



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

# **REPORT**

  

## **33<sup>rd</sup> TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS**

**(VIRTUAL MEETING NO 2)**

**08 NOVEMBER 2021**

**ROME, ITALY**

**IPPC Secretariat**

## Required citation

IPPC Secretariat. 2021 33<sup>rd</sup> (2<sup>nd</sup> meeting) *Technical Consultation among RPPOS* 8 November 2021

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, 2021



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/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 <http://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 ([www.fao.org/publications](http://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: [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://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 Meeting .....	<u>43</u>
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	<u>44</u>
1.2 Welcome by the TC-RPPO Chairperson .....	<u>44</u>
2. Meeting arrangements .....	<u>44</u>
2.1 Selection of a Rapporteur .....	<u>44</u>
2.2 Adoption of the agenda .....	<u>44</u>
3. Administrative matters .....	<u>44</u>
3.1 Documents list .....	<u>44</u>
3.2 Participants list .....	<u>44</u>
4. Strategic issues .....	<u>55</u>
4.1 Decision on the ECOWAS application to be recognized as an RPPO .....	<u>55</u>
4.2 Laboratory Diagnostic Network: Development agenda of the IPPC Strategic Framework .....	<u>88</u>
4.3 Amendments to the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the TC-RPPO .....	<u>1010</u>
4.4 Update from PPPO .....	<u>1211</u>
5. Future plans .....	<u>1212</u>
Appendix 1: Agenda .....	<u>1312</u>
Appendix 2: Participants list .....	<u>1413</u>

## 1. Opening of the Meeting

### 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] Mr. Arop DENG from the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat welcomed all members of the Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC-RPPO) to the second session of the 33rd meeting. He was happy to see a full house with all members attending despite a full calendar approaching the year-end. He thanked everyone for finding time to participate in this meeting and wished a very fruitful deliberation. He was thankful for the opportunity to be back after a period of absence due to health issues.
- [2] The IPPC Secretariat noted the advance request by the Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) to provide interpretation in this meeting. The Chairperson approved the request and asked members to speak slowly to assist the interpreters.

### 1.2 Welcome by the TC-RPPO Chairperson

- [3] The Chairperson thanked the Secretariat for the welcome address and for all members availing their time for this meeting.
- [4] Acknowledging everyone joined from different parts of the world, he wished all a very good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and for building time to meet again. He thanked the Secretariat for the support and encouragement to have all of the TC-RPPO members present virtually and invited colleagues to observe the protocols.

## 2. Meeting arrangements

### 2.1 Selection of a Rapporteur

- [5] The Representative from the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) volunteered to be the rapporteur for the meeting. The Chairperson thanked and acknowledged Ms Stephanie BLOEM.

### 2.2 Adoption of the agenda

- [6] The Chairperson opened the floor to approve the agenda, and without any objections, the member from NAPPO moved to adopt the agenda.

## 3. Administrative matters

- [7] Referencing the documents list and the meeting participants the Secretariat concluded the administrative issues and moved for the Chairperson to begin with the question of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to be the 11th RPPO.

### 3.1 Documents list

- [8] ECOWAS application for RPPO
- [9] Terms of Reference (Draft Clean and Track versions)

### 3.2 Participants list

- [10] All members were present except Mr GC YUBAK from the Asia-Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) because of internet connection issues.
- Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) - Visoni TIMOTE TC-RPPO Chairperson
  - Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) - Juliet GOLDSMITH

- Andean Community (CAN) - Katty ROJAS
- Comité Regional de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE) - James PAZO
- European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) - Nico HORN
- Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC) IAPSC - Jean Gérard MEZUI
- North American Plant Protection Organization - Stephanie BLOEM
- Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO)- Mekki CHOUIBANI
- Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA) - Oscar ZELAYA

#### IPPC Secretariat

- IPPC Secretariat - Aoife CASSIN
- IPPC Secretariat - Arop DENG
- IPPC Secretariat - John GILMORE
- IPPC Secretariat - Erika MANGILI
- IPPC Secretariat - Riccardo MAZZUCHELLI
- IPPC Secretariat - Adriana MOREIRA
- IPPC Secretariat - Natalie NICORA

