

REPORT

Rome,
Italy,
2-6 April
2001

Third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

ICPM 01 / REPORT

**REPORT OF THE
THIRD INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

Rome, 2-6 April 2001

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2001**

CONTENTS

Report of the Third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures

<i>Appendix I</i>	Agenda
<i>Appendix II</i>	Open-ended Expert Working Group for the Development of a Detailed Standard Specification on the Plant Pest Risks Associated with LMOs/Products of Modern Biotechnology
<i>Appendix III</i>	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: Amendments to the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms
<i>Appendix IV</i>	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: Pest Risk Analysis for Quarantine Pests
<i>Appendix V</i>	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: Guidelines for Phytosanitary Certificates
<i>Appendix VI</i>	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: Guidelines for the Notification of Non-Compliance and Emergency Action
<i>Appendix VII</i>	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms, Supplement No. 1: Guidelines on the Interpretation and Application of the Concept of Official Control for Regulated Pests
<i>Appendix VIII</i>	Report of the Working Group on the Formation of a Standards Committee
<i>Appendix IX</i>	Terms of Reference for the Standards Committee
<i>Appendix X</i>	Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee
<i>Appendix XI</i>	Dispute Settlement Procedures
<i>Appendix XII</i>	Report of the Joint Consultation on IPPC-CBD Cooperation
<i>Appendix XIII</i>	Statements of the ICPM Exploratory Open-ended Working Group on Phytosanitary Aspects of GMOs, Biosafety and Invasive Species
<i>Appendix XIV</i>	ICPM Guidelines for the Recognition of a Regional Plant Protection Organization
<i>Appendix XV</i>	Report of the Working Group on Information Exchange
<i>Appendix XVI</i>	Technical Assistance
<i>Appendix XVII</i>	Strategic Planning
<i>Appendix XVIII</i>	Provisional Agenda for the Fourth Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
<i>Appendix XIX</i>	List of Participants

THIRD INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

Rome, 2-6 April 2001

REPORT

I. OPENING OF THE SESSION

1. The Chairperson, Mr John Hedley (New Zealand) opened the meeting by welcoming the delegates. Ms Louise Fresco, Assistant Director-General, FAO Agriculture Department gave an opening statement. She noted that the IPPC enters its 50th year since coming into force. There had been a significant amount of activity since the Second Session of the ICPM in October 1999, and many important technical issues had been addressed in the work programme. In particular, she outlined the record amount of standard setting undertaken by the Secretariat and the Working Groups, including the conclusion of three new draft standards, a draft supplementary standard and draft revisions to the Glossary for adoption in this session. She discussed the progress made in the areas of technical assistance and information exchange and in the development of administrative procedures for dispute settlement and standard setting. She also noted that the ICPM would undertake the election of a new Bureau during this session. She highlighted the role of the IPPC as part of the coordinated and cross-disciplinary approach to Biosecurity within FAO and in services FAO provides to its Members. In this regard, the Secretariat has been proactive in seeking cooperation with other organizations, such as World Trade Organization (WTO) and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), especially with regard to GMOs, biosafety and invasive species. She commended the ICPM for its ambitious work programme as it continues to serve as a global forum for the harmonization of phytosanitary measures and for the enhancement of food and economic security through safe trade. Finally, she thanked Mr Hedley for his exemplary work as the Chairperson over the past two years, as well as the Government of New Zealand for its continued support of Mr Hedley in his role as Chairperson.

II. REPORT BY THE CHAIRPERSON

2. Mr Hedley, Chairperson of the ICPM, reported on the substantial achievements of the ICPM and the Secretariat over the past eighteen months. He noted specific issues that would be discussed during the meeting, including the development of ISPMs, establishment of procedures, information exchange, technical cooperation, collaboration with other international organizations, and financial support to the work programme. He discussed the sustainability of the current level of work in relation to available resources from FAO and extrabudgetary funds and discussed the implications for the future work programme of the ICPM in view of limited resources. He asked the participants to consider during the course of the meeting the necessity and possibilities for increasing the resources of the Secretariat in order to maintain its outstanding programme of activities.

III. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

3. The ICPM agreed to add agenda items on biosecurity, procedures for meetings, the Global Invasive Species Programme, and trade measures on plant products as they relate to foot and mouth disease, and to include all discussions on information exchange under point 8.2 of the Provisional Agenda. The Agenda was adopted as revised (Appendix I).¹

¹ ICPM 01/1 Rev.1

IV. STANDARD-SETTING PRIORITIES

4. The Secretariat presented a summary of topics identified for international standards. The Chairperson noted the lack of agreed procedures for identifying and prioritizing topics, and suggested that procedures be developed. Several delegations suggested new topics for standards and recommended priorities. A working group was established to formulate recommendations on topics and priorities, including changes in the existing priorities and on procedures for identifying topics and priorities. Based on the conclusions of the working group.

5. The ICPM:

1. decided that new standards can be proposed by:
 - NPPOs,
 - RPPOs,
 - the IPPC Secretariat, and
 - the WTO – SPS Committee;
2. noted that other organizations, such as the CBD, could propose topics through the IPPC Secretariat;
3. decided that topics for standards should fit into a loose framework of the following categories:
 - urgent issues,
 - foundation standards to address fundamental concepts (e.g. treatment efficacy or inspection methodology),
 - developing country concerns, and
 - review and updating of current standards, including the Glossary;
4. decided that further development of specific procedures for identifying topics and setting priorities for standards should be undertaken by the Working Group on Strategic Planning. These procedures should include provisions for consultation procedures;
5. decided that until such time as a procedure is established, the criteria agreed by the ICPM in 1998 would continue to be used in establishing priorities except that “feasibility of developing and implementing the ISPM within a reasonable time schedule” would be deleted. The meeting considered that the IPPC has a sufficiently well-developed base of standards so that the work programme should not exclude those standards which require more time or effort to develop if they are deemed to be important by the ICPM;
6. decided that all standards currently under development should be considered to be a high priority for completion. This includes:
 - *Guidelines for surveillance for specific pests: citrus canker,*
 - *Guidelines for an import regulatory system,*
 - *Inspection methodology,*
 - *General considerations and specific requirements for regulated non-quarantine pests,*
 - *Systems approaches for risk management,*
 - *Guidelines for pest listing,*
 - *Guidelines for pest reporting, and*
 - *Guidelines for the use of non-manufactured wood packing material;*
7. recommended that the following new standards to be added to the priorities of the work programme:

- *Risk analysis for environmental hazards of plant pests,*
- *Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests,*
- *Defining economic importance* (possibly through a supplement to the Glossary),
- *Efficacy of phytosanitary measures,*
- *Low pest prevalence,* and
- *Irradiation* (noting that the formulation of a standard on irradiation was based on the provision of extrabudgetary resources); and

8. decided that an ICPM Open-ended Expert Working Group be established for the development of a detailed standard specification on the plant pest risks associated with LMOs/products of modern biotechnology according to the Terms of Reference in Appendix II.

V. ADOPTION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

6. The Secretariat introduced the documents submitted to the ICPM for adoption. These included:

- *Amendments to the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*²;
- *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*³;
- *Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*⁴;
- *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*⁵; and
- *Glossary Supplement No. 1: Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests*⁶.

7. In addition, the ICPM was asked to consider adopting a statement drafted by the Secretariat and FAO Legal Office to clarify the application of all ISPMs to Contracting Parties and the relationship of ISPMs to the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS). This statement was discussed and adopted as amended to read as follows:

Application

International standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) are adopted by contracting parties to the IPPC, and by FAO Members that are not contracting parties, through the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures. ISPMs are the standards, guidelines and recommendations recognized as the basis for phytosanitary measures applied by Members of the World Trade Organization under the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. Non-contracting parties to the IPPC are encouraged to observe these standards.

8. A number of points were raised by delegations regarding amendments to the draft standards as well as to the supplement and amendments to the Glossary. A working group was established to consider the proposals and finalize the standards. The working group reached consensus on changes to the three new standards. Amendments to the Glossary were also agreed with the exception of the definition of official control, which was opposed by the delegation of Japan as was the Glossary supplement.

9. Based on the recommendations of the working group, the ICPM adopted the proposed amendments to the *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (Appendix III). In addition, *Pest risk analysis for*

² APPENDIX III (ICPM 01/3 ANNEX 1)

³ APPENDIX IV (ICPM 01/3 ANNEX 2)

⁴ APPENDIX V (ICPM 01/3 ANNEX 3)

⁵ APPENDIX VI (ICPM 01/3 ANNEX 4)

⁶ APPENDIX VII (ICPM 01/3 ANNEX 5)

quarantine pests was adopted as ISPM No. 11 (Appendix IV) with note being made by the European Community that due to biological uncertainties concerning the behavior of organisms in special circumstances and different environments, the assessment of probabilities does not necessarily include statistical analysis. *Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates* was adopted as ISPM No. 12 (Appendix V), and *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action* was adopted as ISPM No. 13 (Appendix VI).

10. The delegation of Japan stated that it could not join consensus on the adoption of the definition of official control or the Glossary supplement on official control because they believed additional consideration was required in particular with regard to the mandatory nature of official control and the role of suppression. No other delegation joined Japan in this view. Japan therefore suggested that the ICPM proceed according to Rule X.2 of the Rules of Procedure of the ICPM. A roll-call vote was conducted based on 84 registered Members (requiring a quorum of 44). Sixty-five Members were present and voted as yes, no, or abstain. The results were 64 affirmative votes and one opposed. The definition and Glossary supplement (Appendix VII) were therefore adopted.

VI. ITEMS ARISING FROM THE SECOND SESSION OF THE INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

A. Formation of a Standards Committee (SC)

11. At its Second Session in October 1999, the ICPM agreed on general considerations for standard setting and adopted new standard-setting procedures to annex to the Rules of Procedure that were provisionally adopted by the ICPM at its First Session in November 1998. However, the standard-setting procedures and hence the finalization of the Rules of Procedure for the ICPM could not be completed at the Second Session of the ICPM because the structure and membership of the Standards Committee (SC) were not agreed. The ICPM established an Informal Working Group to consider all options for the establishment of a SC and make recommendations to the ICPM.

12. The Informal Working Group met 11-14 April 2000 at FAO Headquarters in Rome. Representatives of the governments of Australia, Germany, Japan, Kenya, New Zealand, Thailand, the United States, and Uruguay were in attendance. Discussions followed the the terms of reference given to the group by the ICPM.

