SC comments stating that, by moving these parts to guidance material, some information will be lost. For this reason, the SC agreed to include a reference to the implementation material in the draft standard.

[86] **Scope.** The presenter explained that the following sentence was added for clarity: “If a country has declared a fruit fly to be absent in an area in accordance with ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*), then establishing and maintaining a pest free area in accordance with this standard should not be required by importing countries unless there is technical justification”.

[87] **Reference to implementation materials.** A consultation comment proposed the deletion of the reference to “*Guide for establishing and maintaining pest free areas – Understanding the principal requirements for pest free areas, pest free places of production, pest free production sites and areas of low pest prevalence*” as it was published in 2019 and therefore not harmonized with the revised version of ISPM 4, adopted in 2024. The presenter reported that the SC, at its last meeting in May 2024, agreed that implementation materials would not be cited in the text of the ISPM but could be listed in a Further reading section along with a general statement giving the URL for IPPC guides and training materials.

[88] **Outbreak vs incursion.** The presenter reported a comment that proposed the replacement of the term “incursion” with “outbreak” to align with ISPM 4 and also because the definition of “outbreak” is more encompassing as it can also include incursions. A participant pointed out that, although the rationale of the comment is understandable, there is no consistent use of terms as “incursion” refers to a population that is not established and therefore it should be established case by case when to use “incursion” and “outbreak”.

- [89] **Circumstances where the target fruit fly is transient within the FF-PFA.** The presenter reported an issue identified throughout the text and was object of some comments from CPs: a population may be transient but could also be or not be established. She reported the following paragraph was not clear:

In circumstances where the target fruit fly is transient within the FF-PFA, no action may be necessary unless the presence of the target fruit fly poses an unacceptable risk to plant trade (see Article VII.3 of the IPPC).

and therefore proposed to clarify that no action may be necessary for the transient population of target fruit fly that is not expected to be established. A participant was of the same opinion and reported that the definition of “transience” in the ISPM 5 is “Presence of a pest that is not expected to lead to establishment” and for this reason she agreed that “transient” was not sufficient and proposed to clarify that “transient” means that the transient population of the target fruit fly is not expected to become established in the FF-PFA.

- [90] **Reference to IPPC.** A participant pointed out that the same paragraph refers to the Article VII.3 of the IPPC. She specified that the Article VII of the IPPC is entitled "Requirements in relation to imports", thus referring to importing countries, while the paragraph refers to the possible establishment of the fruit fly in the exporting. Therefore, the participant suggested deletion of the reference to Article VII.3 of the IPPC.
- [91] **Plant trade.** A participant pointed out a consultation comment stating that, throughout the text, it is used the term “plant trade” and not “trade of plants and plant products” and thus proposed to consider a rewording. A participant clarified that the term “plant” refer to all the part of the plant, such as seed or flowers, while “plant product” refers to sugar for example, and since the draft ISPM refers to fruit flies, fruits are plants, not plant products, the proposal is to maintain the text as it is.
- [92] **Notification of NPPOs of importing countries when criteria for incursion or breeding population are met.** The presenter highlighted a consultation comment which proposed that NPPOs of importing countries should be notified not when the criteria for an incursion are met but when the criteria for a breeding population (transient or established) are, as this case is worse than a transient population. Another proposal was to replace “incursion” with “outbreak” while third one was to rephrase the sentence as follows: “if the criteria are met, the NPPOs of relevant importing countries (see ISPM 17) should be notified of the outbreak” because if there is a breeding population, then there is an outbreak.
- [93] **Eradication measures and transient or established breeding population.** A participant proposed to clarify that if the breeding population that was detected is not transient, an eradication area and related control measures should be established. The intent is that if there is risk for plant trade, then eradication measures should be taken.

#### **5.4 Draft ISPM under 1<sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex *Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds (2018-009) to ISPM 38 (International movement of seeds)***

- [94] Harry ARIJS, an SC member, provided background information regarding the history of the draft annex, the scope and the reasons for its development, in particular:
- that trade of seeds has become global with seeds circulating around the world before they reach the final destination and therefore it is important that NPPOs have a common understanding of certification that can be provided;
  - that NPPOs are exploring the use of systems approaches (SAs) to manage the pest risk associated with the international movement of seeds;
  - that industry practices that contribute to a pest risk reduction in seeds moving internationally could be incorporated in systems approaches developed by NPPOs; and
  - that a SA can serve as an alternative option for the phytosanitary certification of seeds.
- [95] The presenter provided as well important considerations:

- SA for seeds can provide an additional option for phytosanitary certification while meeting the phytosanitary import requirements of all the NPPOs involved along the seed supply chain;
- Entities interested in participating in the SA for seeds should be authorized by NPPOs before their participation begins;
- Production practices used by participating entities may be included by NPPOs in the SAs if they effectively reduce pest risks;
- NPPOs should identify the pest risks of individual pests or pest groups;
- SA for seeds can be used to manage individual pests or pest groups (concept used in ISPM 36); and
- NPPOs can always use testing to verify that regulated pests were eliminated from the seed supply chain.

[96] Moreover, the presenter explained:

- that NPPOs for identifying the Critical Control Points (CCPs) at which measures could be applied;
- the establishment of performance criteria, its components as well as seed entities should meet the performance criteria for each measure associated with the SA; and
- the responsibilities of NPPOs, for example the development of the list of regulated pests associated with the seed commodity, and seed entities.

[97] The presenter concluded that the NPPOs must play a central role in SAs, for example in case of quarantine, and also because ISPMs are addressed to NPPOs.

[98] Another participant expressed some concerns:

- As the seed trade is organized globally, SA should be multilateral to be successful and therefore countries have to work together;
- make clear which pests are within the scope of the SA; and
- Import consignment and phytosanitary certificate: there are ten additional declarations for seed as every country requires specific wording for the same measure, raising the cost of management and confusion. Therefore, the proposal is to harmonize not only the measures but

[99] **Experiences in applying SAs.** Several participants questioned the presenter to share positive and negative experiences in the application of SAs, in particular from European Union (EU) Member States, as some of them are key seed suppliers and many producers are European. The presenter replied that EU does not apply SA as described in this draft annex as EU has general import requirements for all countries, and the principle behind SA is new and therefore there is hesitation to hand over control. A participant added that some EU Member States only recently introduced SAs in their work so testing is still undergoing without conclusions being drawn yet. .

[100] Some participants recalled that that this standard does not bind NPPOs but it would be important to have a common understanding of SAs and provide comments in order to elaborate what is needed in the establishment of SA for seed trade.

[101] **Inclusion of additional documentation as reference.** The chairperson questioned the presenter on the potential linkages between this draft standard and, for example, OECD schemes, whose inclusion in the standard might be helpful. The presenter stated that the starting point is this ISPM and only at a later stage consider the inclusion of additional documentation that may fit.

[102] **Participating entities.** The presenter highlighted that the definition of “entities” drew attention and emphasized that the participating entities are not simply entities that participate in the SA, but they need to be registered and authorized. Therefore, one of the proposals was to refer to “authorizing entities” rather than “participating entities”.