#### Other participants

- Andean Community (CAN) – Ron BECERRA
- ECOWAS - Benoit GNONLONFIN
- IAPSC - Jovita AKIUMBENI
- IAPSC - Luiza MUNYUA
- INTERPRETER – French - Élodie NDONGO E.
- INTERPRETER- English- Sandra SHURI
- INTERPRETER EN-FR - Sebastien GANDU
- INTERPRETER EN-FR - mthecl@ yahoo.fr

## 4.Strategic issues

### 4.1 Decision on the ECOWAS application to be recognized as an RPPO

- [11] Chairperson TIMOTE began by opening the floor for discussions on ECOWAS and noted the documentation that was provided.
- [12] The floor was given to the EPPO representative. He acknowledged the document and the process for recognition by the TC-RPPO to assess whether ECOWAS meets the criteria to be a new Regional Plant Protection Organization (RPPO).
- [13] The question for the TC-RPPO, is ECOWAS working on harmonization of phytosanitary measures, participating in activities to promote the objectives of the IPPC, and is gathering and disseminating information?
- [14] The representative from EPPO opined that ECOWAS meets all minimum requirements and actual functions that are needed for an RPPO, and that the TC-RPPO can conclude that it does fulfill the minimum requirements. Stating that a final decision on endorsing ECOWAS is up to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM).

- [15] The role of the TC-RPPO is to focus on the four functions for Regional Plant Protection Organization (RPPOs) from the information that was presented in one of the previous meetings. With these comments, the representative from EPPO felt that ECOWAS does fulfill the four functions as described in this document.
- [16] The Chairperson thanked the EPPO colleague for his comments and for reminding the members concerning the documentation submitted by ECOWAS.
- [17] The Chairperson then gave the floor to the representative from IAPSC, who spoke through an interpreter. He explained that as the Director of IAPSC he cannot commit to sign anything to recognize ECOWAS, but that the TC-RPPO is free to decide, yet he cannot.
- [18] The Chairperson thanked the colleague from IAPSC for his comments regarding the ECOWAS application and took note on the IAPSC view.
- [19] Giving the floor to the representative from NEPPO who agreed with the representative from EPPO that there is a process for recognizing a new RPPO and that ECOWAS has followed this process.
- [20] He stated that the minimum requirements have been met by ECOWAS and that the TC-RPPO can make a decision, by majority, that can be sent to CPM for endorsement. He added that, according to the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the TC-RPPO that were adopted in Lima, Peru at the 30th TC-RPPO in 2018, some decisions do not need consensus, and if there is no consensus then the majority of RPPOs can take a decision.
- [21] The floor was given to the observer from ECOWAS who took the opportunity to thank the whole TC-RPPO for the recognition and support for all the work that has been done so far in this process.
- [22] Referring to the previous TC-RPPO meeting, the Director of Agriculture and Rural Development of the ECOWAS Commission reminded everyone that ECOWAS had already elaborated on different aspects related to consideration by the TC-RPPO including whether ECOWAS fulfills the requirements to become the 11<sup>th</sup> RPPO. He is appreciative of the TC-RPPO's support to move the process forward.
- [23] The Chairperson thanked the ECOWAS representative for his comments by stating the ECOWAS submission and appeal is recognized as fulfilling the requirements.
- [24] The Chairperson gave the floor to the IAPSC representative who questioned the issue of the TC-RPPO taking decisions by majority and not consensus that was discussed in Lima. He does not have the latest document that indicates that simple majority can make decisions. The Chairperson thanked the IAPSC colleague and noted his comment.
- [25] The representative from NEPPO confirmed that the Terms of Reference discussed during these last two TC-RPPO meetings were adopted in Lima, and the TC-RPPO should wait for CPM endorsement. The TC-RPPO articles were written according to FAO rules, and in Lima the new Terms of Reference concerning decisions indicated that consensus is always sought. However, if there is no consensus among TC-RPPO members, then a vote can be taken, and a decision made by simple majority.
- [26] Acknowledging the sensitive issue at hand, the Chairperson gave the floor to the IAPSC representative who again questioned the Lima documentation mentioned by the colleague from NEPPO.
- [27] The Chairperson added the need to go back to the submission that was made and gave the opportunity for a voice from EPPO.
- [28] Referring to the decision in Lima, the representative from EPPO stated he was not in TC-RPPO at that time. However, he referred to the Terms of Reference that were recently updated by a TC-RPPO subgroup. While according to this revised document, the decision procedure always tries to achieve