13. The Chairperson of the ICPM introduced the report of the Informal Working Group. He noted that this was the second time that the composition of the SC was discussed at the ICPM, and that the informal working group had achieved a carefully composed compromise that was, in his opinion the best that could be achieved.

14. The ICPM discussed the composition of the SC, in particular, geographical representation. It stressed that developing countries should participate fully in the SC, and that financial support to enable their participation should be available.

15. The ICPM noted the need for regional groups to decide on, and submit to the IPPC by 1 December 2001, the names of experts for the SC so that the composition of the SC could be endorsed by the ICPM at its next session.

16. The ICPM:

1. adopted provisions for the establishment of a SC (paragraph 4, Appendix VIII);
2. adopted the recommendations on financial considerations as laid out in paragraphs four and five of Appendix VIII);
3. adopted the recommendation concerning the biennial review of the SC (paragraph 6, Appendix VIII);

4. adopted the Terms of Reference and the Rules of Procedure for the SC (Appendix IX); and
5. decided that the names of experts on the SC be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat by 1 December 2001 for distribution to Members and confirmation by the ICPM at its next session.

B. Dispute Settlement Procedures

17. At its First Session, in October 1998, the ICPM decided to establish an Informal Working Group on Dispute Settlement. At its Second Session in October 1999, the ICPM adopted general considerations and dispute settlement procedures proposed by the Informal Working Group on Dispute Settlement Procedures to fulfil one of the functions charged to the ICPM in its Terms of Reference⁷. The ICPM also agreed that the Informal Working Group would undertake to further elaborate certain aspects associated with the following procedures:

- a) develop rules and procedures for the approval of Expert Committee reports by the ICPM or its subsidiary body;
- b) analyze the need for the establishment of a subsidiary body on dispute settlement and make recommendations on structure, functions, and membership;
- c) develop rules and procedures for the establishment of expert rosters and the selection process;
- d) develop standard formats for dispute settlement reports;
- e) examine the possible roles and functions of regional plant protection organizations in IPPC dispute settlement procedures;
- f) develop standard terms of reference that may be used by the Expert Committee;
- g) develop rules concerning the attendance of observers in Expert Committee procedures;
- h) explore the possibilities for enhancing developing countries' abilities to participate effectively in dispute settlement procedures;
- i) consider guidelines concerning the sharing of expenses associated with dispute settlement;
- j) address any other matters referred to it by the ICPM regarding dispute settlement.

18. The Informal Working Group met 9-12 May 2000 at FAO Headquarters in Rome. Representatives of the governments of Brazil, Finland, New Zealand, Portugal, and the United States were in attendance. Documents provided by the Chairperson (Finland) and the United States served as references. Discussions followed the Terms of Reference given to the group by the ICPM. Proposals from the meeting were subsequently reviewed, modified for correctness, and approved by the FAO Legal Office for submission to the ICPM.

19. The Chairperson of the Working Group presented the report of the Working Group to the meeting. He noted that consensus had been reached on all issues considered by the Group.

20. The ICPM discussed options for establishing a Subsidiary Body on Dispute Settlement Procedures: its size, composition and geographical representation. It decided that the Subsidiary Body should be independent of the SC and that it be composed of one representative from each FAO region. The ICPM considered that the dispute settlement procedure would focus on the resolution of technical issues, and therefore be complementary in function to the formal dispute settlement procedures of the WTO.

⁷ ICPM 01/INF 2

21. The ICPM considered whether a time limit should be introduced in the procedure to make it an attractive alternative the WTO dispute settlement procedures. It noted however that the timing of events should be decided by the disputing parties rather than by a generic time limit. As the IPPC dispute settlement procedure is concerned with technical matters, the inclusion of sanctions in the procedure was not considered appropriate.

22. The ICPM:

1. noted the General Considerations (section A, Appendix XI)⁸;
2. modified and adopted the specific procedures (sections F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, and N, Appendix XI);
3. decided to establish a Subsidiary Body, and
 - decided on the structure and composition of the Subsidiary Body (Appendix XI),
 - adopted the procedures for the Subsidiary Body (sections C and E, Appendix XI), and
 - requested that the Subsidiary Body develop its Terms of Reference (taking into account sections C, D, E and K, Appendix XI); and
4. requested that the Secretariat integrate the newly adopted elements into existing procedures.

C. GMOs, Biosafety and Invasive Species

23. At its Second Session in October 1999, the ICPM considered initiatives and activities of the CBD that may have implications for the IPPC. These included in particular issues related to genetically modified organisms (GMOs), biosafety, and invasive species. The ICPM established an Exploratory Open-Ended Working Group to consider these implications and report to the ICPM at its Third Session.

24. Terms of reference for the working group were as follows:

- a) develop a statement on:
 - i) the role of the IPPC in assessing the plant pest risk of GMOs,
 - ii) the relationship between invasive species and plant quarantine pests;
- b) identify the roles and responsibilities of other relevant bodies and any overlaps or potential overlaps with the role of the IPPC;
- c) consider the necessity of developing and adopting international standards under the IPPC;
- d) identify the need for capacity building in developing countries to fulfil their identified role under the IPPC;
- e) develop a draft communication strategy to promote and clarify the role of the IPPC in this area.

25. The Exploratory Open-Ended Working Group on the phytosanitary aspects of GMOs, biosafety and invasive species (OEWG) met 13-16 June 2000 at FAO Headquarters in Rome. Fifty-six participants representing governments of 28 countries and seven international organizations were in attendance. The Chairperson of the OEWG introduced the report of the meeting to the ICPM.

26. A joint consultation on IPPC-CBD collaboration was held 6-8 February 2001 in Bangkok, Thailand. A small group of government representatives with technical expertise in IPPC or CBD issues were invited by the Chairperson of the ICPM to participate. The meeting was conducted as a follow-up to recommendations made by the OEWG conducted 13-16 June 2000 in Rome. The meeting had as its purpose to explore areas of potential collaboration between the IPPC and CBD, and provide proposals for the consideration of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) and/or the ICPM for collaboration projects, in particular, in relation

⁸ ICPM 01/5

to alien invasive species. The Chairperson of the ICPM introduced the report of the Joint Consultation on IPPC - CBD Collaboration (see Appendix XII)⁹.

27. The ICPM was also informed about the participation of the Chairperson of the ICPM and Secretariat in a meeting of the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) in September 2000 in Kirstenbosch, South Africa, and participation of the Secretariat in a liaison group to advise the CBD Secretariat on options for future activities regarding alien invasive species to be submitted to SBSTTA. The Chairperson and Secretary also participated in the Sixth Session of SBSTTA. As follow-up to this meeting, the Chairperson of GISP was invited to address the ICPM on the work programme of GISP and areas of possible collaboration. He stated that GISP could assist the ICPM by:

- a) providing information and contacts through the clearinghouse mechanism;
- b) stimulate methods development;
- c) foster intersectorial cooperation; and
- d) harmonize international initiatives.

He also stated that the ICPM could assist GISP by:

- a) participation with environmental agencies in regional and national capacity building exercises;
- b) assist in the development of new, or revise, methodologies, e.g. risk analysis; and
- c) cooperation on harmonization of measures relating to environment.

28. A representative of the CBD Secretariat informed the meeting of the adoption of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety in January 2000 and noted that 87 countries had signed the Protocol, and some ratifications had been received. The Inter-governmental Committee for the Cartagena Protocol (ICCP) had met for the first time in December 2000 and had recommended the establishment of the pilot phase of the biosafety clearinghouse, as well as inter-sessional work on capacity building, handling, transport, packaging and identification, and compliance.

29. The CBD representative recalled that Article 8(h) of the CBD states that Contracting Parties shall as far as possible and as appropriate: "prevent the introduction of, control or eradicate those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or species." He referred to the decision of the Fifth Meeting of the Conference of Parties (COP) on invasive alien species, including cooperation with the IPPC, and with FAO in general. He informed the meeting of the outcome of the Sixth Session of SBSTTA of the CBD that was held from 22-26 March 2001 in Montreal, Canada. A substantial part of that meeting had been dedicated to the discussion on alien invasive species. SBSTTA had made recommendations to the COP, acknowledging the contribution of the IPPC and other existing relevant instruments to the implementation of CBD Article 8(h). It had recommended that parties and other governments consider ratifying the revised IPPC. SBSTTA invited the IPPC, as it elaborates or revises standards and agreements, including risk assessment and analysis, to consider incorporating criteria related to threats posed by alien invasive species, and to report on any such initiatives to the CBD. It welcomed the initiative by the Working Group on Phytosanitary Measures and the Secretariat of the IPPC to develop closer relationships to the CBD and its work.

30. As inter-sessional work, the SBSTTA had requested the CBD Executive Secretary explore ways and means of cooperating with the international and regional organizations operating within the framework of the IPPC in the development and periodic review of standards recognized under the SPS Agreement.

31. The CBD representative also reported on the progress in the discussion of Interim and Guiding Principles on the Prevention of Introduction, and Mitigation of the Impacts, of Alien Species, and noted that the text had been discussed at SBSTTA and had now been forwarded to the COP.

⁹ ICPM 01/INF 3

32. A member of the Bureau of the Intergovernmental Committee of the Cartagena Protocol (ICCP) on Biosafety informed the ICPM of the recent discussions held in the ICCP Bureau relevant to the ICPM, and the interest expressed for the ongoing IPPC work on LMOs. He indicated the Bureau noted the usefulness of reinforcing the mutual cooperation between ICPM and ICCP in the framework of the implementation of the Biosafety Protocol. Support for the ICPM work would be addressed by the possibility of the active participation of the ICCP and the CBD Secretariat in ICPM work on LMOs thereby enabling an appropriate assessment of the impact of IPPC work on the future work of the ICCP.

33. The ICPM emphasized that there should not be contradicting national regulations or standards on agriculture and environment or contradicting international standards emanating from the IPPC and CBD. The ICPM recognized that LMOs/products of modern biotechnology and invasive species are covered by various international agreements, which defines the rights and obligations to these agreements, and initiatives. As a consequence, in order to reach the objective of coherence and mutual support in the implementation of these agreements, it is necessary to strengthen the cooperation between the IPPC and the CBD. The ICPM welcomed the work of the joint consultation on IPPC - CBD cooperation and noted the report (Appendix XII¹⁰).