- [103] **Annex to ISPM 14 or ISPM 38.** The presenter pointed out that the draft annex refers to ISPM 14 and that some comments suggested this draft standard be annexed to ISPM 14 as some aspects of the current draft are already covered in it. The presenter stated that it would be beneficial having the draft standard annexed to ISPM 38, which is related to the international movement of seeds.
- [104] **Measures and critical control points.** The presenter pointed out that the examples of critical control points reported in this section are similar to the ones included in ISPM 38 and therefore some comments proposed whether there is the need to include them in this standard or simply refer to section 1.5 of ISPM 38. The presenter added that EPPO considered useful retaining this list in the draft annex as it refers to the different stages where critical control points take place as well as the associated regulatory actions and production practices that may reduce pest risk.
- [105] **Responsibilities of NPPOs and participating entities in addressing pest risk along the seed supply chain.** The presenter reported that many comments were submitted on this matter. He remarked that the ISPMs refer to NPPOs and, based on this, he reported that several comments that pointed out that the draft annex should address the NPPOs, not the participating entities. The presenter stressed it should be clearly described in the draft annex that NPPOs are responsible for determining the measures that comprise a systems approach, verifying their effectiveness at reducing the pest risk posed by potential pests associated with each of the production stages, including the evaluation, auditing and authorizations.
- [106] **Multilateral systems approaches.** The presenter highlighted that some comments suggesting either to provide a more detailed description on multilateral systems approaches or remove any reference to them. The chairperson questioned the feasibility of using a multilateral systems approach for seed certification and a participant provided an example of multilateral SAs for seed between Argentina, Chile and US, adding that, since the seed trade is global with many countries being involved in it, an approach towards bilateral SAs might not be beneficial.
- [107] **Importing requirements and SAs.** The chairperson questioned how EU's import requirements would be set if we want to apply SA through supply chain and a participant suggested that, in a SA, it would be specified the roles and responsibilities and specify what would be the importing requirements while another one pointed out that the general importing requirements would not change: the seeds should still be free from certain pests and this would be demonstrated by the phytosanitary certificate. He added that the various parties involved in the SA should first of all agree on the list of pests and how they should be treated. The chairperson, in this case, proposed to clearly mention that said seed should stay within the same region and, in any case, underlined the importance of traceability throughout the whole process. The presenter added that the imported seeds should still come with phytosanitary certificate to demonstrate that the seeds are free from pest of concerns of the importing country and that a SA can provide an additional option for the phytosanitary certification of seeds while meeting the phytosanitary import requirements of all the NPPOs involved along the seed supply chain. The chairperson concluded that it seems it would be quite challenging running all the tests on each particular seed.
- [108] **Example contained in Appendix 1.** The presenter reported that the appendix reports an example, based on the ReFreSH system developed by USA, of critical control points along the seed supply chain where seed pest risk considerations exist and pest risk can be managed by the regulatory actions of NPPOs together with the actions of participating entities. Some comments suggested to remove it while others to retain it while making it more neutral. The presenter added that the appendix is not a prescriptive part of the standard and that the example gives a quite comprehensive overview.
- [109] **Way forward for the draft annex.** A participant questioned how the SC sees the way forward and the presenter firstly underlined the work done so far to reach an initial agreement on the text as at the beginning the European countries were against the approval of this draft annex for consultation and there were proposals of sending it back to the EWG for rewriting or even proposing the development of a new specification. With the review of the text that enhanced the central of the NPPO, the European countries agreed to have the reviewed draft annex approved for consultation. The presenter concluded that, in any case, SAs are voluntary and consider them a viable option.

- [110] A participant provided questioned on countries' positions regarding the draft annex, particularly their agreement with the text, with requests to share good practices from NPPOs (not the private sector), consider consulting the private sector on specific areas, and discuss whether to include or remove private sector obligations in the standard for a unified approach.
- [111] On the first point, the presenter replied that they would agree on the text as long as NPPOs retain the control, while on third point, he explained that private sector provided its inputs through NPPOs and RPPOs and stated that the seed industry is soliciting for the development and adoption of this draft annex.
- [112] Another participant stated she considers SAs viable but they require work and that it is crucial streamlining the existing ISPMs, for example ISPM 14. Regarding the example reported in the appendix 1, the participant underlined that Chile, Argentina and USA are implementing this system only for few years and it was drafted to be applied to the seed industry.

### **5.5 Draft ISPM under 2<sup>nd</sup> Consultation: Draft annex *Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood (2015-004) to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood)***

- [113] Thorwald GEUZE, an IC member, provided background information on the history of the draft annex to ISPM 39 and outlined the reasons for annex, the scope and the requirements for the development of wood commodities systems approaches.
- [114] **Scope.** The presenter highlighted several consultation comments proposing the review of the scope to improve clarity and accuracy. In particular, the scope of this annex is to provide guidance to NPPOs on the use of “specific integrated measures that, when applied together, reduce the pest risk posed by quarantine pests associated with the international movement of wood” within the context of a wood-commodities systems approach.
- [115] **Data be used to identify infested trees and guide harvest-planning decisions.** It was highlighted a consultation comment proposing to include data not only from field inspection but also from regular forest inventories, which should provide valuable information on vitality and growth of trees within a respective forest stand.
- [116] **Cold temperature as treatment or mitigating factor.** A consultation comment pointed out that cold temperature – below –15 °C – during harvest, post-harvest, transport and storage cannot be considered a treatment during storage as treatment is an official procedure as per ISPM 5 and cold temperature is not. The comment continued stating that if the cold temperature is within the native range of a pest, the pest will not be harmed as it is adapted to such cold temperature but rather remain in a dormant stage” and concluded that “low temperature can only prevent reinfestation”. The presenter agreed that cold temperature is not a temperature but it could be considered a mitigating factor during storage and transportation as the pest is immobilized, resulting in a lower pest risk.
- [117] **Sawing and planing wood.** The presenter highlighted some comments on this procedure related to the change of pest status during the production cycle of the wood. In particular, consultation comments pointed out the necessity of specifying which type sawing process will guarantee a complete removal of the bark, that sawing wood is a not a management measure and that sawn wood is a commodity. Therefore, the presenter stated that sawing should not be defined in the table but rather within the wood-commodities systems approach as well as the requirements for sawing.
- [118] **Refer to sawn wood or wood.** A consultation comment proposed to refer to wood and not sawn wood only, although it would be easier to detect pests in sawn wood rather than round wood. The presenter considered either the removal of “sawn” from “quality control of sawn wood” or add another example in the table on quality control for round wood as well. A participant pointed out that the standard is about wood, not only sawn wood and, for this reason, the list of measure should not refer to sawn wood only but to wood. Another participant highlighted that the reason why it is referred to sawn wood might be because the section in which this procedure is contained is “processing and treatment”, while previous

steps, such as post-harvest, refer to round wood. Eventually, it was proposed first to remove “sawn” from “quality control of sawn wood” and then replace it with “processed” as debarked round wood is processed but not sawn.

[119] **Chipping and relative pest risk.** The presenter highlighted a consultation comment stating that commercial specifications for chip quality cannot reduce pest risk whereas different type and quality of wood chips pose different levels of pest risk. It was proposed to rephrase the paragraph to clarify that the use of commercial specifications may reduce pest risk because of the conformity to the specification.