consensus, if consensus cannot be achieved, then the different TC-RPPO positions will be described in the meeting report. He also said if that is not clear to everybody, we should get this document up to follow the procedures as they are described in Terms of Reference that are now applicable.

[29] The Chairperson thanked the representative from EPPO for his views on the way forward on this issue. He commented that through the Secretariat, it is proper to coordinate the views and send out an email to all the TC-RPPO members for feedback that can be provided directly to the Secretariat on the procedures highlighted in the document, and that was read out loud by the member from EPPO. He again repeated the minimum functions required to become an RPPO:

- Coordinate the activities among national plant protection organizations in the region, covered in order to achieve the objectives of the IPPC.
- Harmonize phytosanitary measures in IPPC activities to promote the objectives of the IPPC.
- Gather and disseminate information.

[30] He stated this will give the TC-RPPO a platform to evaluate the request from ECOWAS and allows it to move forward with the remaining Agenda.

[31] The Chairperson opened the floor for comments on what was raised and asked the Secretariat to send everyone an email in this regard reminding them to provide feedback directly to the Secretariat, so that there will at least be a record of support or dissention on this point.

[32] The representative from NAPPO agreed that the main reason of needing the recommendations from all the RPPOs was to provide this information to the CPM and reminded everyone that we all need all the help that we can get in achieving the objectives of the IPPC.

[33] Using NAPPO as an example with only three countries in the organization, the Executive Director's job is difficult and challenging enough. With an area as large and diverse as Africa, getting additional organizations involved in disseminating phytosanitary information, in improving the capacity of the member countries, and in collaborating with all the other RPPOs, can only benefit plant health in the long term. Adding that she agreed with the Chairperson that the comprehensive dossier submitted by ECOWAS had provided everyone with sufficient information on this organization to show that it meets the requirements to become an RPPO. It is what the RPPOs are discussing in this meeting.

[34] The CAHFSA representative agreed on the value of having all the help from an RPPO. CAHFSA is the fourth RPPO in Latin America and Caribbean and the fifth in the hemisphere, with everyone working together; there is an opportunity and value in working with the other four RPPOs.

[35] She also thought that in CAHFSA's opinion and based on the directive that has been given to what the committee is looking for, that ECOWAS does meet the minimum requirements to be recognized as an RPPO. Stating that for the record.

[36] The colleague from IAPSC thanked the Chairperson for doing a great job moving forward and reminded everyone that IAPSC is a core institution in Africa where they all work as one continent, and one unit. ECOWAS has different positions sometimes not in line with all African countries. IAPSC submitted documents to the African Union and at this point, there is no feedback or information.

[37] The observer from ECOWAS thanked everyone that has supported ECOWAS' submission for consideration as an RPPO and looks forward to working with everyone in this journey.

[38] The Secretariat noted that comments and chats recorded during the TC-RPPO meeting indicate that representatives from PPPO, NEPPPO, OIRSA, CAN, COSAVE, CAHFSA, EPPO and NAPPO agree



that ECOWAS meets the requirements. Subsequently, the Secretariat received APPPC's position via email indicating that they are in favor of ECOWAS' application to be the 11<sup>th</sup> RPPO.

[39] IAPSC could not endorse the ECOWAS application.

[40] The Chairperson thanked everyone for their comments and referred to the Secretariat on whether this is a recommendation or an affirmative decision to the CPM from the TC-RPPO on ECOWAS' submission.