34. The ICPM:

1. endorsed the statements regarding the purpose, scope, and activities of the IPPC (paragraphs 1-4, Appendix XIII¹¹);
2. endorsed statements regarding the role of the IPPC and LMOs/products of modern biotechnology (paragraphs 5-8, Appendix XIII);
3. endorsed the statement in paragraph 9, Appendix XIII and adopted the recommendations that follow (paragraphs 10-12, Appendix XIII);
4. endorsed the statements regarding the relationship between invasive species and quarantine pests (paragraphs 13 and 14, Appendix XIII);
5. endorsed the statements on the role of IPPC with respect to invasive species (paragraphs 15-18, Appendix XIII) and adopted the recommendations of the Working Group regarding the clarification of terms and concepts, and the relationships between of the IPPC to the Interim Guiding Principles drafted for the CBD (paragraphs 19 and 21, Appendix XIII);
6. strongly urged Members to communicate the scope and responsibility of the IPPC to relevant officials in their countries (paragraph 20, Appendix XIII);
7. endorsed the statement by the Working Group regarding the level of detail associated with environmental risks in current IPPC standards on risk analysis (paragraph 22, Appendix XIII) and the application by countries of these standards to environmental risks (paragraph 27, Appendix XIII) and adopted the recommendations of the working group to develop further guidance in standards (paragraphs 23-25, Appendix XIII), recognizing in particular points identified in paragraph 26 (Appendix XIII);
8. recognized that LMOs/products of modern biotechnology and invasive species are covered by various international agreements and initiatives. As a consequence the ICPM considered it necessary, in order to reach the objective of coherence and mutual support in the

¹⁰ ICPM 01/INF 3

¹¹ ICPM 01/7 ANNEX 1

implementation of these agreements, to strengthen the cooperation between the IPPC and the CBD;

9. urged countries to identify their phytosanitary capacity-building needs and recognize the special needs of developing countries regarding LMOs/products of modern biotechnology, and alien invasive species (paragraphs 29 and 31, Appendix XIII);

10. adopted the recommendations of the working group regarding technical assistance and liaison initiatives of the ICPM (paragraphs 30 and 32, Appendix XIII);

11. adopted the recommendations of the working group regarding communication between the Secretariat and the CBD, including provision for appropriate communication initiatives in the strategic planning process of the ICPM (paragraphs 34-37 and 39, Appendix XIII); and

12. strongly urged Members to communicate IPPC interests and issues to in-country officials with responsibility for CBD matters (paragraph 38, Appendix XIII).

D. Official Control

35. The Secretariat informed the ICPM of progress made toward the completion of a definition for official control in response to the request of the WTO Committee on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. It was noted that a supplement to the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms had been developed to define and explain the concept. The supplement was submitted to the present session of the ICPM for adoption under Agenda Item 5.

VII. REPORT FROM THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AMONG RPPOS

A. Recognition of RPPOS

36. The establishment of guidelines for the recognition of Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) is a function ascribed to ICPM in its Terms of Reference.¹² The Eleventh Technical Consultation among RPPOs in September 1999 undertook to facilitate the establishment of these guidelines by formulating draft guidelines to propose to the ICPM based on the role of RPPOs outlined in Article IX of the New Revised Text of the IPPC. At its Second Session in October 1999, the ICPM agreed that it would consider at its next session the recommendations of the RPPOs regarding guidelines for their recognition.

37. Draft guidelines formulated by the Eleventh Technical Consultation were reviewed and modified by the FAO Legal Office for further consideration. The RPPOs at their Twelfth Technical Consultation in October 2000 subsequently considered the modified draft guidelines. The Twelfth Technical Consultation agreed on additional changes to the draft guidelines. The revised text was subsequently reviewed and approved by the FAO Legal Office.

38. The ICPM discussed the scope of application of the guidelines, in particular, whether or not they should be applied to validate existing RPPOs or to evaluate any new organization wishing to be considered as an RPPO. The ICPM also discussed the need for the development of procedures regarding the implementation of the guidelines, and the identification of an appropriate body to develop these procedures.

39. The ICPM:

¹² Appendix H of C97/REP from the Twenty-ninth FAO Conference

1. adopted the guidelines as the basis for the recognition of RPPOs by the ICPM (Appendix XIV13);
2. decided that the guidelines should not be used to validate existing RPPOs, but to evaluate any new organization that wishes to be considered as an RPPO; and
3. recommended the development of procedures by the next Technical Consultation among RPPOs to describe how the guidelines are to be implemented, for consideration by the next session of the ICPM.

VIII. WORK PROGRAMME FOR HARMONIZATION

A. Standard Setting

40. The Secretariat informed the ICPM of progress made in the work programme for harmonization and that ten standards had been adopted at the time of the meeting. The meeting was also informed of the working groups established since the Second Session of the ICPM and progress made on the development of draft standards. In particular, the Secretariat noted that several standards were expected to be reviewed by the ISC in May 2001 including:

- *Guidelines for pest reporting;*
- *Guidelines for the use of non-manufactured wood packing material;*
- *Guidelines for an import regulatory system;*
- *General considerations and specific requirements for regulated non-quarantine pests; and*
- *Systems approaches for risk management.*

41. Several other standards are currently in different stages of development, including *Guidelines for surveillance for specific pests: citrus canker, Inspection methodology*, and *Guidelines for an import regulatory system*. The Secretariat reminded the ICPM that some standards are due for revision, including ISPM No. 1 (Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade) and ISPM No. 2 (Guidelines for pest risk analysis). The Glossary Working Group had recommended the establishment of a working group to address revision of ISPM No. 1.

42. The ICPM was advised that due to the savings realized by the Secretariat as a result of developed countries funding the expenses of their experts in standard-setting activities, the Secretariat was able to organize two meetings of the Interim Standards Committee in 2000. Likewise, assistance from Members and RPPOs allowed the Secretariat to organize many more expert meetings and consultations than would have been possible with regular programme funds.

43. Some Members suggested that, in the future, the format of report on standard setting could include information on the projected time needed for completion of standards and the status of standards in different stages of development. Members requested that the Secretariat make draft standards available to Members at the earliest opportunity.

B. Information Exchange

Implementation of work programme on information exchange

44. The Secretariat reported on the information exchange work programme and noted specific issues in the papers before the ICPM. The ICPM stressed the importance of the exchange of official information and requested that information exchange continue to receive high priority in the work programme.

¹³ ICPM 01/9

45. The ICPM encouraged Members to actively develop their electronic communication abilities, and to develop mechanisms to assist developing countries in this process, as this was the most cost-effective method of communication. The Secretariat noted that this process is being facilitated by the Secretariat in developing countries whenever possible through the ongoing FAO Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP).

46. The ICPM noted that:

- a) although electronic communication were increasingly important in the work programme, all services offered electronically should continue to be available in printed format to Members without capacity in, or those who choose not to use, electronic communication;
- b) many Members have not identified their official contact points to the Secretariat, and Members were encouraged to do this as soon as possible to facilitate the efficient exchange of information;
- c) Members have been requested to notify the Secretariat whether or not they are prepared to accept electronic correspondence in the place of printed material;
- d) Members were reminded that the official contact points are responsible for the dissemination of phytosanitary information as appropriate in their country;
- e) Members were encouraged to comment and recommend modifications or enhancements to the IPPC Website to further meet their needs; and
- f) most Members have not yet provided information as specified in the IPPC to the Secretariat (Articles VIII.2, IV.4, VII.2I and VII.2d) and are encouraged to do so.

47. The ICPM urged Members to assist the Secretariat to improve the translation of official documents by providing specific comments where appropriate based on review and consultation.

48. The ICPM agreed that the IPPC Website should continue to be developed by the IPPC Secretariat and that it would be migrated into the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) once this new system for the exchange of official phytosanitary information was fully operational.

Working group on information exchange

49. The Second Session of the ICPM agreed that the Chairperson would initiate the development of an information exchange programme. The Chairperson began this process with an informal ad hoc meeting September 2000 in Rome to identify aspects of information exchange that may be addressed by the ICPM. This was followed by a Working Group meeting January 2001 in Paris that examined the issues in greater detail.

50. The Chairperson and the Director-General of the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) introduced the report of the Working Group on Information Exchange. The ICPM welcomed the report of the working group and attached great importance to the exchange of official information.

51. The ICPM noted that:

- a) the IPP should be linked, where relevant, with other existing official international information exchange systems, e.g. the clearinghouse mechanism for the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the WTO; and
- b) the IPP would be developed as an integral part of the FAO food safety and agricultural health portal. In this regard, the Secretary informed the ICPM that some additional resources had been made available by two Members, but additional resources were urgently needed to ensure the success and sustainability of the project.

52. The ICPM discussed the establishment of a support group to the IPP. The ICPM agreed to the establishment of such a support group, but noted that such a group would work primarily through e-mail.

53. The ICPM:

1. adopted the interpretations of the IPPC on information exchange (Appendix XV14);
2. adopted the proposal for an IPP (Appendix XV), taking note of the resource requirements needed for implementation;
3. decided that Members would nominate a support group to provide guidance to the Secretariat in the implementation and maintenance of the IPP, with priority to the mandatory information and to provide further information on the handling of additional information for consideration at the Fourth Session of the ICPM in 2002; and
4. requested Members to provide names for the support group to the Secretariat by 30 April 2001.

C. Technical Assistance

54. The Secretariat outlined its involvement in Technical Assistance for developing countries. This included:

- technical assistance to many developing countries through the FAO Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP);
- the Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) in which provision was made for phytosanitary capacity building in about 100 countries covered by about 23 regional groupings;
- direct technical assistance provided by the Secretariat, which included subregional training workshops under the Umbrella Programme, other workshops/training programmes, technical dispute settlement and review of national legislation;
- assistance to RPPOs; and
- identification of specific issues and needs of developing countries regarding phytosanitary capacities.

55. The ICPM took note of the Secretariat's involvement in these capacity-building activities.

ICPM technical assistance

56. The ICPM, at its Second Session in October 1999, was asked to provide guidance to the Secretariat regarding strategies to assist developing countries in fulfilling their obligations under the New Revised Text of the IPPC. The ICPM was also informed of developments regarding a pilot project that was initiated by the Government of New Zealand.