[120] **Cleanliness of conveyances.** A consultation comment proposed that the cleaning of conveyances before loading or after unloading to reduce infestation of wood commodities by pests from previous cargoes must be mandatory by replacing “may” with “must”. Some participants agreed with the proposal as the cleaning of conveyances should be common practice while others recalled that these are examples of measures and are not mandatory and “should” could be used. A participant remarked that the measures listed in the table are not measures that should be done but rather measures that may be included in the systems approach. Eventually, it was proposed the following rewording: “Cleaning of conveyances before loading or after unloading reduce infestation of wood commodities by pests from previous cargoes”.

## 5.6 Draft ISPM under 2<sup>nd</sup> Consultation: Draft annex *International movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit (2021-011) to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures)*

[121] CIAMPITTI, an SC member, provided background information on the history of the draft annex to ISPM 46, the first commodity standard being developed. The presenter pointed out that, at the last meeting of the CPM, it was agreed that commodity standards will be subjects – and not topics –, therefore no specifications will be needed. Then, the presenter highlighted that the draft ISPM was reviewed according to consultation comments received and the main ones were to:

- make the “scope” specific to the commodity, fresh *Mangifera indica* (mango) (Sapindales: Anacardiaceae) fruit;
- reinforce key statements on the responsibilities of importing NPPOs with respect to using commodity standards;
- include the references for pest-host association;
- emphasize phytosanitary treatments (PTs) adopted by the CPM by making them appear in bold in the text; and
- adding or removing specific pests and measures.

[122] Among the implementation issues raised during consultation, it was suggested that implementation of the commodity standards could be enhanced by the development of a searchable database of information. It was suggested that, where possible, it should include commodities, pests and measures, and efficacy information (if available), number of years a measure has been used in trade and any other criteria that provide confidence in the effectiveness of measures as described in ISPM 46. The development of a database and the resources needed to do so are being considered by the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS).

[123] A participant questioned in case treatments and requirements are not established by ISPMs and thus, for example, refer to regional standards. The presenter explained that, as stated in ISPM 46, a measure may be considered by the TPCS for inclusion in a commodity standard when it is, or has been, set as a phytosanitary import requirement by at least one contracting party and hence in operation between at least two contracting parties. Moreover, the inclusion in the standard is further supported if one or more of the criteria laid out in ISPM 46 are met, including the experience from domestic use.

[124] The participant then pointed out that it might be confusing including treatments in the table which are agreed by the IPPC and others that are not, and these treatments being considered acceptable by exporting countries. It was replied that the measures included in this draft commodity standard have to

be automatically accepted by NPPOs and that it is a starting point as the options for phytosanitary measures included in it meet the criteria outlined in ISPM 46. Moreover, it is the NPPO of importing country that determines the level of pest risk and evaluate whether the options provided in this commodity standard meet this level before instituting these options as phytosanitary measures.

[125] The presenter recalled that several consultation comments proposed the addition of pests to the table in the draft commodity standard and she reminded that, to be included in the table, the pests have to be considered to be associated with fresh *M. indica* fruit, are regulated in international trade by at least one contracting party and are based on technical justification.

[126] **Pest group.** A participant pest group is common term and general and a more scientific one should be such as “taxa” or “taxon”. The presenter pointed out that pest groups is not always related to taxon, but rather to the biology of the pest. For example, it is referred in the table to Hemiptera as different pest groups such as mealybugs, whiteflies and other Hemipterans. The presenter took note of the proposal to refer to “Taxa” rather than “Pest group”.

[127] The presenter highlighted the new paragraph added to clarify that the addition of measures need to meet the criteria laid out in ISPM 46:

Options for phytosanitary measures included in this commodity standard meet the criteria in the core text of ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*).

[128] **Options for methyl bromide fumigation (MB).** The presenter explained an extensive use of methyl bromide fumigation can be requested only if there is a documentation to support the request on the efficacy for a specific pest. For this reason, there is no reference to methyl bromide fumigation related to a specific pest in the text.

[129] **Evaluation of references.** A participant clarified that countries are requested to submit also the reference but the content of such reference will not be assessed and the presenter recalled that it is not a task of TPCS to re-evaluate the conclusion of PRA carried out by NPPOs. However, the chairperson pointed out that the result of the PRA cannot be attached to the standard and that the verification of meeting the criteria leads to the verification of the documents. The presenter replied that some proposals were refused as they were clearly not in line with the PRA.

## 5.7 Draft Specification for ISPM under consultation: Draft specification on *Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM (2023-037)*

[130] Jose Maria GUITIAN CASTRILLON, an EPPO panel member, provided background information on the history of the topic, the reasons for the revision of the draft reorganization pest risk analysis (PRA) ISPM as well as the main tasks of the expert working group (EWG) should undertake.

[131] The presenter highlighted the main consultation comments submitted from CPs of EPPO region:

- Current text is challenging;
- Not all CPs submitted comments to the whole text so the SC does not have a complete overview;
- The approval of the draft standard on pest risk management for quarantine pests, which was considered as high priority, will be delayed following the reorganization of the draft ISPM;
- Some countries proposed that more “freedom” should be given to the EWG in the development of the revision of the draft reorganized PRA ISPM and the presenter pointed out that it should be clarified what are the priorities and consequently the tasks for the EWG;
- Whether the proposed structure, as drafted by the last EWG, should be maintained and the presenter stated that said structured should be maintained or should be similar to, for example, WOH standard’s structure, which are very different from ISPMs’, and therefore it should be considered by the EWG or discussed at SC level or even to CPM;
- Whether guidance and requirements should be separated or merged as in adopted ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*); and

- Whether there is the need to include in task 1 the review of standards developed by other standard setting organizations (i.e. World Organisation for Animal Health, Codex Alimentarius Commission) named in the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, and the presenter considered that this should be removed from the tasks of the EWG.

[132] **Scope.** A participant pointed out that the scope clearly states that the “ISPM should also clearly describe the relationship between the pest risk and phytosanitary measures” but, as of now, this is not reflected in the tasks and that the EWG should focus on this rather than revising World Organization for Animal Health’s (WOAH) and Codex Alimentarius Commission’s standards. This task would support countries on how to use the results of the PRA for pest risk management. The presenter replied that pest risk management was already included in the document but it could be clarified in the text of the Scope section. The participants agreed.

[133] **Review of sister organizations’ standards and relative standard setting procedure and EWG’s task 1.** A participant stressed that the question of whether referring to WOAH’s and Codex’s standards should be addressed rather than deferred, as this matter could be brought up again in the future.

[134] Several participants agreed that how WOAH and Codex develop their standards shall be considered at SC level, or even at Strategic Planning Group (SPG), but not at the EWG given the importance of the topic and therefore agreed in principle to remove the review of WOAH’s and Codex’s standards from the EWG’s tasks. This was also considered important to avoid risks of structural changes, which may create precedents as well as the possibility that the EWG decides that the standard should be completely reorganized according to the sister organizations’ standards structure. Moreover, it was agreed in principle that no experts from a sister organization to the IPPC should be attending the EWG meeting.

[135] **Other information regarding the draft standard.** A participant reminded that the draft standard on PRA was initially sent for consultation for what concerns the management part and the comments were addressed by the steward, who did a remarkable job. Moreover, the steward underlined the fact that some comments proposed by some CPs might change how standards are drafted. It was also decided that the comments received during first consultation and the comments addressed by steward would have been considered by future EWG.