[41] The Secretariat clarified that it is a recommendation based on the discussions and opinions expressed by the TC-RPPO concerning whether ECOWAS meets the criteria to become the 11<sup>th</sup> RPPO. The final decision rests with the CPM who decides based on the TC-RPPO recommendations made at this meeting.

[42] Being as there was a quorum with eight RPPOs present expressing a clear vote for yes, followed by one affirmative email, nine out of 10 RPPOs made a decision without reaching a consensus, and all ten member's positions are stated in this report. A consensus was not met, but a majority of nine RPPOs agreed that ECOWAS fulfills the criteria and that is the message that will be presented to CPM. It is up to CPM to take a decision. The Chairperson closed the discussion on this agenda item.

## **4.2 Laboratory Diagnostic Network: Development agenda of the IPPC Strategic Framework**

[43] The Secretariat thanked the TC-RPPO members for their comments and edits to the fifth revision of the background and information on this topic. She noted that there is no work plan and no staff resource allocated for this topic at this time. There is a plan to hire an international consultant to conduct a literature review. A draft for the consultant's Terms of Reference is underway and the TC-RPPO could discuss their potential role by providing comments and brainstorming on the scope of the project.

[44] The EPPO representative thanked the Secretariat for the revised document and noted that RPPOs play an important role in the regions, and that issues and needs are different from one region to the next. Each region does not have the same challenges. Joining every region through global recognition of a network of diagnostic laboratories will be extremely difficult. RPPOs could assess the needs of their own regions. There are national and regional networks, but a global network is difficult and challenging. A first step should be to take an inventory of existing networks and laboratories and not do a literature review.

[45] Maybe regions that already have a diagnostic network can assist other regions with testing, or there are regions where expert laboratories are available, and are willing to exchange expertise in certain groups, for example with identifying insects because we all know that at present taxonomist expertise is scarce. In that respect, RPPOs can play a role by assisting the consultant with an inventory of existing networks within their RPPOs. The first step is to clarify the objectives of this developmental agenda item. Global recognition of laboratories may be too difficult and have many challenges. Each RPPO may be able to indicate what is best for their region.

[46] The NAPPO representative thanked the Secretariat for reworking the paper and agreed with the representative from EPPO by adding other points. Referring to the NAPPO annual meeting in October, a paper was presented on different challenges the RPPOs face in the next two or three years. NAPPO faces different challenges than other regions. It is important that the IPPC phytosanitary community understand that NAPPO is integrated, structured, and governed differently than other regions. These differences affect how decisions are made in each region such as how to structure a diagnostic laboratory network. Not all RPPOs take internal decisions in the same way.