57. The ICPM at its Second Session endorsed the continuation, improvement and expansion of the New Zealand pilot project and established an open-ended working group to:

- a) define possible coordinating roles for the ICPM in the area of technical assistance;
- b) review the results of the New Zealand pilot project; and
- c) based on the results of this review, recommend future activities of the ICPM in technical assistance.

58. The Secretariat convened a Technical Consultation on Technical Assistance in conjunction with the ICPM meeting on Strategic Planning 6-10 March 2000 in Bangkok, Thailand to begin to

¹⁴ ICPM 01/19

address the charges identified by the ICPM. The meeting was attended by representatives of national plant protection organizations from: Bangladesh, Australia, Canada, Viet Nam, USA, Uruguay, Thailand, Sweden, South Africa, Nigeria, Indonesia, Japan and New Zealand. Representatives of the APPPC and Comunidad Andina attended as observers. The meeting was chaired by Mr Hedley, Chairperson of the ICPM, and also attended by the IPPC Secretariat. A second meeting of the Consultation was held in Bangkok from 2-6 October 2000. The meeting reviewed the further development of the New Zealand Pilot Project and developed draft statements regarding the coordinating role of the ICPM and future activities. The second meeting included most of the same Members attending the first meeting, with the addition of IICA as an observer.

59. The Chairperson presented the report of the Technical Consultation on Technical Assistance. He noted the coordinating role for the ICPM towards reinforcing the implementation of the IPPC. The Chairperson drew attention to the New Zealand Pilot Project, which had been improved and become known as the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE), and the recommendations concerning its application and maintenance.

60. Mr Felipe Canale (Uruguay) shared with the ICPM his experiences with the application of the PCE in the Andean Region. Mr Canale stressed that the PCE was used as an instrument for national self-assessment rather than for comparisons of phytosanitary capabilities.

61. The ICPM:

1. endorsed the statements of the Consultation regarding the coordinating role of the ICPM (paragraphs 6 and 7, Appendix XVI), recognizing that the role of the ICPM in technical assistance is to support regional and global activities whereas technical assistance for individual countries is addressed through donor funded projects;
2. recommended that the role of the ICPM in technical assistance be fully considered in strategic planning and decisions regarding the work programme;
3. adopted the recommendations regarding the New Zealand pilot project (paragraph 9, Appendix XVI);
4. recommended that the establishment of a trust fund be fully considered under the framework of strategic planning;
5. adopted the recommendations regarding future activities of the ICPM in technical assistance (paragraphs 10 and 11, Appendix XVI¹⁵); and
6. agreed to establish an ad hoc working group with the charge to implement recommendations.

D. Report on Biosecurity

62. The Secretariat introduced the paper on biosecurity and reported on the discussions that took place during the FAO Committee on Agriculture (COAG) during the preceding week.

IX. STRATEGIC PLANNING

63. The ICPM, at its Second Session in October 1999, recommended that as part of the work programme of the ICPM in 2000, interested Members develop a strategic plan for the work of the ICPM. The Secretariat convened a Technical Consultation on Strategic Planning in conjunction with

¹⁵ ICPM 01/13

an ICPM meeting on technical assistance 6-10 March 2000 in Bangkok, Thailand. (see also paragraph 58)

64. The meeting developed a draft strategic plan that was distributed to Members for comments in the form of a questionnaire. Thirty-nine Members provided responses to the Secretariat. Responses were summarized by the Secretariat and submitted to a second meeting of the Technical Consultation on Strategic Planning held 2-6 October that included most of the same Members attending the first meeting, with the addition of IICA as an observer. The second meeting considered the comments of Members in reformulating the draft plan for submission to the ICPM for adoption.

65. The Chairperson introduced the Strategic Plan as developed by the Consultation. The ICPM considered the position statement, the mission statement, and the strategic directions. The ICPM also considered the goals, timing, priority, and means to achieve goals and the activities within the provisional work calendar.

66. The ICPM considered its own capacity, the capacity of the SC, the capacity of Member governments and that of the Secretariat to realize the required activities in both standard setting and technical assistance. It noted that the capacity of the SC was limited to the consideration of approximately five standards each year. Also, Members were limited in the number of standards they could review each year. The ICPM recognized the need for developing countries to participate fully in standard-setting procedures. Additional resources would be required to enable countries to participate in standard setting and particularly in the implementation of standards.

67. The ICPM was informed of the limitations within the present resources of the Secretariat. It noted that over the last 18 months, the Secretariat and the Bureau had maintained a level of activities that would be unsustainable in the future with the present level of resources. Additional activities could only be undertaken if funding was available for the activity and for the staff time to support such an activity. The ICPM took note of the various possibilities that would exist to establish a trust fund to support the activities of the ICPM, including activities related to technical assistance. These included assistance through project funding, the establishment of a voluntary trust fund, the establishment of a trust fund with voluntary assessed contributions, and a trust fund with mandatory assessed contributions.

68. The ICPM noted that an increase in resources is needed to achieve the aims of the IPPC, therefore all efforts should be made to establish a sound financial basis. The ICPM welcomed the budget proposal of FAO for its next Programme of Work and Budget to make additional resources available to the IPPC Secretariat but noted that these would still fall short of requirements. Members wished to consider at the next ICPM possible sources of funding to support the work programme of the ICPM, including the World Bank, Regional banks, and the UNDP. Members also thought it important to take account of the work going on within the SPS to increase the participation of developing countries in the standard-setting organizations. The WTO Representative gave details of this work. Members also wished to consider at the next ICPM the purpose and the draft rules and the framework for a voluntary trust fund, drawing upon the principles and practices used for voluntary contributions to other international activities. They declared the necessity for budget transparency to ensure that funds would be allocated in a transparent manner. Some Members indicated that options should take account of the economic capacity of Member countries.

69. The ICPM:

1. endorsed the position statement;
2. adopted the mission statement;
3. adopted the strategic directions;

4. agreed to review the mission statement and strategic directions on an annual basis, or as necessary;
5. adopted the goals, as well as the corresponding work programme and provisional calendar, with the understanding that these will be reviewed on an annual basis, or as necessary;(Appendix XVII¹⁶);
6. requested FAO to consider increasing the budget of the IPPC Secretariat;
7. requested the Working Group on Strategic Planning to:
 - examine the possible resources from World Bank, Regional Banks and the UNDP available to support the work programme of the ICPM, including technical assistance,
 - clarify the purpose of and develop draft rules and a framework for a voluntary trust fund, and a trust fund with voluntary assessed contributions, taking into account other existing trust fund mechanisms and considering mechanisms for budget transparency, and
 - develop rules for sponsorship of standards which would guarantee transparency of the process and participation of developing countries in the drafting of the standard; and
8. declared that a positive consideration of trust funds is dependent on the availability of a transparent budget summary including detailed specifications for expenditure.

X. STATUS OF THE IPPC

A. Acceptance of the New Revised Text of the IPPC

70. The ICPM was informed by the Secretariat that the New Revised Text of the IPPC approved by the FAO Conference at its Twenty-ninth Session in November 1997 had now been accepted by twenty-one Contracting Parties: Argentina, Australia, Bangladesh, Barbados, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Korea (Republic of), Mauritius, Mexico, Moldova, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and Tunisia. A number of delegations reported that the necessary internal procedures for acceptance of the new Revised Text were underway and the deposit of their countries' instruments of acceptance could be expected shortly. In addition, it was noted that the United States of America has notified FAO of acceptance of the amendments and is in the process of submitting an instrument of acceptance.

71. The ICPM was informed by the Secretariat that since the Second Session of the ICPM, five additional countries had deposited their instruments of adherence, bringing the total number of Contracting Parties to 115.

72. The ICPM encouraged Contracting Parties to expedite the process of acceptance of the New Revised Text, and encouraged FAO Members that are not contracting parties to the IPPC to submit their instruments of adherence.

B. Interim Measures

73. The ICPM was informed by the Secretariat of the implementation of interim measures, including the establishment of the ICPM, the designation of official contact points, the voluntary use of the amended phytosanitary certificates and the development of a standard for regulated non-quarantine pests. The Secretariat noted that since the last meeting of the ICPM, no Members had indicated they were using the new model phytosanitary certificate, but several Members had indicated that the adoption of the new standard providing guidelines for the use of the new certificate would facilitate the transition.

¹⁶ ICPM 01/14

C. 50th Anniversary of the IPPC

74. The meeting was informed of the 50th anniversary of the entry into force of the IPPC in April 2002. The ICPM supported a proposal for a one-day symposium that would be held in association with the next ICPM to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the IPPC.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Reporting of Non-Compliance

75. The Representative of Uruguay introduced the paper that proposed to include a standing item on the agenda of the ICPM which, like that existing on the Agenda of the Committee of the SPS Agreement of the WTO, would enable the ICPM to take note, through reports by the Members of situations of non-compliance with the international standards of the IPPC. A number of countries expressed support for the proposal, but indicated that rules of procedure should be developed so that the non-compliance reporting system would be effective. Other members wished to have more time to consider the implications of the proposal. The ICPM agreed that the proposal would be considered further by the Dispute Settlement Subsidiary Body.

B. Structure and Organization of Meetings

76. The Secretariat informed the ICPM of the structure and organization of meetings conducted as part of the work programme. The ICPM was advised that participation in meetings depended on whether the meetings were considered technical consultations, or expert, informal, or open-ended working groups. In general, participants are either invited experts or representatives designated by a government or organization. The Secretariat also informed the ICPM that several Members had funded their own experts' participation in meetings, and this savings enabled the Secretariat to fund participants from developing countries and additional meetings. The Secretariat was requested to make reports of meetings available to Members within a short time period after the meetings occur. Some Members urged that that ICPM members be given explicit and timely notice of meetings to permit the necessary arrangements to be made and requested that the ICPM reduce the number of meeting titles and include these in the Rules of Procedure of the ICPM.

C. Trade Measures on Plant Products and Foot and Mouth Disease

77. Concerns over the implementation of trade measures on plant products by Members in response to recent outbreaks of foot and mouth disease were discussed. The ICPM was advised that the Secretariat of the IPPC had coordinated with the Office International des Epizooties (OIE) in clarifying the role of phytosanitary certification with respect to foot and mouth disease. The Secretariat explained that both organizations have formulated statements emphasizing that matters relating to animal health or concerns should not be addressed on phytosanitary certificates.