## 5.8 Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Draft Specification on *Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (2021-020)*

[136] Marco TRAA, a CPM Strategic Planning Group (SPG) member, outlined the history and the reason for the development of this draft Specification.

[137] **References.** TRAA highlighted one general comment pointing out that it is reported in the references of the draft Specification only one scientific article<sup>1</sup>, dated 2006, raising questions regarding the rationale for the development of the standard. It was also noted that the title refers to invasive alien species rather than phytosanitary issues. The scientific article refers to invasive alien species, which range from microbes to mammals. The number of outbreaks or problems increases with the numbers of pests, diseases for crops and livestock, and other organisms intercepted by quarantine units. Moreover, the articles cites a variety of pests, ranging from Larger grain borer to plant nematodes, earthworm, mealy bugs and related to contaminated ballast water. The articles also mentions examples of quite old phytosanitary outbreaks such as cassava mealy bug in 1970s, sugarcane white grub in early 20<sup>th</sup> century or wholly aphid in 1909.

[138] A participant pointed out that the proposal of this standard originated from the Pacific region, where all the commodities imported are controlled in the same way. This is not considered acceptable for the

<sup>1</sup> **Murphy S.T., Cheesman, O.D.** 2006. The Aid Trade International Assistance Programs as Pathways for the Introduction of Invasive Alien Species (a preliminary report). A paper prepared by C.A.B.I. Bioscience, U.K. Centre. 38 p.



European and Central Asia region and it is for this reason that it was developed as a CPM recommendation and not as a standard.

- [139] **Scope of the standard.** Another participant highlighted that the draft Specification refers not only to plants and plant products – therefore referring to IPPC –, but also to food. The participant therefore questioned if the Food Assistance Convention (FAC) and the relative rules of procedure and implementation, which define what the eligible products for food assistance are, are being considered or additional information shall be provided.
- [140] On this point, a participant recalled what happened with the CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers, where the Task Force discussed the movement of clean containers and faced the issue of defining the term “clean” in the context of the IPPC. It was then suggested whether the term “safe” in the context of IPPC in relation to the movement of aid, although this would restrict the scope.
- [141] A participant pointed out that in the Scope section of the draft Specification it is stated already that the standard should not cover issues of food safety or animal pests associated with the food-aid supply chain, thus narrowing the scope of the standard. However, it should be made clear that only phytosanitary issues are addressed (e.g. clarifying that pest risk is related to the plants or that the scope falls within the scope of the IPPC).
- [142] It was also proposed to clarify that the standard shall not cover biosecurity issues as well. However, this would make many actions redundant, questioning the need for the standard.
- [143] **Need of the standard.** Another major concern raised was whether there is an actual need for this standard as there is already an adopted CPM Recommendation on the same topic. The chairperson stated that there must have been a discussion on the reason why it was agreed to elaborate a CPM Recommendation rather than an ISPM at that time. A participant recalled that EPPO previously concluded that a standard on this topic was not needed.
- [144] **Risk of creating a precedent.** Several participants raised concerns about the derogation to the Standard Setting Procedure (SSP) as the CPM did not approve this topic and this draft Specification is not following the SSP, thus creating a precedent. The secretariat recalled that the CPM agreed to proceed in this way and that it is the governing body of the IPPC. Moreover, the secretariat explained that the CPM agreed to submit the draft Specification for consultation so that CPs could raise their concerns and, once the consultation period is concluded, the CPM Focus Group would address the comments to revise the draft specification, which will be then presented to the SC. The Standards Committee, following their consideration, would present to the CPM the finalized draft specification with a request for the CPM to decide whether the development of an ISPM should proceed. Eventually, the participants convened that the SSP shall be followed in order to not to create a precedent.
- [145] **Collaboration of IPPC with CBD.** The scientific article mentions that the “IPPC is working in collaboration with the CBD on the broadening of existing standards for phytosanitary measures to include environmental concerns” and it was questioned the exact meaning of “environmental concerns”, considered a very broad concept. The secretariat explained that this is contained in the Specifications for draft ISPMs and it became a standard task for EWGs, which have to consider whether the draft ISPM being developed could affect in a specific way (positively or negatively) the protection of biodiversity and the environment. If this is the case, the impact should be identified, addressed and clarified in the draft ISPM. However, the secretariat highlighted that it is usually a complex task to be completed in the short amount of time the EWG has to elaborate the draft ISPM and the task itself is currently being under discussion by the SC.

## 6. Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs

### 6.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities

[146] Zsuzsanna KERESZTES, a FAO REU representative, updated the participants on the latest activities and initiatives, organized within the framework of FAO Four Betters (4Bs) and the three regional priority programmes (RPPs) on:

- empowering smallholders, family farms and youth through inclusive rural transformation, digitalization and innovation;
- transforming food systems and facilitating market access and integration; and
- managing natural resources sustainably and preserving biodiversity in a changing climate.

with the second and third one connected to IPPC's strategic objectives.

[147] The presenter provided several actions being carried out in the region's countries such as the promotion of Integrated Pest Management (IPM), resilience in agrifood systems, workshops, support in digitalization, FAO's One Country One Priority Product (OCOP) initiative, contingent management plans, technical support for projects (e.g. sustainable crop production, IPM and food value chain), support in joining IPPC ePhyto Solution, as well as global emergency support to Ukraine, Armenia and Moldova.

[148] The presenter illustrated also the Regional Technical Platform on Green Agriculture, a digital, user-friendly, open, intraregional and interregional gateway for sharing information. It is a knowledge repository that facilitates connections among expert networks regarding various technical areas related to green agriculture, with the aim to support plant protection in Europe and Central Asia region.

### 6.2 EPPO activities

[149] HORN, EPPO Director General, explained the role of EPPO as RPPO and its activities, such as:

- early warning system with EPPO Alert list;
- evaluate risks presented by emerging pests through PRA; and
- recommendation on pests which should be regulated in EPPO region and prepare associated Standards (e.g. diagnostics and phytosanitary measures).

[150] The presenter reported some of the projects, both concluded and ongoing, such as:

- the first part of the EU Project on Regulated Non-Quarantine Pests (RNQP) (2016-2018), which aimed at the development of a methodology for assessing the RNQP status of pests, as well as the implementation of that methodology to candidate organisms identified for various sectors;
- the second part of the project (2023-2025), which aims to assess the potential RNQP status of the pests listed in the EU Fruit Marketing Directives and, as of now, a total of 429 pest/host combinations were identified; and
- the revision of the EPPO datasheets on regulated pests (2020-2024), with a revision and production of 360 datasheets, transformed into dynamic datasheets to be displayed in the EPPO Global Database.

[151] The presenter reported the EPPO Global Database, where all pest-specific information that has been produced or collected by EPPO is constantly updated.

[152] The presenter illustrated also the EPPO Platform on PRAs, which aims to provide, in a single portal. PRAs relevant for the EPPO region for all pest and commodity such as EPPO PRAs, European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) PRAs and national assessments. NPPOs of EPPO member countries and their national agencies involved in PRA activities can upload their PRA information to the platform in English or any other national language.