- [47] For example, the three NAPPO executives are the top phytosanitary officials that make decisions, while in the case of CAN they need to consult with each Minister before making a decision. This is going to affect the role of RPPOs in anything that is done globally. Not just to understand the capacity in the various regions, but to see if there might be a possibility to have interregional cooperation in diagnostics. The first need is to understand what everybody has before we understand what everybody can provide.
- [48] Agreeing with EPPO on laboratory diagnostic networks, there is a role for RPPOs, yet with a careful understanding that RPPOs under Article nine of the IPPC do things differently.
- [49] A useful task for all RPPOs is to provide information to the consultant to assess the possibility of interregional diagnostics in the future. The approach needs to be taken with care to build trust on diagnostics and to understand what laboratories provide that can be accepted by other countries within the region.
- [50] The representative from NAPPO added that recognition of regional laboratories requires building trust. For example, there is an EPPO diagnostic expertise database, but it needs to be maintained and updated every year, and if this were done on a global scale it would be extremely difficult to keep it up to date. What is needed is to begin from simple to complex, not the other way around.
- [51] The representative from COSAVE mentioned that an important issue for COSAVE countries is restrictions in the shipment of pest samples or exchange of pest samples between laboratories for identification purposes only. In this regard, COSAVE requests that the IPPC encourage countries to facilitate the exchange of official samples for identification purposes in NPPOs.
- [52] The representative from EPPO clarified what is meant by developing an inventory of expertise and something that is published. The first step is not to publish, but to conduct an inventory of existing diagnostic experience and to know what the needs are to be developed.
- [53] A listing of the names of laboratory networks in different countries is different than the issue of acceptance of laboratory results. One country's laboratory result being accepted by another country's laboratory is a delicate issue.
- [54] The Secretariat thanked everyone for the useful information and noted that the idea is not to conduct a literature review, but to collect existing information on diagnostic laboratories as a first step. This to first identify what exists, what examples to use, how to present the information, and collect guidance from the regions. The second step is to collect additional insights and direction from the RPPOs and contracting parties. Comments are welcomed now, before the process is started, in order to have an informed way forward. The inventory of laboratories would include all registered laboratories in a particular region and would outline the type of expertise that each laboratory possesses.
- [55] In the NAPPO region, they have a project that will build trust among the laboratories in the three member countries concerning diagnostics for specific pests. A similar approach might be considered by other RPPOs as they consider the issue of a network of trusted diagnostic laboratories.
- [56] The representative from NAPPO noted that different diagnostic laboratories may work with NPPOs, including university, state or provincial entities that can be officially accredited by the NPPO to provide phytosanitary diagnostics. Which laboratories, what process is in place to approve them, how they maintain their credentials nationally or regionally, needs consideration.
- [57] The representative from IAPSC suggested that for a continental strategy the idea could be building continental laboratories and having these abide by standards applicable to all countries:
- Who will be in charge of accreditation and support of these laboratories?

- What diagnostic protocols will be used?
- How will exchanges between regions for things like samples be handled?

[58] IAPSC supports working on a laboratory network and on how decisions to accredit laboratories will work.

[59] The CAHFSA representative noted the issues with limited diagnostic capacity in her region. She noted the challenges of sending and receiving specimens by courier service. She also mentioned issues with sending digital images versus physical samples and the challenges these pose when rapid identification is needed. To meet the challenges, the Caribbean has built relationships with pest diagnostic networks such as the University of Florida. Yet, there are financial and other considerations when transporting samples such as diagnostic services fees, courier services policies, and timely diagnostics of laboratory submissions. Some laboratories use digital photography to solve these challenges. CAHFSA also supports this topic.

[60] The representative from EPPO reminded everyone that recognition of laboratories is with the NPPO. He also mentioned that there is also the question of trust in recognizing the results from one laboratory in one country by another country. In EPPO there are numerous examples where this happens, for example when countries that do not have expertise in bacterial testing send their samples to another country for testing.

[61] EPPO is maintaining a database on diagnostic expertise that people can access if looking for an expert on a certain genus of insects. Databases such as these need constant maintenance to ensure the information remains current. If this is done on a global level it may be more difficult. The question of what to achieve and how much effort and cost is achievable should be considered when planning for this network.

[62] The representative from NEPPO said that what is needed is to reconsider the minimal criteria for safe trade and resolve differences between regions. How a consultant engages the RPPOs will be important and should consider the entire implementation of the strategic framework 2020-2023.

[63] The observer from ECOWAS said the regional network can consider whether the protocols need to be harmonized by looking at commonalities within regions to facilitate the process. The regional network could include a mixture of mutual recognition of diagnostic laboratories and a capacity building effort on specific diagnostic laboratory protocols.

[64] The Secretariat noted the comments and thanked the TC-RPPO on their suggestions on how to proceed with this complex topic. A focus group or something similar like a task force could work on this because there is a need to start simple with this complex topic.

[65] The Chairperson closed this agenda item thanking colleagues for their insights and inputs on the way forward. The TC-RPPO looks forward to work in collaboration with the IPPC Secretariat and this development agenda.

#### **4.3 Amendments to the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the TC-RPPO**

[66] The members from EPPO and NAPPO acknowledged and introduced the work on the draft document by representatives from CAN, EPPO, NEPPO, and NAPPO with support from FAO legal and the IPPC Secretariat.