XII. DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING

78. The ICPM decided that the next meeting would be held 11-13 March 2002 in Rome, Italy.

XIII. ELECTION OF THE BUREAU

79. The ICPM agreed that nominations for the Bureau should be submitted by 4 April 2001. The Chairperson indicated that three nominations had been received:

- Chairperson: Mr Felipe Canale (Uruguay)
- Vice-Chairperson: Mr John Hedley (New Zealand)
- Vice-Chairperson: Mr Ralf Lopian (Finland)

80. The ICPM elected the Bureau by acclamation.

XIV. CLOSURE

81. The ICPM thanked the Bureau and in particular, the Chairperson, Mr John Hedley, and expressed its gratitude to New Zealand for its support.

XV. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

82. The ICPM adopted the report.

INTERIM COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**Rome, 2-6 April 2001****AGENDA**

1. Opening of the Session
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Report by the Chairperson
4. Standard Setting Priorities
5. Adoption of International Standards
 - Amendments to the Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms
 - Pest Risk Analysis for Quarantine Pests
 - Guidelines for Phytosanitary Certificates
 - Guidelines for Notification of Non-compliance and Emergency Actions
 - Glossary Supplement No 1: Guidelines on the Interpretation and Application of the Concept of Official Control for Regulated Pests
6. Items Arising from the Second Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
 - 6.1 Formation of a Standards Committee
 - 6.2 Dispute Settlement Procedures
 - 6.3 Information Exchange (moved to Agenda Item 8.2)
 - 6.4 GMOs, Biosafety and Invasive Species
 - 6.5 Official Control
7. Report from the Technical Consultation among RPPOs
 - 7.1 Recognition of RPPOs
8. Work Programme for Harmonization
 - 8.1 Standard Setting
 - 8.2 Information Exchange
 - 8.3 Technical Assistance
 - 8.4 Report on Biosecurity
9. Strategic Planning
10. Status of the IPPC
 - Acceptance of the New Revised Text
 - Interim Measures
11. Other business
 - 11.1 Reporting of Non-compliance with Phytosanitary Measures
 - 11.2 Structure and Organization of Meetings
 - 11.3 Phytosanitary Measures and Foot and Mouth Disease
12. Date and Venue of the Next Meeting
13. Election of the Bureau
14. Adoption of the Report

ICPM Open-ended Expert Working Group for the Development of a Detailed Standard Specification on the Plant Pest Risks Associated with LMOs/Products of Modern Biotechnology

Terms of Reference

The Open-ended Expert Working Group will develop a detailed standard specification for consideration at ICPM 4 that:

1. identifies the plant pest risks associated with LMOs/products of modern biotechnology;
2. identifies elements relevant to the assessment of these plant pest risks;
3. considers existing international regulatory frameworks and guidelines;
4. identifies areas within PRA standards and other ISPMs that are relevant to the phytosanitary aspects of LMOs/products of modern biotechnology; and
5. identifies the plant pest risks associated with LMOs/products of modern biotechnology that are not adequately addressed by existing ISPMs.

In order to better prepare for the Open-ended Expert Working Group meeting, a discussion paper and recommendations should be developed in advance of the meeting.

Consistent with the objective of strengthening cooperation between the IPPC and the CBD, the Secretariat should make contact with the CBD and other relevant organizations to explain the purpose of the Open-ended Expert Working Group meeting.

The Secretariat should invite the secretariats of these organizations to designate experts to attend the Open-ended Expert Working Group meeting to contribute to the development of the specification for the standard.

AMENDMENTS TO THE GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS**1. New Terms and Definitions**

Devitalization	A procedure rendering plants or plant products incapable of germination, growth or further reproduction
Emergency action	A prompt phytosanitary action undertaken in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation
Emergency measure	A phytosanitary regulation or procedure established as a matter of urgency in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation. An emergency measure may or may not be a provisional measure
Official control	The active enforcement of mandatory phytosanitary regulations and the application of mandatory phytosanitary procedures with the objective of eradication or containment of quarantine pests or for the management of regulated non-quarantine pests (see Glossary Supplement No. 1)
Phytosanitary action	An official operation, such as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment, undertaken to implement phytosanitary regulations or procedures
Provisional measure	A phytosanitary regulation or procedure established without full technical justification owing to current lack of adequate information. A provisional measure is subjected to periodic review and full technical justification as soon as possible

2. Revised Terms and Definitions

Bulbs and tubers	A commodity class for dormant underground parts of plants intended for planting (includes corms and rhizomes)
Commodity	A type of plant, plant product, or other article being moved for trade or other purpose
Consignment	A quantity of plants, plant products and/or other articles being moved from one country to another and covered, when required, by a single phytosanitary certificate (a consignment may be composed of one or more commodities or lots)

Cut flowers and branches	A commodity class for fresh parts of plants intended for decorative use and not for planting
Fruits and vegetables	A commodity class for fresh parts of plants intended for consumption or processing and not for planting
Grain	A commodity class for seeds intended for processing or consumption and not for planting (See Seeds)
Phytosanitary procedure	Any officially prescribed method for implementing phytosanitary regulations including the performance of inspections, tests, surveillance or treatments in connection with regulated pests
Phytosanitary regulation	Official rule to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests, or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests, including establishment of procedures for phytosanitary certification
Regulated area	An area into which, within which and/or from which plants, plant products and other regulated articles are subjected to phytosanitary regulations or procedures in order to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests
Seeds	A commodity class for seeds for planting or intended for planting and not for consumption or processing (see Grain)
Wood	A commodity class for round wood, sawn wood, wood chips or dunnage, with or without bark

3. Other Recommendations

Country of re-export: The term is removed from the Glossary because the definition is incorrect. Refer to the Glossary Group for correction and clarification of its relationship to other terms.

Country of origin (of a consignment of plant products): Refer to the Glossary Group

Growing season: Retain the existing term in the Glossary but refer it to the Glossary Group for consideration of its relationship to *Growing period (for a crop)* which is also referred to the Glossary Group to consider in this regard.

Plants in tissue culture: Maintain existing term in the Glossary but refer to the Glossary Group to determine appropriateness of both the term and the definition. Alternative definition: a commodity class for plants obtained by in vitro technique in an aseptic medium and transported in a closed container.

General recommendations:

1. Terms and definitions included in ISPMs be annotated to indicate the date and body that adopted the term. This is to be consistent with the format in the *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* and to help identify the most recent term and definition.
2. Delete “acronym for” or “abbreviation for” on all abbreviations and acronyms.

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

PEST RISK ANALYSIS FOR QUARANTINE PESTS



**Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention
Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations
Rome, 2001**

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE	1
REFERENCES	1
DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS	1
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	4

PEST RISK ANALYSIS FOR QUARANTINE PESTS

1. Stage 1: Initiation	5
1.1. Initiation points	5
1.1.1 PRA initiated by the identification of a pathway	5
1.1.2 PRA initiated by the identification of a pest	5
1.1.3 PRA initiated by the review or revision of a policy	5
1.2 Identification of PRA area	6
1.3 Information	6
1.3.1 Previous PRA	6
1.4 Conclusion of initiation	6
2. Stage 2: Pest Risk Assessment	6
2.1 Pest categorization	7
2.1.1 Elements of categorization	7
2.1.1.1 Identity of pest	7
2.1.1.2 Presence or absence in the PRA area	7
2.1.1.3 Regulatory status	7
2.1.1.4 Potential for establishment and spread in PRA area	8
2.1.1.5 Potential for economic consequences in PRA area	8
2.1.2 Conclusion of pest categorization	8
2.2 Assessment of the probability of introduction and spread	8
2.2.1 Probability of entry of a pest	8
2.2.1.1 Identification of pathways for a PRA initiated by a pest	8
2.2.1.2 Probability of the pest being associated with the pathway at origin	9
2.2.1.3 Probability of survival during transport or storage	9
2.2.1.4 Probability of pest surviving existing pest management procedures	9
2.2.1.5 Probability of transfer to a suitable host	9
2.2.2 Probability of establishment	10
2.2.2.1 Availability of suitable hosts, alternate hosts and vectors in the PRA area	10
2.2.2.2 Suitability of environment	10
2.2.2.3 Cultural practices and control measures	11
2.2.2.4 Other characteristics of the pest affecting the probability of establishment	11
2.2.3 Probability of spread after establishment	11
2.2.4 Conclusion on the probability of introduction and spread	12
2.2.4.1 Conclusion regarding endangered areas	12
2.3 Assessment of potential economic consequences	12
2.3.1 Pest effects	12
2.3.1.1 Direct pest effects	13
2.3.1.2 Indirect pest effects	13

2.3.2	Analysis of economic consequences	13
2.3.2.1	Time and place factors	13
2.3.2.2	Analysis of commercial consequences	14
2.3.2.3	Analytical techniques	14
2.3.2.4	Non-commercial and environmental consequences	14
2.3.3	Conclusion of the assessment of economic consequences	15
2.3.3.1	Endangered area	15
2.4	Degree of uncertainty	15
2.5	Conclusion of the pest risk assessment stage	15
3.	Stage 3: Pest Risk Management	15
3.1	Level of risk	15
3.2	Technical information required	16
3.3	Acceptability of risk	16
3.4	Identification and selection of appropriate risk management options	16
3.4.1	Options for consignments	17
3.4.2	Options preventing or reducing infestation in the crop	17
3.4.3	Options ensuring that the area, place or site of production or crop is free from the pest	18
3.4.4	Options for other types of pathways	18
3.4.5	Options within the importing country	18
3.4.6	Prohibition of commodities	18
3.5	Phytosanitary certificates and other compliance measures	18
3.6	Conclusion of pest risk management	19
3.6.1	Monitoring and review of phytosanitary measures	19
4.	Documentation of Pest Risk Analysis	19
4.1	Documentation requirements	19

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

The standard provides details for the conduct of pest risk analysis (PRA) to determine if pests are quarantine pests. It describes the integrated processes to be used for risk assessment as well as the selection of risk management options.

REFERENCES

- Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures*, 1994. World Trade Organization, Geneva.
- Glossary of phytosanitary terms*, 1999. ISPM Pub. No. 5, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for pest risk analysis*, 1996. ISPM Pub. No. 2, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for surveillance*, 1998. ISPM Pub. No. 6, FAO, Rome.
- International Plant Protection Convention*, 1992. FAO, Rome.
- New Revised Text of the International Plant Protection Convention*, 1997. FAO, Rome.
- Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*, 1995. ISPM Pub. No. 1, FAO, Rome.
- Export Certification System*, 1997. ISPM Pub. No. 7, FAO, Rome
- Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*, 1996. ISPM Pub. No. 4, FAO, Rome.
- Determination of pest status in an area*, 1998. ISPM No. 8, FAO, Rome.
- Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest-free production sites*, 1999. ISPM No. 10, FAO, Rome.