- [153] The presenter showcased the EPPO Panel on Global Phytosanitary Affairs, which is composed of experts nominated by member countries who agree on the position of the region on all matters relating to the International Plant Protection Convention, such as the review of ISPMs under the country consultation process, prepare EPPO comments on ISPMs by using OCS as well as the review of documents and agendas, especially those linked with the annual meeting of the CPM).
- [154] The presenter illustrated also the role of EPPO as co-organizer of IPPC Regional Workshops and the support in the translation of the draft ISPMs and draft Specification for ISPMs into Russian.
- [155] The presenter concluded the presentation by displaying several future activities, such as the workshop on future work of EPPO, which cover a 5-year strategic plan, and the upcoming meetings of some EPPO panels.

### **6.3 Host country NPPO activities**

- [156] Artur NIKOYAN illustrated the structure of Food Safety Inspection Body, which operates under the government of Armenia. The Food Safety Inspection Body is the NPPO of Armenia and it collaborates with the IPPC and the WTO.
- [157] The presenter then outlined several results and achievements of the NPPO such as the identification of 12 quarantine pests during inspections, the testing of 500 pests per year, the activities carried out such as workshops and training for farmers on the proper use of pesticides, the collaboration with partner countries as well as the improvement of national regulations. The presenter highlighted also the control over the import of chemicals and pesticides, the quality control of imported and exported products, the monitoring of sold products and the compliance with national regulations.
- [158] The chairperson thanked the presenter for the exhaustive overview and wished Armenia join EPPO in the near future.

### **6.4 Phytosanitary situation in the ECA region (e.g. emerging pests, projects, other issues, phytosanitary measures for seeds, including import requirements)**

- [159] The chairperson opened the floor to the representative of North Macedonia, Kazakhstan and Russian Federation to present the phytosanitary situation in their respective countries.
- [160] Nadica DZERKOVSKA, representative of North Macedonia, outlined the national legal framework, international framework and the relevant acquis (EU regulation) and pointed out that North Macedonia joined the IPPC in 1993, EPPO in 1997 and Central European Trade Agreement (CEFTA) in 2006.
- [161] The presenter explained that the national legal framework is based on the EU Official Controls Regulation (2017) and EU Plant Health Law (2019) and that it is being drafted a new national plant health law in compliance with such regulations.
- [162] The presenter reported that, in the implementation of the “rulebook” related to Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/2072, many misunderstandings were faced, for example on the import of used machinery in agricultural sectors and, for this reason, invited non-EU countries to harmonize the legislation and collaborate closely with customs offices to facilitate the trade of plant, plant products and other objects.
- [163] Regarding institutional framework, the Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy is responsible for development and implementation of plant health policy and legislation. Although the absence of a legal base, North Macedonia began the programme on surveillance of priority pests for the country and, with the new law, a dedicated body will be created to oversee the surveillance of priority pests and implementation activities.
- [164] The presenter also reported on:



- the annual phytosanitary monitoring programme, which is a survey programme based on surveillance of quarantine and regulated non-quarantine, priority and emergency pests, host plants;
- the phytosanitary information system; and
- the general contingency planning and pest specific contingency plans that are relevant at regional level.

[165] The presenter also reported on the current projects on:

- Central European Trade Agreement (CEFTA) to facilitate the trade of fruits and vegetables;
- The improvement of administrative and operation capacities of the plant protection authorities;
- Capacity building of veterinary and plant health services in the western Balkans; and
- Strengthening national phytosanitary system.

[166] A participant questioned if North Macedonia carried out a phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE) and the presenter replied that it did not yet.

[167] Arman ABDULLIN, the representative of Kazakhstan firstly outlined the structure of the State Inspection Committee, the subsidiary organizations, the regional representations and the network of the local administrative unites.

[168] The presenter reported activities related to quarantine pests, such as the interceptions at the border through the phytosanitary checkpoint controls, the transformation, digitalization and the implementation of a quarantine pests' system as well as examples of measures against the violation of quarantine requirements, such as the incineration of infested tomato seeds.

[169] The representative of the Russian Federation, Igor RYLKOV, outlined first the institutional structure and then the communication strategy developed by the All-Russian Plant Quarantine Center, which is based on four pillars:

- scientific events, such as scientific conferences on plant protection and quarantine, underlining the importance of inclusion and participation of young researchers;
- visualization, which included informative videos on YouTube on several topics such as diagnostics and quarantine pests;
- social media, where updates on the activities carried out are reported, in particular Telegram and VK; and
- merchandise, such as calendars and activity books.

[170] Some participants expressed appreciation for the qualitative material developed and invited the Russian NPPO to share the informative material on the EPPO platform as well as submit it to the secretariat.

## 6.5 Topics of interest for the region

[171] SHAMILOV explained the group exercise: split into three groups and followed by three facilitators, the participants had discussed two topics – latest outbreaks of quarantine pests and applied eradication measures, and topics of regional interests to be discussed at the next IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia – and had reported to the plenary.

[172] The first group focused on:

- the issues related to the transportation of timber and packing material, in particular during the shipment from pest free areas and proposed to discuss what could made and what measures could be applied to ensure freedom of pest from the commodity during transportation;
- the development of a network of laboratories within a framework to ensure traceability; and
- discuss best practices of movement of seeds.

[173] Regarding the latest outbreaks, the first group identified several pests such as *Tomato brown rugose fruit virus*, *Pepino mosaic virus* and, as quarantine pests, *Bactrocera dorsalis*, *Spodoptera frugiperda* and *Aleurocanthus spiniferus* as well as *Halyomorpha halys* which, however, is not a quarantine pest.

[174] The second group reported examples on the importance of traceability and, in particular, of communication. For example, a CP reported how they successfully dealt with *Root-knot nematode* and how the tracing of the products, through the plant passport, allowed them to destroy contaminated material and prevent spread of root-knot nematode. Another CP reported the measures applied against the *Agilus planipennis*, in particular the essential role of the establishment of a web group to share information in a quick and efficient manner throughout the countries. A third CP reported how they fought an outbreak of *Bark beetle* through an efficient collaboration with researchers who managed to identify that said Bark beetle was non-European and therefore the CP could apply restricting measures in a quick manner. They had surveillance programme in place and with help of traps they identified outbreaks. Another CP reported the success of the interception measures applied during the import control. Other CPs reported that no outbreaks were quickly identified also thanks to the good network of laboratories that was established.

[175] Regarding the topics to be considered for discussion at the next IPPC Regional workshop, the second group highlighted:

- the use of artificial intelligence to support NPPOs;
- ePhyto, in particular phytosanitary issues such as dealing with mixed consignment, replace or withdrawal of ePhytos as well as how to join ePhyto;
- contingency plans, in particular knowledge- and experience-sharing from countries; and
- potato pests, such as *Colorado potato beetle*, which is a pest of economic significance for the region.

[176] The third group proposed to allocate more time for discussion at the next IPPC Regional workshop for the following topics:

- issues faced by countries and how they dealt with them and whether the measures applied were successful or not; and
- locusts, in particular what chemicals are being used.

[177] Regarding the pests, the third group identified *Ceratitis capitata*, *Tomato brown rugose fruit virus*, *Frankliniella occidentalis*, *Spodoptera frugiperda*.

[178] The secretariat thanked the participants, wished they enjoyed the group exercise and will aim to include the topics proposed in the agenda of the next IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia.