[67] The RPPOs thanked the group that agreed to review the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure that had begun discussions when IAPSC hosted the TC-RPPO in Abuja. Between that time and early 2021, the small group which included Mekki CHOUIBANI from NEPPO, the former colleague Camilo BELTRAN MONTTOYA from CAN, Nico HORN from EPPO, and Stephanie BLOEM from

NAPPO worked on the update of the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure after the IPPC Secretariat and FAO legal provided their suggested edits.

- [68] The updated document was posted with both a clean version and a track-changes version for further review. No additional comments were received from the RPPOs.
- [69] The edits did not change the intent of the document but made things clearer for everyone.
- [70] The NAPPO colleague suggested sharing a presentation called NAPPO 101 designed for new people coming into positions challenged by unfamiliarity with NAPPO history and the way it functions. The NAPPO 101 can be shared at the next meeting as an example of what the group can develop to assist new RPPO representatives that join the in the future. Should it be approved, it could be called something like the TC-RPPO 101.
- [71] This will highlight what the TC-RPPO does. More importantly, it would assist a new Executive Secretary or Executive Director of a particular RPPO. They could use it as a resource to improve understanding at the international level, where their input and expertise will be sought.
- [72] The Chairperson commented that it is a good to present the NAPPO 101 for the TC-RPPO. Noting that the PPPO has experienced the same issue with people in new positions unfamiliar with the work of the region. The NAPPO 101 was available for all new participants in advance to the NAPPO Annual Meeting to ensure their improved understanding of the functions of NAPPO.
- [73] The Chairperson thanked the member from IAPSC who gave comments in French on the idea of the draft presentation.
- [74] The NAPPO colleague clarified that it is not another document or suggestion for another document; it is a suggested tool to help new people be more effective in their new role.
- [75] The ECOWAS representative commented that CODEX and OIE has something similar to help new members and thinks it is very useful for those new members who are contact points.
- [76] Speaking in French, the member from IAPSC shared his concerns and views about the revised TOR ROP. The Chairperson clarified that it is only for plant protection and asked him to please note the draft document stressing that it is only for plant protection, and it does not touch CODEX or animal health issues in that regard. It is only for the TC-RPPO.
- [77] The member from NEPPO further clarified this in French to the IAPSC colleague.
- [78] The member from IAPSC gave his support for the document presentation by NAPPO.
- [79] The Chairperson thanked the team for its work and confirmed that there were no further comments or suggestions from the floor.
- [80] The representatives from CAHFSA, PPPO, EPPO, NEPPO and NAPPO, acknowledged the comments from the Chairperson. In the chat the COSAVE representative agreed with the document and appreciated the work of the group in charge. Only one observation that seems to have stuck at the end of paragraph 33 (the text: "in ..")
- [81] Katty Rojas from CAN agreed with the revised document on the Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure for the TC-RPPO. In addition, James PAZO from COSAVE, Juliet GOLDSMITH from CAHFSA, Mekki CHOUIBANI from NEPPO, and Oscar ZELAYA from OIRSA endorsed and approved the amended document.
- [82] Before closing this agenda item, the Chairperson thanked the members from EPPO, NEPPO, NAPPO and CAN and acknowledged their work on the TOR and their engagement in all matters.

#### **4.4 Update from PPPO**

[83] The Chairperson proposed to all colleagues to present their own RPPO challenges and opportunities at the next virtual TC-RPPO meeting. He had prepared a presentation similar to the one delivered at previous meetings and apologized to defer the presentation to a later date, as time was short. It was agreed to defer the PPPO presentation to the next meeting

[84] The next meeting will provide an opportunity for all RPPOs to present on the regional challenges they face.

#### **5.Future plans**

[85] Without reaching a decision, various members proposed options for the final virtual meeting for sometime in early December or after the New Year in January 2022. The Secretariat sent a Doodle poll to confirm the next meeting date in this range. No clear date emerged from the Doodle poll and new dates were added for February 2022.

[86] The outcome of the Doodle poll was 3 February 2022 for the third virtual session of the 33rd TC-RPPO meeting.