DEFINITIONS, ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Area	An officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries
Commodity	A type of plant, plant product or other article being moved for trade or other purpose
Consignment	A quantity of plants, plant products and/or other articles being moved from one country to another and covered by a single phytosanitary certificate (a consignment may be composed of one or more commodities or lots)
Country of origin (of a consignment of plant products)	Country where the plants from which the plant products are derived were grown
Country of origin (of a consignment of plants)	Country where the plants were grown
Country of origin (of regulated articles other than plants and plant products)	Country where the regulated articles were first exposed to contamination by pests
Endangered area	An area where ecological factors favour the establishment of a pest whose presence in the area will result in economically important loss

Entry (of a pest)	Movement of a pest into an area where it is not yet present, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled
Establishment	Perpetuation, for the foreseeable future, of a pest within an area after entry
Introduction	The entry of a pest resulting in its establishment
IPPC	The International Plant Protection Convention, as deposited in 1951 with FAO in Rome and as subsequently amended
National Plant Protection Organization	Official service established by a government to discharge the functions specified by the IPPC
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
Official	Established, authorized or performed by a National Plant Protection Organization
	Any means that allows the entry or spread of a pest
	Any species, strain or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products
	The process for determining whether a pest has or has regulated non-quarantine pest
	An area in which a specific pest does not occur as where appropriate, this condition is being officially
Pest free production site	specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by this condition is being officially maintained for a the same way as a pest free place of production
Pest risk analysis	and economic evidence to determine whether a pest phytosanitary measures to be taken against it
(for quarantine pests)	spread of a pest and of the associated potential
Pest risk management	Evaluation and selection of options to reduce the risk
Phytosanitary certificate	IPPC

Phytosanitary measure	Any legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests
Phytosanitary regulation	Official rule to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests, or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests, including establishment of procedures for phytosanitary certification
Post-entry quarantine	Quarantine applied to a consignment after entry
PRA area	Area in relation to which a pest risk analysis is conducted
Prohibition	A phytosanitary regulation forbidding the importation or movement of specified pests or commodities
Quarantine pest	A pest of potential economic importance to the area endangered thereby and not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled
Regional Plant Protection Organization	An intergovernmental organization with the functions laid down by Article IX of the IPPC
RPPO	Regional Plant Protection Organization
Spread	Expansion of the geographical distribution of a pest within an area

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

The objectives of a PRA are, for a specified area, to identify pests and/or pathways of quarantine concern and evaluate their risk, to identify endangered areas, and, if appropriate, to identify risk management options. Pest risk analysis (PRA) for quarantine pests follows a process defined by three stages:

Stage 1 (initiating the process) involves identifying the pest(s) and pathways that are of quarantine concern and should be considered for risk analysis in relation to the identified PRA area.

Stage 2 (risk assessment) begins with the categorization of individual pests to determine whether the criteria for a quarantine pest are satisfied. Risk assessment continues with an evaluation of the probability of pest entry, establishment, and spread, and of their potential economic consequences.

Stage 3 (risk management) involves identifying management options for reducing the risks identified at stage 2. These are evaluated for efficacy, feasibility and impact in order to select those that are appropriate.

PEST RISK ANALYSIS FOR QUARANTINE PESTS

1. Stage 1: Initiation

The aim of the initiation stage is to identify the pest(s) and pathways which are of quarantine concern and should be considered for risk analysis in relation to the identified PRA area.

1.1 Initiation points

The PRA process may be initiated as a result of:

- the identification of a pathway that presents a potential pest hazard
- the identification of a pest that may require phytosanitary measures
- the review or revision of phytosanitary policies and priorities.

1.1.1 PRA initiated by the identification of a pathway

The need for a new or revised PRA of a specific pathway may arise in the following situations:

- international trade is initiated in a commodity not previously imported into the country (usually a plant or plant product, including genetically altered plants) or a commodity from a new area or new country of origin
- new plant species are imported for selection and scientific research purposes
- a pathway other than commodity import is identified (natural spread, packing material, mail, garbage, passenger baggage, etc.).

A list of pests likely to be associated with the pathway (e.g. carried by the commodity) may be generated by any combination of official sources, databases, scientific and other literature, or expert consultation. It is preferable to prioritize the listing, based on expert judgement on pest distribution and types of pests. If no potential quarantine pests are identified as likely to follow the pathway, the PRA may stop at this point.

1.1.2 PRA initiated by the identification of a pest

A requirement for a new or revised PRA on a specific pest may arise in the following situations:

- an emergency arises on discovery of an established infestation or an outbreak of a new pest within a PRA area
- an emergency arises on interception of a new pest on an imported commodity
- a new pest risk is identified by scientific research
- a pest is introduced into an area
- a pest is reported to be more damaging in an area other than in its area of origin
- a pest is repeatedly intercepted
- a request is made to import an organism
- an organism is identified as a vector for other pests
- an organism is genetically altered in a way which clearly identifies its potential as a plant pest.

1.1.3 PRA initiated by the review or revision of a policy

A requirement for a new or revised PRA originating from policy concerns will most frequently arise in the following situations:

- a national decision is taken to review phytosanitary regulations, requirements or operations

- a proposal made by another country or by an international organization (RPPO, FAO) is reviewed
- a new treatment or loss of a treatment system, a new process, or new information impacts on an earlier decision
- a dispute arises on phytosanitary measures
- the phytosanitary situation in a country changes, a new country is created, or political boundaries have changed.

1.2 Identification of PRA area

The PRA area should be defined as precisely as possible in order to identify the area for which information is needed.

1.3 Information

Information gathering is an essential element of all stages of PRA. It is important at the initiation stage in order to clarify the identity of the pest(s), its/their present distribution and association with host plants, commodities, etc. Other information will be gathered as required to reach necessary decisions as the PRA continues.

Information for PRA may come from a variety of sources. The provision of official information regarding pest status is an obligation under the IPPC (Art. VIII.1c) facilitated by official contact points (Art. VIII.2).

1.3.1 Previous PRA

A check should also be made as to whether pathways, pests or policies have already been subjected to the PRA process, either nationally or internationally. If a PRA exists, its validity should be checked as circumstances and information may have changed. The possibility of using a PRA from a similar pathway or pest, that may partly or entirely replace the need for a new PRA, should also be investigated.

1.4 Conclusion of initiation

At the end of Stage 1, the initiation point, the pests and pathways of concern and the PRA area will have been identified. Relevant information has been collected and pests have been identified as possible candidates for phytosanitary measures, either individually or in association with a pathway.

2. Stage 2: Pest Risk Assessment

The process for pest risk assessment can be broadly divided into three interrelated steps:

- pest categorization
- assessment of the probability of introduction and spread
- assessment of potential economic consequences (including environmental impacts).

In most cases, these steps will be applied sequentially in a PRA but it is not essential to follow a particular sequence. Pest risk assessment needs to be only as complex as is technically justified by the circumstances. This standard allows a specific PRA to be judged against the principles of necessity, minimal impact, transparency, equivalence, risk analysis, managed risk and non-discrimination set out in ISPM No. 1, *Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade* (FAO, 1995).

2.1 Pest categorization

At the outset, it may not be clear which pest(s) identified in Stage 1 require a PRA. The categorization process examines for each pest whether the criteria in the definition for a quarantine pest are satisfied.

In the evaluation of a pathway associated with a commodity, a number of individual PRAs may be necessary for the various pests potentially associated with the pathway. The opportunity to eliminate an organism or organisms from consideration before in-depth examination is undertaken is a valuable characteristic of the categorization process.

An advantage of pest categorization is that it can be done with relatively little information, however information should be sufficient to adequately carry out the categorization.

2.1.1 Elements of categorization

The categorization of a pest as a quarantine pest includes the following primary elements:

- identity of the pest
- presence or absence in the PRA area
- regulatory status
- potential for establishment and spread in PRA area
- potential for economic consequences (including environmental consequences) in the PRA area.

2.1.1.1 Identity of pest

The identity of the pest should be clearly defined to ensure that the assessment is being performed on a distinct organism, and that biological and other information used in the assessment is relevant to the organism in question. If this is not possible because the causal agent of particular symptoms has not yet been fully identified, then it should have been shown to produce consistent symptoms and to be transmissible.

The taxonomic unit for the pest is generally species. The use of a higher or lower taxonomic level should be supported by scientifically sound rationale. In the case of levels below the species, this should include evidence demonstrating that factors such as differences in virulence, host range or vector relationships are significant enough to affect phytosanitary status.

In cases where a vector is involved, the vector may also be considered a pest to the extent that it is associated with the causal organism and is required for transmission of the pest.

2.1.1.2 Presence or absence in PRA area

The pest should be absent from all or a defined part of the PRA area.

2.1.1.3 Regulatory status

If the pest is present but not widely distributed in the PRA area, it should be under official control or expected to be under official control in the near future.

2.1.1.4 Potential for establishment and spread in PRA area

Evidence should be available to support the conclusion that the pest could become established or spread in the PRA area. The PRA area should have ecological/climatic conditions including those in protected conditions suitable for the establishment and spread of the pest and where relevant, host species (or near relatives), alternate hosts and vectors should be present in the PRA area.

2.1.1.5 Potential for economic consequences in PRA area

There should be clear indications that the pest is likely to have an unacceptable economic impact (including environmental impact) in the PRA area.

2.1.2 Conclusion of pest categorization

If it has been determined that the pest has the potential to be a quarantine pest, the PRA process should continue. If a pest does not fulfil all of the criteria for a quarantine pest, the PRA process for that pest may stop. In the absence of sufficient information, the uncertainties should be identified and the PRA process should continue.

2.2 Assessment of the probability of introduction and spread

Pest introduction is comprised of both entry and establishment. Assessing the probability of introduction requires an analysis of each of the pathways with which a pest may be associated from its origin to its establishment in the PRA area. In a PRA initiated by a specific pathway (usually an imported commodity), the probability of pest entry is evaluated for the pathway in question. The probabilities for pest entry associated with other pathways need to be investigated as well.