## 7. Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session)

### 7.1 New IPPC Guides and e-learning courses

[179] SHAMILOV explained that IPPC Guides and training materials are implementation and capacity development tools that are developed under the oversight of the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) and they include guides, e-learning courses and training kits. The guides and the training materials are developed to:

- support the implementation of the IPPC, ISPMs and CPM Recommendations;
- provide accurate and easy to understand technical information; and
- share best practices to facilitate the establishment and operation of national phytosanitary systems as well as support development of national strategies, policies, legislation, SOPs, manuals, training programmes and building national phytosanitary capacities.

[180] The presenter reported that two IPPC e-learning courses on NROs and surveillance and pest status determination were released and five guides about participating in CPM, e-commerce, wood packaging material, emergency preparedness and *Fusarium TR4* prevention, preparedness and response were

published. The presenter also showed participants where all the IPPC guides and training materials can be found on the IPP and invited participants to consider the possibility of becoming translators or proof-readers of such resources as in-kind contribution.

- [181] A participant pointed out the need to update guides when the relative ISPM is updated or revised, otherwise such guides could either be withdrawn or an ink amendment could be applied to the ISPM the guide refers to. The secretariat replied that the process of updating guides follows the same procedure for updating ISPMs while an IC member added that guides are updated based on available resources and that the CP could submit the update of the guide as topic to the next Call for topics for standards and implementation.

## **7.2 E-commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade**

- [182] GEUZE updated the participants on the IPPC Observatory study on e-commerce, which aims to understand the extent to which the CPM recommendations have been implemented by IPPC contracting parties, providing baseline data to monitor the global evolution of phytosanitary e-commerce strategies and IPPC's e-commerce programme. In particular, the presenter highlighted the importance of replying to the survey mentioning the issues the country faces during the implementation as well as the data gathered are safely stored and strictly confidential.
- [183] A participant pointed out that, in order to fill the survey, data may not be readily available and therefore it should be elaborated. The presenter replied that all the questions included in the survey are available on the IPP beforehand. Eventually, it was also reminded that the survey shall be submitted through the Contracting Party's official IPPC Contact Point.

## **7.3 Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments**

- [184] ARNITIS explained that Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) are a fully comprehensive NPPO-led, facilitator-enabled, IPPC Secretariat-supported processes of multiple phases, with a wide range of benefits, to help countries evaluate their phytosanitary capacities.
- [185] The presenter explained the three modalities to access a PCE and how it is conducted, which includes a tailored and modular gap identification assessment that allows the identification of weaknesses, gaps and their prioritization.
- [186] The PCE provides a framework for evaluation which includes a situation analysis, strategic planning and a validation phase and, based on the outcomes of the PCE, a phytosanitary capacity development strategy is developed leading to the creation or revision of national legislation.
- [187] The presenter reported an example of a country that, based on the results of the PCE, developed a proposal for STDF to request funds for projects.
- [188] The presenter reported also the main findings of the PCE Desk Study conducted in 2023 which included the generally high satisfaction with the process, the crucial role of the facilitator in guiding NPPOs as well as areas of improvement such as the online platform's user-friendliness.

## **7.4 IPPC commodity standards**

- [189] SHAMILOV explained that commodity standards are developed by the Technical Panel on Commodity Standards (TPCS) and their purpose is to support the development of phytosanitary import requirements that are technically justified and facilitate safe trade, highlighting their strategic value. Moreover, the development, adoption and implementation of commodity standards do not alter the sovereign rights and fundamental obligations under the IPPC and WTO-SPS Agreement and do not impose additional obligations on importing countries as highlighted in ISPM 46 (*Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures*).
- [190] The presenter reported that commodity standards:

- should be considered by CPs when developing phytosanitary import requirements;
- contain lists of pests, which include those known to be associated with the specified commodity and intended use, and corresponding options for phytosanitary measures; and
- list measures that satisfy minimum criteria for inclusion in the standard.

[191] Moreover, the lists of pests and options for phytosanitary measures are not intended to be exhaustive and are subject to review and amendment.

[192] The presenter pointed out that the first commodity standard is on international movement of *Mangifera indica* fruit and there are other seven topics under the work programme of the TPCS.

[193] The presenter informed participants of the ongoing call for information material on four topics: International movement of seeds of *Phaseolus vulgaris*, International movement of fresh taro (*Colocasia esculenta*) for consumption, International movement of fresh banana (*Musa paradisiaca*) fruit and International movement of *Citrus fruit*.

## **7.5 National Reporting Obligations and discussion on obstacles preventing better reporting**

[194] SHAMILOV illustrated what the National Reporting Obligations (NROs) are, their purpose, their connection with the IPPC as well as the difference between public and bilateral NROs. The presenter informed the participants of the available guides and training materials – including e-learning courses – on NROs.

[195] The presenter invited participants to check if their relative country page on the IPP is up to date with the NROs and, if not, inform the secretariat with updated information, including pest reporting and IPPC Official Contact Point's details.

[196] A participant pointed out that, in each country page on the IPP, there is a graph on the reporting obligations, which might be misleading as, for example, it may seem that a high number of pest reports uploaded means the country has done a good job. The presenter agreed that the graph does not fully represent the state of a country and that some adjustments are needed.

## **7.6 Presentations from countries on Communications (IDPH & Comms Networks) and public relation programmes and tools**

[197] Some CPs and RPPOs reported their experience and activities related to the IDPH.

[198] Olga LAVRENTJEVA, representative of Estonia, emphasized the importance of increasing awareness in younger generations and reported some examples such as a tour throughout the schools, which included interactive presentations, highlighting that the activities had a very positive impact.

[199] ARNITIS, representative of Latvia, reported the successful organization of a whole week dedicated to the IDPH, which included different exhibitions in several cities with tents installed to carry out a variety of activities involving schools and delivering lectures. Moreover, several ambassadors were nominated. The representative of Latvia highlighted the valuable support of the European Commission and, in particular, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), which provided useful resources to improve the communication strategy.

[200] DZERKOVSKA, representative of North Macedonia, presented their project which consisted of two events, one in the mountains and one in a central park. Tents were installed where gadgets were handed out so that the public could get familiar with the importance of plant health. Schools were involved as well. The representative pointed out the value of the campaign carried out by EFSA.

[201] Tana KLAILOVA, representative of Czech Republic, reported on the activities organized by the NPPOs, involving children and activities in the agricultural museum, and the participation in the EFSA's campaign.

[202] CIAMPITTI, representative of Italy, provided an overview of the campaign launched by the Lombardy region on the farm fruits that, according to EU regulations, can be introduced without phytosanitary certifications. The campaign was launched through social media and airports and included workshops as well.

[203] IOANNIDOU, representative of Greece, emphasized the importance of public awareness and reported on their activities which targeted travellers, gardeners and students. Within the EFSA's campaign, the representative reported that several activities were carried out, including producing content to be shared and presented by social media influencers.

## **8. Online survey of the workshop**

[204] The chairperson invited the participants to complete the final evaluation survey, which is available in English and Russian languages.

## **9. Date and venue of the next regional workshop**

[205] The venue for the 2025 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia was confirmed as Turkey.

[206] The dates of the workshop are tentatively scheduled for first week of September 2025.

[207] Moreover, Uzbekistan and then Georgia proposed to host the next Regional Workshops for Europe and Central Asia.