## Appendix 1: Agenda

### 33<sup>rd</sup> (2<sup>nd</sup> Virtual Meeting) Technical Consultation among RPPOs

8 November, 2021

#### Agenda

	Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
<b>1.</b>	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		Arop DENG
1.2	Welcome and introductions to the new members by the TC-RPPO Chairperson		TIMOTE
<b>2.</b>	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1	Election of the Rapporteur		TIMOTE
2.2	Adoption of the Agenda	VM01_01_TC-RPPO_2021_Nov	TIMOTE
<b>3.</b>	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		GILMORE
3.1	Documents list	VM01_02_TC-RPPO_2021_Nov	
3.2	Participants list	VM01_03_TC-RPPO_2021_Nov	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Strategic issues<sup>1</sup></b>		
4.1	Decision on ECOWAS application to be recognized as an RPPO	<a href="#">LINK</a>	TC-RPPO Members
4.2	Guidance for new heads of RPPOs to contribute to the IPPC mandate	Welcoming information for new TCRPPO members	TC-RPPO Members BLOEM/ GOLDSMITH
4.3	Laboratory Diagnostic Networking: Developing agenda of the IPPC Strategic Framework	VM01_05_TC-RPPO_2021_Nov	MOREIRA/ CASSIN/ MANGILI
4.4	Amendments of Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of TC-RPPO	VM01_06(a)_TC-RPPO_2021_Nov VM01_06(b)_TC-RPPO_2021_Nov	BLOEM/ CHOUIBANI/ HORN
4.5	Update from PPPO	VM01_07_TC-RPPO_2021_Nov	TIMOTE
<b>5.</b>	<b>Future plans</b>		
5.1	Date and arrangement of the next meeting		TIMOTE/ GILMORE
<b>6.</b>	<b>Any other business</b>		TIMOTE/GILMORE
<b>7.</b>	<b>Close of the Meeting</b>		TIMOTE/

**Appendix 2: Participants list****33rd Technical Consultation Among RPPOs****VIRTUAL MEETING N° 03****PARTICIPANTS LIST**

List of members attending the meeting.

*(Updated 2021-11-08)*

<b>Present</b>	<b>Region/ Role</b>	<b>Name, mailing, address, telephone</b>	<b>Email address</b>
✓	Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)	<b>Mr Jean Gérard MEZUI M'ELLA</b> Director of Inter-African Phytosanitary Council of African Union African-Union Inter-African Phytosanitary Council / Conseil Phytosanitaire Inter-Africain de l'Union Africaine P.O.Box 4170 Nlongkak, Yaoundé, Cameroon Tel: (+237) 222 21 19 69, (+237) 694 89 93 40, +237 673275853 Fax: (+237) 222 21 19 67	MezuiJG@africa-union.org; jeangerardmezuimella@gmail.com
✓	Inter-African Phytosanitary Council (IAPSC)	<b>Mr Luiza MUNYUA</b> Director of Inter-African Phytosanitary Council of African Union African-Union Inter-African Phytosanitary Council / Conseil Phytosanitaire Inter-Africain de l'Union Africaine P.O.Box 4170 Nlongkak, Yaoundé, Cameroon Tel: (+237) 222 21 19 69, (+237) 694 89 93 40, +237 673275853 Fax: (+237) 222 21 19 67	MunyuaL@africa-union.org;
✓	Near East Plant Protection Organisation (NEPPO)	<b>Mr Mekki CHOUIBANI</b> Executive Director Near East Plant Protection Organisation (NEPPO) NEPPO Batiment C de l'INRA, Angle des Avenues Ibn Al Ouazzani et Hassan II. Rabat. Morocco Tel: +212 537 704 810 Mobile: + 212 673 997 808 Fax: +212 537 7087 63	hq.neppo@gmail.com; chouibani@gmail.com
	Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC)	<b>Mr Yubak Dhoj G. C.</b> Senior Agricultural Officer (Plant Protection) FAO Regional Office for Asia (RAP) 39 Phra Atit Road Bangkok 10200, Thailand Tel: +662974268 Mobile: +66858758784 Fax: +662 6974445	yubak.gc@fao.org; yubak.gc@yahoo.com
✓	European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO)	<b>Mr Nico M. HORN</b> Director-General European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO/OEPP) 21 boulevard Richard Lenoir 75011 PARIS FRANCE Tel: + 33 (0) 1 45 20 77 94	nico.horn@epo.int;