For risk analyses that have been initiated for a specific pest, with no particular commodity or pathway under consideration, the potential of all probable pathways should be considered.

The assessment of probability of spread is based primarily on biological considerations similar to those for entry and establishment.

2.2.1 Probability of entry of a pest

The probability of entry of a pest depends on the pathways from the exporting country to the destination, and the frequency and quantity of pests associated with them. The higher the number of pathways, the greater the probability of the pest entering the PRA area.

Documented pathways for the pest to enter new areas should be noted. Potential pathways, which may not currently exist, should be assessed. Pest interception data may provide evidence of the ability of a pest to be associated with a pathway and to survive in transport or storage.

2.2.1.1 Identification of pathways for a PRA initiated by a pest

All relevant pathways should be considered. They can be identified principally in relation to the geographical distribution and host range of the pest. Consignments of plants and plant products moving in international trade are the principal pathways of concern and existing patterns of such trade will, to a substantial extent, determine which pathways are relevant. Other pathways

such as other types of commodities, packing materials, persons, baggage, mail, conveyances and the exchange of scientific material should be considered where appropriate. Entry by natural means should also be assessed, as natural spread is likely to reduce the effectiveness of phytosanitary measures.

2.2.1.2 Probability of the pest being associated with the pathway at origin

The probability of the pest being associated, spatially or temporally, with the pathway at origin should be estimated. Factors to consider are:

- prevalence of the pest in the source area
- occurrence of the pest in a life-stage that would be associated with commodities, containers, or conveyances
- volume and frequency of movement along the pathway
- seasonal timing
- pest management, cultural and commercial procedures applied at the place of origin (application of plant protection products, handling, culling, roguing, grading).

2.2.1.3 Probability of survival during transport or storage

Examples of factors to consider are:

- speed and conditions of transport and duration of the life cycle of the pest in relation to time in transport and storage
- vulnerability of the life-stages during transport or storage
- prevalence of pest likely to be associated with a consignment
- commercial procedures (e.g. refrigeration) applied to consignments in the country of origin, country of destination, or in transport or storage.

2.2.1.4 Probability of pest surviving existing pest management procedures

Existing pest management procedures (including phytosanitary procedures) applied to consignments against other pests from origin to end-use, should be evaluated for effectiveness against the pest in question. The probability that the pest will go undetected during inspection or survive other existing phytosanitary procedures should be estimated.

2.2.1.5 Probability of transfer to a suitable host

Factors to consider are:

- dispersal mechanisms, including vectors to allow movement from the pathway to a suitable host
- whether the imported commodity is to be sent to a few or many destination points in the PRA area
- proximity of entry, transit and destination points to suitable hosts
- time of year at which import takes place
- intended use of the commodity (e.g. for planting, processing and consumption)
- risks from by-products and waste.

Some uses are associated with a much higher probability of introduction (e.g. planting) than others (e.g. processing). The probability associated with any growth, processing, or disposal of the commodity in the vicinity of suitable hosts should also be considered.

2.2.2 Probability of establishment

In order to estimate the probability of establishment of a pest, reliable biological information (life cycle, host range, epidemiology, survival etc.) should be obtained from the areas where the pest currently occurs. The situation in the PRA area can then be compared with that in the areas where it currently occurs (taking account also of protected environments such as glass- or greenhouses) and expert judgement used to assess the probability of establishment. Case histories concerning comparable pests can be considered. Examples of the factors to consider are:

- availability, quantity and distribution of hosts in the PRA area
- environmental suitability in the PRA area
- potential for adaptation of the pest
- reproductive strategy of the pest
- method of pest survival
- cultural practices and control measures.

In considering probability of establishment, it should be noted that a transient pest (see ISPM No. 8, *Determination of pest status in an area*) may not be able to establish in the PRA area (e.g. because of unsuitable climatic conditions) but could still have unacceptable economic consequences (see IPPC Art. VII.3).

2.2.2.1 Availability of suitable hosts, alternate hosts and vectors in the PRA area

Factors to consider are:

- whether hosts and alternate hosts are present and how abundant or widely distributed they may be
- whether hosts and alternate hosts occur within sufficient geographic proximity to allow the pest to complete its life cycle
- whether there are other plant species, which could prove to be suitable hosts in the absence of the usual host species
- whether a vector, if needed for dispersal of the pest, is already present in the PRA area or likely to be introduced
- whether another vector species occurs in the PRA area.

The taxonomic level at which hosts are considered should normally be the "species". The use of higher or lower taxonomic levels should be justified by scientifically sound rationale.

2.2.2.2 Suitability of environment

Factors in the environment (e.g. suitability of climate, soil, pest and host competition) that are critical to the development of the pest, its host and if applicable its vector, and to their ability to survive periods of climatic stress and complete their life cycles, should be identified. It should be noted that the environment is likely to have different effects on the pest, its host and its vector. This needs to be recognized in determining whether the interaction between these organisms in the area of origin is maintained in the PRA area to the benefit or detriment of the pest. The probability of establishment in a protected environment, e.g. in glasshouses should also be considered.

Climatic modelling systems may be used to compare climatic data on the known distribution of a pest with that in the PRA area.

2.2.2.3 Cultural practices and control measures

Where applicable, practices employed during the cultivation/production of the host crops should be compared to determine if there are differences in such practices between the PRA area and the origin of the pest that may influence its ability to establish.

Pest control programs or natural enemies already in the PRA area which reduce the probability of establishment may be considered. Pests for which control is not feasible should be considered to present a greater risk than those for which treatment is easily accomplished. The availability (or lack) of suitable methods for eradication should also be considered.

2.2.2.4 Other characteristics of the pest affecting the probability of establishment

These include:

- *Reproductive strategy of the pests and method of pest survival* - Characteristics, which enable the pest to reproduce effectively in the new environment, such as parthenogenesis/self-crossing, duration of the life cycle, number of generations per year, resting stage etc., should be identified.
- *Genetic adaptability* - Whether the species is polymorphic and the degree to which the pest has demonstrated the ability to adapt to conditions like those in the PRA area should be considered, e.g., host-specific races or races adapted to a wider range of habitats or to new hosts. This genotypic (and phenotypic) variability facilitates a pest's ability to withstand environmental fluctuations, to adapt to a wider range of habitats, to develop pesticide resistance and to overcome host resistance.
- *Minimum population needed for establishment* - If possible, the threshold population that is required for establishment should be estimated.

2.2.3 Probability of spread after establishment

A pest with a high potential for spread may also have a high potential for establishment, and possibilities for its successful containment and/or eradication are more limited. In order to estimate the probability of spread of the pest, reliable biological information should be obtained from areas where the pest currently occurs. The situation in the PRA area can then be carefully compared with that in the areas where the pest currently occurs and expert judgement used to assess the probability of spread. Case histories concerning comparable pests can usefully be considered. Examples of the factors to consider are:

- suitability of the natural and/or managed environment for natural spread of the pest
- presence of natural barriers
- the potential for movement with commodities or conveyances
- intended use of the commodity
- potential vectors of the pest in the PRA area
- potential natural enemies of the pest in the PRA area.

The information on probability of spread is used to estimate how rapidly a pest's potential economic importance may be expressed within the PRA area.

This also has significance if the pest is liable to enter and establish in an area of low potential economic importance and then spread to an area of high potential economic importance. In addition it may be important in the risk management stage when considering the feasibility of containment or eradication of an introduced pest.

2.2.4 Conclusion on the probability of introduction and spread

The overall probability of introduction should be expressed in terms most suitable for the data, the methods used for analysis, and the intended audience. This may be quantitative or qualitative, since either output is in any case the result of a combination of both quantitative and qualitative information. The probability of introduction may be expressed as a comparison with that obtained from PRAs on other pests.

2.2.4.1 Conclusion regarding endangered areas

The part of the PRA area where ecological factors favour the establishment of the pest should be identified in order to define the endangered area. This may be the whole of the PRA area or a part of the area.

2.3 Assessment of potential economic consequences

Requirements described in this step indicate what information relative to the pest and its potential host plants should be assembled, and suggest levels of economic analysis that may be carried out using that information in order to assess all the effects of the pest, i.e. the potential economic consequences. Wherever appropriate, quantitative data that will provide monetary values should be obtained. Qualitative data may also be used. Consultation with an economist may be useful.

In many instances, detailed analysis of the estimated economic consequences is not necessary if there is sufficient evidence or it is widely agreed that the introduction of a pest will have unacceptable economic consequences (including environmental consequences). In such cases, risk assessment will primarily focus on the probability of introduction and spread. It will, however, be necessary to examine economic factors in greater detail when the level of economic consequences is in question, or when the level of economic consequences is needed to evaluate the strength of measures used for risk management or in assessing the cost-benefit of exclusion or control.

2.3.1 Pest effects

In order to estimate the potential economic importance of the pest, information should be obtained from areas where the pest occurs naturally or has been introduced. This information should be compared with the situation in the PRA area. Case histories concerning comparable pests can usefully be considered. The effects considered may be direct or indirect.

2.3.1.1 Direct pest effects

For identification and characterization of the direct effects of the pest on each potential host in the PRA area, or those effects which are host-specific, the following are examples that could be considered:

- known or potential host plants (in the field, under protected cultivation, or in the wild)
- types, amount and frequency of damage
- crop losses, in yield and quality

- biotic factors (e.g. adaptability and virulence of the pest) affecting damage and losses
- abiotic factors (e.g. climate) affecting damage and losses
- rate of spread
- rate of reproduction
- control measures (including existing measures), their efficacy and cost
- effect on existing production practices
- environmental effects.

For each of the potential hosts, the total area of the crop and area potentially endangered should be estimated in relation to the elements given above.

2.3.1.2 Indirect pest effects

For identification and characterization of the indirect effects of the pest in the PRA area, or those effects that are not host-specific, the following are examples that could be considered:

- effects on domestic and export markets, including in particular effects on export market access. The potential consequences for market access which may result if the pest becomes established, should be estimated. This involves considering the extent of any phytosanitary regulations imposed (or likely to be imposed) by trading partners
- changes to producer costs or input demands, including control costs
- changes to domestic or foreign consumer demand for a product resulting from quality changes
- environmental and other undesired effects of control measures
- feasibility and cost of eradication or containment
- capacity to act as a vector for other pests
- resources needed for additional research and advice
- social and other effects (e.g. tourism).