## **10. Adoption of the report**

[208] The report would be first reviewed by the Organizing Committee of the 2024 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia and then by the rapporteur. The secretariat will then post the adopted report on the IPP and will notify the participants of its publication.

## **11. Conclusion of the workshop**

[209] The representative of Georgia expressed profound gratitude to the organizers, the secretariat, the colleagues of the NPPO, the chairperson, the interpreters, and the local host for their warm reception.

[210] The EPPO Director General underlined the excellent job of the organizers and for hosting the EPPO Panel on Global Phytosanitary Affairs as well.

[211] The chairperson thanked all the participants, the host, the secretariat and EPPO for their contribution in organizing the workshop as well as the interpreters.

[212] NIKOYAN thanked all for their warm words and underlined the efforts of the local host in organizing the workshop.

[213] The chairperson informed the participants of the field trip's details and closed the workshop.

**Appendix 1: Agenda****Day 1: Monday 02 September**

Registration	
Time	Description
9:00 – 9:55	Registration of participants

Time	No	Item	Presenter / Facilitator	Document
9:30 – 9:55	Coffee break			
	1	Opening of the Session		
10:00 – 10:30	1.1	Welcome remarks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IPPC Secretariat</li> <li>- EPPO Director General</li> <li>- Food Safety Inspection Authority (NPPO of Armenia)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IPPC Secretariat officer</li> <li>- In-person</li> <li>- In-person</li> </ul>	
	2	Meeting Arrangements		
10:30 – 10:35	2.1	Election of the Chair and the Rapporteur	All	
10:35 – 10:40	2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	All	Doc
	3	Administrative Matters	Organizer	
10:40 – 10:45	3.1	Participants list	Organizer	Doc
	4	Updates on Governance and Strategic issues (this will involve presentations, discussion, and questions from workshop's participants)		
10:45 – 11:05	4.1	Governance and strategy (CPM, CPM Bureau)	IPPC Secretariat	PPT
11:05 – 11:30	4.2	Update from IPPC Secretariat on Communications (IDPH & Coms Networks)	Shamilov	PPT
11:30 – 11:55	4.3	Update from SC	Ioannidou	PPT
11:55 – 12:20	4.4	Update from IC	Arnitis	PPT
12:20 – 13:00	4.5	Updates on Strengthening Pest Outbreak and Response Systems (POARS) and CPM Focus Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- POARS Steering group</li> <li>- FG on Climate Change and Phytosanitary Issues</li> <li>- FG on Sea Containers</li> </ul>	Shamilov	PPT

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FG on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Comments on the “safe aid pathway diagram”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>13:00 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>			
	<b>5</b>	<b>Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations</b> (this will involve presentations, discussion, and questions from workshop’s participants)		
<b>14:00 – 14:20</b>	5.1	The IPPC standard setting process in a nutshell <a href="#">Link to video</a>	Torella	Video + PPT
<b>14:20 – 15:30</b>	5.2	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>Field inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 ( <i>Guidelines for inspection</i> )	Ciampitti	Presentation
<b>15:30 – 15:45</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>			
<b>15:45 – 16:05</b>	5.2	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>Field inspection</i> (2021-018) to ISPM 23 ( <i>Guidelines for inspection</i> ) (continued)	Ciampitti	Presentation
<b>16:05 – 17:35</b>	5.3	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft revision of ISPM 26 ( <i>Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)</i> ) (2021-010)	Ioannidou	Presentation
<b>17:35 – 18:00</b>	5.4	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds</i> (2018-009) to ISPM 38 ( <i>International movement of seeds</i> )	Arijs	Presentation

**Day 2: Tuesday 03 September**

Registration	
Time	Description
<b>9:30 – 9:55</b>	Registration of participants

Time	No	Item	Presenter / Facilitator	Document
<b>10:00 – 11:05</b>	5.4	Draft ISPM under 1 <sup>st</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>Design and use of systems approaches for phytosanitary certification of seeds</i> (2018-009) to ISPM 38 ( <i>International movement of seeds</i> ) (continued)	Arijs	Presentation



<b>11:05 – 11:30</b>	5.5	Draft ISPM under 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood</i> (2015-004) to ISPM 39 ( <i>International movement of wood</i> )	Geuze	Presentation
<b>11:30 – 11:45</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>			
<b>11:45 – 12:20</b>	5.5	Draft ISPM under 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood</i> (2015-004) to ISPM 39 ( <i>International movement of wood</i> ) (continued)	Geuze	Presentation
<b>12:20 – 13:00</b>	5.6	Draft ISPM under 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>International Movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit</i> (2021-011) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> )	Ciampitti	Presentation
<b>13:00 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>			
<b>14:00 – 14:20</b>	5.6	Draft ISPM under 2 <sup>nd</sup> Consultation: Draft annex <i>International Movement of fresh Mangifera indica fruit</i> (2021-011) to ISPM 46 ( <i>Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures</i> ) (continued)	Ciampitti	Presentation
<b>14:20 – 15:05</b>	5.7	Draft Specification for ISPM under consultation: Draft specification on <i>Revision of the draft reorganized pest risk analysis ISPM</i> (2023-037)	Guitian Castrillon	Presentation
<b>15:05 – 15:30</b>	5.8	Draft Specification for ISPM under consultation: Draft Specification on <i>Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid</i> (2021-020)	Traa	Presentation



<b>15:30 – 15:45</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>			
<b>15:45 – 16:05</b>	5.8	Draft Specification for ISPMs under consultation: Draft Specification on <i>Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid</i> (2021-020) (continued)	Traa	Presentation
	<b>6</b>	<b>Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs</b> This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants		
<b>16:05 – 16:35</b>	6.1	Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities	Keresztes	PPT
<b>16:35 – 17:05</b>	6.2	EPPO activities	Horn	PPT
<b>17:05 – 17:20</b>	6.3	Host country NPPO activities	Nikoyan	PPT
<b>17:20 – 18:00</b>	6.4	Phytosanitary situation in the ECA region (e.g. emerging pests, projects, other issues, phytosanitary measures for seeds, including import requirements)	3 NPPOs (North Macedonia, Kazakhstan and Russian Federation)	PPT

### Day 3: Wednesday 04 September

Registration	
Time	Description
<b>9:30 – 9:55</b>	Registration of participants

Time	No	Item	Presenter / Facilitator	Document
<b>10:00 – 11:00</b>	6.5	Topics of interest for the region	Organizer <b>Group exercise to discuss different problems and share to the plenary</b>	Discussions
	<b>7</b>	<b>Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session)</b> This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants		
<b>11:00 – 11:30</b>	7.1	New IPPC Guides and e-learning courses	Shamilov	Presentation