Present	Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Comunidad Andina (CAN)	<b>Ms Katty Rojas QUIROGA</b> Responsable Especialista en sanidad vegetal COMUNIDAD ANDINA	krojas@comunidadandina.org;
	Comunidad Andina (CAN)	<b>Mr Ronald Becerra CORREDOR</b> Especialista en sanidad vegetal COMUNIDAD ANDINA	rbecerra@comunidadandina.org;
✓	Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)	<b>Mr Oscar ZELAYA OIRSA</b>	
	Comite de Sanidad Vegetal del Cono Sur (COSAVE)	<b>Mr César De La Cruz</b> Director General de Sanidad Vegetal, del Servicio Nacional de Sanidad Agraria (SENASA) -Presidente del Comité Directivo del COSAVE 2020-2021 Av. La Molina 1915, La Molina, Lima Perú Tel: (+511) 313-3300 Anexo 6101	cdelacruz@senasa.gob.pe; asist_tecnico@cosave.org;
	Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria (OIRSA)	<b>Mr Efraín MEDINA GUERRA</b> OIRSA Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria ' OIRSA Edificio OIRSA Calle Ramón Bellosó, final pasaje Isolde Colonia Escalón, San Salvador Apdo. Postal (01) 61, San Salvador El Salvador Tel: +503 2263 1127 Mobile: +503 7737 9999 Fax: +503 2263 1128	emedina@oirsa.org; svegetal@oirsa.org;
✓	Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA)	<b>Ms Juliet GOLDSMITH</b> Plant Health Specialist Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) Letitia Vriesdelaan #10 Paramaribo, Suriname Tel: + 597 422 546 Mobile: + 597-725-2922	juliet.goldsmith@cahfsa.org; rppe.secretariat@cahfsa.org;
✓	North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)	<b>Ms Stephanie BLOEM</b> Executive Director North American Plant Protection Organization Secretariat 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 145, Raleigh, North Carolina 27606 United States of America Tel: + 919 617 4040 Mobile: + 919 480 4761	stephanie.bloem@nappo.org; tita.bloem@gmail.com;
✓	Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)	<b>Mr Visoni TIMOTE</b> Executive Secretary Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) Pacific Community (SPC) Pacific Community, Land Resources Division, Private Mail Bag ,Suva, Fiji Tel: (+679) 337 9220 or (+679) 337 0733 Ext: 35220 Mobile: (+679) 863 3542 Fax: (+679) 337 0021	visonit@spc.int; timotev@gmail.com;
✓	COSAVE	<b>Mr James PAZO</b> COSAVE	secretaria_tecnica@cosave.org;



Present	Region/ Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Observer ECOWAS	<b>Mr Benoît GNONLONFIN</b> Department of Industry and Private Sector Promotion & Directorate of Agriculture and Rural Development, ECOWAS Commission, 101, Yakubu Gowon Crescent-Aoskoro, PMB 401, Abuja FCT, Nigeria Tel:+2347084003507 Mobile:+234 7084003507 ECOWAS	bgnonlonfin74@gmail.com; bgnonlonfin@yahoo.fr;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Arop Deng</b> <b>Integration and Support Team</b>	Arop.Deng@fao.org;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr John Gilmore</b> <b>Agricultural Officer</b>	John.Gilmore@fao.org;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Mr Riccardo Mazzucchelli</b> <b>Integration and Support Team</b>	Riccardo.Mazzucchelli@fao.org;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Adriana Moreira</b> <b>SSU Officer</b>	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<b>Ms Natalie Nicora</b> <b>Implementation Facilitation Officer</b>	Natalie.Nicora@fao.org;