<b>11:30 – 11:45</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>			
<b>11:45 – 11:55</b>	7.1	New IPPC Guides and e-learning courses (continued)	Shamilov	Presentation
<b>11:55 – 12:25</b>	7.2	E-commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade	Geuze	Video / Presentation
<b>12:25 – 13:00</b>	7.3	Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations (PCE) and latest developments	Arnitis	Presentation
<b>13:00 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>			
<b>14:00 – 14:30</b>	7.4	IPPC commodity standards: - Key Principles Overview  Call for information material for new commodity standards	Shamilov	PPT
<b>14:30 – 15:00</b>	7.5	National Reporting Obligations and discussion on obstacles preventing better reporting	Shamilov	Presentation Brainstorming based on Behavioural Science for Innovation Approach
<b>15:00 – 15:30</b>	7.6	Presentations from countries on Communications (IDPH & Comms Networks) and public relation programmes and tools	NPPOs (Estonia, Latvia, North Macedonia, Czech Republic, Italy, Greece )	
<b>15:30 – 15:45</b>	<b>Coffee break</b>			
<b>15:45 – 16:45</b>	7.6	Presentations from countries on Communications (IDPH & Comms Networks) and public relation programmes and tools (continued)	NPPOs (Estonia, Latvia, North Macedonia, Czech Republic, Italy, Greece)	
<b>16:45 – 17:05</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>Online survey of the workshop</b>	All participants	
<b>17:05 – 17:10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Date and venue of the next regional workshop</b>	Chair	
<b>17:10 – 17:15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>Adoption of the report</b> (Procedure to be decided for each region)	All participants	
<b>17:15 – 17:30</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>Conclusion of the workshop</b>	Chair	

**Appendix 2: Participants list**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Name, Organization</b>	<b>Email address</b>
<b>Albania</b>	<b>Ms Buça Valdete</b> Director of the Directorate of Health policies of plants, seeds, seedlings and fertilizer Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	valdete.buca@bujqesia.gov.al
<b>Armenia</b>	<b>Mr Artur Nikoyan</b> Head of Phytosanitary Department The Food Safety Inspection Body of the Republic of Armenia	artur.nikoyan@ssfs.am
<b>Belarus</b>	<b>Ms Balashova Tatsiana</b> Deputy Head of the State Plant Quarantine Inspectorate Main State Inspectorate for Seed Breeding, Quarantine and Plant Protection	rastenfito@ggiskzr.by
<b>Bosnia And Herzegovina</b>	<b>Mr Colakovic Nenad</b> Head of Department for Plant Health Protection Administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina for Plant Health Protection	nenad.colakovic@uzzb.gov.ba
<b>Czech Republic</b>	<b>Ms Klailova Tana</b> Senior Plant Health Officer Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (UKZUZ)	tana.klailova@ukzuz.cz
<b>Estonia</b>	<b>Ms Lavrentjeva Olga</b> Principal Adviser of the Agriculture and Food Board of the Republic of Estonia Agriculture and Food Board of the Republic of Estonia	olga.lavrentjeva@pta.agri.ee
<b>European Commission</b>	<b>Mr Arijs Harry</b> Deputy Head of the Plant Health Unit European Commission, Health and Food Safety Directorate-General, Unit G1, Plant Health	harry.arijs@ec.europa.eu
<b>France</b>	<b>Ms Bouhot-Delduc Laurence</b> Expert in Plant Health International Affairs (EU, EPPO, IPPC) Bureau des négociations européennes et multilatérales ; Sous-direction de l'Europe, de l'international et de la gestion intégrée du risque ; DGAL; Ministère agriculture et souveraineté alimentaire	laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr
<b>France</b>	<b>Mr Horn Nico</b> Director General European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)	nico.horn@eppo.int
<b>France</b>	<b>Mr Lucchesi Valerio</b> Scientific Officer European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)	lucchesi@eppo.int
<b>France</b>	<b>Mr Musolin Dmitrii</b> Scientific Officer European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)	dmitrii.musolin@eppo.int
<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Mr Nutsubidze Lasha</b> Deputy head of plant protection division National Food Agency, Ministry of environment protection and Agriculture	lasha.nutsubidze@nfa.gov.ge
<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Mr Rekhviashvili Bezhan</b> Head of Plant quarantine division, National Food Agency of Georgia. Ministry of environmental protection and agriculture IPPC Contact Point Georgia	bezhan.r@gmail.com

Country	Name, Organization	Email address
Germany	<b>Mr Hess Bastian</b> Ecological modeler and plant health scientist at the German Federal Research Centre for Cultivated Plants (Julius Kühn-Institute). Julius Kühn-Institut, Institute for National and International Plant Health	bastian.hess@julius-kuehn.de
Greece	<b>Ms Ioannidou Stavroula</b> NPPO of Greece, Member of the Standards Committee IPPC-FAO Hellenic Ministry of Rural Development and Food	stioannidou@minagric.gr
Ireland	<b>Mr Eivers John</b> Plant Health international Trade Lead Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine	john.eivers@agriculture.gov.ie
Italy	<b>Ms Ciampitti Mariangela</b> Head of quarantine plant pests Unit Regione Lombardia	mariangela_ciampitti@regione.lombardia.it
Italy	<b>Mr Shamilov Artur</b> Agricultural Officer, FAO/IPPC FAO Headquarters	artur.shamilov@fao.org
Italy	<b>Mr Torella Daniel Lorenzo</b> Phytosanitary Standard Setting Support Specialist Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	daniel.torella@fao.org
Kazakhstan	<b>Mr Abdullin Arman</b> Deputy Director ТИ по городу Астана Комитета государственной инспекции в агропромышленном комплексе MCX PK	armani23@mail.ru
Latvia	<b>Mr Arnis Ringolds</b> Expert State Plant Protection Service	ringolds.arnis@hotmail.com
North Macedonia	<b>Ms Dzerkovska Nadica</b> Head of Plant Health Department, Phytosanitary Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy Head of Plant Health Department, Phytosanitary Directorate in the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Water Economy	nadica.dzerkovska@mzsv.gov.mk
Netherlands (Kingdom of the)	<b>Mr Geuze Thorwald</b> Senior Plant Health Officer NPPO NL Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority	t.geuze@nvwa.nl
Netherlands (Kingdom of the)	<b>Mr Traa Marco</b> Chief Officer Plant Health for Policy Affairs Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality	m.j.w.traa@minlnv.nl
Russian Federation	<b>Ms Bizunova Anna</b> Head of the Department of International Cooperation and Inspection Work in the Field of Plant Quarantine and Seed Control of the Directorate of Phytosanitary Surveillance in Export-Import Operations and International Cooperation Federal Service for Veterinary and Phytosanitary Surveillance	interfito.rshn@fsvps.gov.ru
Russian Federation	<b>Mr Kornev Konstantin</b> Deputy Director All-Russian Plant Quarantine Center	konstantin.kornev@gmail.com
Russian Federation	<b>Mr Rylkov Igor</b> Head of Department for Pest Risks and International Cooperation All-Russian Plant Quarantine Center	rilkov.igor@vniikr.ru

Country	Name, Organization	Email address
Spain	<b>Mr Guitian Castrillon Jose Maria</b> HEAD OF PLANT HEALTH DEPARTMENT Tecnologias y Servicios Agrarios, S. A. - TRAGSATEC	jmgc@tragsa.es
United States of America	<b>Ms Chapman Diana</b> USDA/APHIS	diana.l.chapman@usda.gov
United States of America	<b>Mr Jeffery Austin</b> USDA/APHIS	jeffery.austin@usda.gov
Uzbekistan	<b>Mr Anarbaev Dilshod</b> Head of Plant Quarantine and Protection Control Department Agency of Plant Protection and Quarantine	glavkaruz@mail.ru
Uzbekistan	<b>Mr Sultanov Sultan-Makhmud</b> Chief specialist Agency of plant protection and quarantine of Uzbekistan	glavkaruz@mail.ru