2.3.2 Analysis of economic consequences

2.3.2.1 Time and place factors

Estimations made in the previous section related to a hypothetical situation where the pest is supposed to have been introduced and to be fully expressing its potential economic consequences (per year) in the PRA area. In practice, however, economic consequences are expressed with time, and may concern one year, several years or an indeterminate period. Various scenarios should be considered. The total economic consequences over more than one year can be expressed as net present value of annual economic consequences, and an appropriate discount rate selected to calculate net present value.

Other scenarios could concern whether the pest occurs at one, few or many points in the PRA area and the expression of potential economic consequences will depend on the rate and manner of spread in the PRA area. The rate of spread may be envisaged to be slow or rapid; in some cases, it may be supposed that spread can be prevented. Appropriate analysis may be used to estimate potential economic consequences over the period of time when a pest is spreading in the PRA area. In addition, many of the factors or effects considered above could be expected to change over time, with the consequent

effects of potential economic consequences. Expert judgement and estimations will be required.

2.3.2.2 Analysis of commercial consequences

As determined above, most of the direct effects of a pest, and some of the indirect effects will be of a commercial nature, or have consequences for an identified market. These effects, which may be positive or negative, should be identified and quantified. The following may usefully be considered:

- effect of pest-induced changes to producer profits that result from changes in production costs, yields or prices
- effect of pest-induced changes in quantities demanded or prices paid for commodities by domestic and international consumers. This could include quality changes in products and/or quarantine-related trade restrictions resulting from a pest introduction.

2.3.2.3 Analytical techniques

There are analytical techniques which can be used in consultation with experts in economics to make a more detailed analysis of the potential economic effects of a quarantine pest. These should incorporate all of the effects that have been identified. These techniques may include:

- *partial budgeting*: this will be adequate, if the economic effects induced by the action of the pest to producer profits are generally limited to producers and are considered to be relatively minor
- *partial equilibrium*: this is recommended if, under point 2.3.2.2, there is a significant change in producer profits, or if there is a significant change in consumer demand. Partial equilibrium analysis is necessary to measure welfare changes, or the net changes arising from the pest impacts on producers and consumers
- *general equilibrium*: if the economic changes are significant to a national economy, and could cause changes to factors such as wages, interest rates or exchange rates, then general equilibrium analysis could be used to establish the full range of economic effects

The use of analytical techniques is often limited by lack of data, by uncertainties in the data, and by the fact that for certain effects only qualitative information can be provided.

2.3.2.4 Non-commercial and environmental consequences

Some of the direct and indirect effects of the introduction of a pest determined in 2.3.1.1 and 2.3.1.2 will be of an economic nature, or affect some type of value, but not have an existing market which can be easily identified. As a result, the effects may not be adequately measured in terms of prices in established product or service markets. Examples include in particular environmental effects (such as ecosystem stability, biodiversity, amenity value) and social effects (such as employment, tourism) arising from a pest introduction. These impacts could be approximated with an appropriate non-market valuation method.

If quantitative measurement of such consequences is not feasible, qualitative information about the consequences may be provided. An explanation of how this information has been incorporated into decisions should also be provided.

2.3.3 Conclusion of the assessment of economic consequences

Wherever appropriate, the output of the assessment of economic consequences described in this step should be in terms of a monetary value. The economic consequences can also be expressed qualitatively or using quantitative measures without monetary terms. Sources of information, assumptions and methods of analysis should be clearly specified.

2.3.3.1 Endangered area

The part of the PRA area where presence of the pest will result in economically important loss should be identified as appropriate. This is needed to define the endangered area.

2.4 Degree of uncertainty

Estimation of the probability of introduction of a pest and of its economic consequences involves many uncertainties. In particular, this estimation is an extrapolation from the situation where the pest occurs to the hypothetical situation in the PRA area. It is important to document the areas of uncertainty and the degree of uncertainty in the assessment, and to indicate where expert judgement has been used. This is necessary for transparency and may also be useful for identifying and prioritizing research needs.

2.5 Conclusion of the pest risk assessment stage

As a result of the pest risk assessment, all or some of the categorized pests may be considered appropriate for pest risk management. For each pest, all or part of the PRA area may be identified as an endangered area. A quantitative or qualitative estimate of the probability of introduction of a pest or pests, and a corresponding quantitative or qualitative estimate of economic consequences (including environmental consequences), have been obtained and documented or an overall rating could have been assigned. These estimates, with associated uncertainties, are utilized in the pest risk management stage of the PRA.

3. Stage 3: Pest Risk Management

The conclusions from pest risk assessment are used to decide whether risk management is required and the strength of measures to be used. Since zero-risk is not a reasonable option, the guiding principle for risk management should be to manage risk to achieve the required degree of safety that can be justified and is feasible within the limits of available options and resources. Pest risk management (in the analytical sense) is the process of identifying ways to react to a perceived risk, evaluating the efficacy of these actions, and identifying the most appropriate options. The uncertainty noted in the assessments of economic consequences and probability of introduction should also be considered and included in the selection of a pest management option.

3.1 Level of risk

The principle of "managed risk" (ISPM No. 1, *Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*) states that: "Because some risk of introduction of a quarantine pest always exists, countries shall agree to a policy of risk management when formulating phytosanitary measures". In implementing this principle, countries should decide what level of risk is acceptable to them.

The acceptable level of risk may be expressed in a number of ways, such as:

- reference to existing phytosanitary requirements
- indexed to estimated economic losses
- expressed on a scale of risk tolerance
- compared with the level of risk accepted by other countries.

3.2 Technical information required

The decisions to be made in the pest risk management process will be based on the information collected during the preceding stages of PRA. This information will be composed of:

- reasons for initiating the process
- estimation of the probability of introduction to the PRA area
- evaluation of potential economic consequences in the PRA area.

3.3 Acceptability of risk

Overall risk is determined by the examination of the outputs of the assessments of the probability of introduction and the economic impact. If the risk is found to be unacceptable, then the first step in risk management is to identify possible phytosanitary measures that will reduce the risk to, or below an acceptable level. Measures are not justified if the risk is already acceptable or must be accepted because it is not manageable (as may be the case with natural spread). Countries may decide that a low level of monitoring or audit is maintained to ensure that future changes in the pest risk are identified.

3.4 Identification and selection of appropriate risk management options

Appropriate measures should be chosen based on their effectiveness in reducing the probability of introduction of the pest. The choice should be based on the following considerations, which include several of the *Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade* (ISPM No. 1):

- *Phytosanitary measures shown to be cost-effective and feasible* - The benefit from the use of phytosanitary measures is that the pest will not be introduced and the PRA area will, consequently, not be subjected to the potential economic consequences. The cost-benefit analysis for each of the minimum measures found to provide acceptable security may be estimated. Those measures with an acceptable benefit-to-cost ratio should be considered.
- *Principle of "minimal impact"* - Measures should not be more trade restrictive than necessary. Measures should be applied to the minimum area necessary for the effective protection of the endangered area.
- *Reassessment of previous requirements* - No additional measures should be imposed if existing measures are effective.
- *Principle of "equivalence"* - If different phytosanitary measures with the same effect are identified, they should be accepted as alternatives.
- *Principle of "non-discrimination"* - If the pest under consideration is established in the PRA area but of limited distribution and under official control, the phytosanitary measures in relation to import should not be more stringent than those applied within the PRA area. Likewise, phytosanitary measures should not discriminate between exporting countries of the same phytosanitary status.

The major risk of introduction of plant pests is with imported consignments of plants and plant products, but (especially for a PRA performed on a particular pest) it is necessary to consider the risk of introduction with other types of pathways (e.g. packing materials, conveyances, travellers and their luggage, and the natural spread of a pest).

The measures listed below are examples of those that are most commonly applied to traded commodities. They are applied to pathways, usually consignments of a host, from a specific origin. The measures should be as precise as possible as to consignment type (hosts, parts of plants) and origin so as not to act as barriers to trade by limiting the import of products where this is not justified. Combinations of two or more measures may be needed in order to reduce the risk to an acceptable level. The available measures can be classified into broad categories which relate to the pest status of the pathway in the country of origin. These include measures:

- applied to the consignment
- applied to prevent or reduce original infestation in the crop
- to ensure the area or place of production is free from the pest
- concerning the prohibition of commodities.

Other options may arise in the PRA area (restrictions on the use of a commodity), control measures, introduction of a biological control agent, eradication, and containment. Such options should also be evaluated and will apply in particular if the pest is already present but not widely distributed in the PRA area.

3.4.1 Options for consignments

Measures may include any combinations of the following:

- inspection or testing for freedom from a pest or to a specified pest tolerance; sample size should be adequate to give an acceptable probability of detecting the pest
- prohibition of parts of the host
- a pre-entry or post-entry quarantine system - this system could be considered to be the most intensive form of inspection or testing where suitable facilities and resources are available, and may be the only option for certain pests not detectable on entry
- specified conditions of preparation of the consignment (e.g. handling to prevent infestation or reinfestation)
- specified treatment of the consignment - such treatments are applied post-harvest and could include chemical, thermal, irradiation or other physical methods
- restrictions on end use, distribution and periods of entry of the commodity.

Measures may also be applied to restrict the import of consignments of pests.

3.4.2 Options preventing or reducing infestation in the crop

Measures may include:

- treatment of the crop, field, or place of production
- restriction of the composition of a consignment so that it is composed of plants belonging to resistant or less susceptible species
- growing plants under specially protected conditions (glasshouse, isolation)
- harvesting of plants at a certain age or a specified time of year

- production in a certification scheme. An officially monitored plant production scheme usually involves a number of carefully controlled generations, beginning with nuclear stock plants of high health status. It may be specified that the plants be derived from plants within a limited number of generations.

3.4.3 Options ensuring that the area, place or site of production or crop is free from the pest

Measures may include:

- pest-free area - requirements for pest-free area status are described in *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas* (ISPM No. 4)
- pest-free place of production or pest-free production site - requirements are described in *Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest-free production sites* (ISPM No. 10)
- inspection of crop to confirm pest freedom.

3.4.4 Options for other types of pathways

For many types of pathways, the measures considered above for plants and plant products to detect the pest in the consignment or to prevent infestation of the consignment, may also be used or adapted. For certain types of pathways, the following factors should be considered:

- Natural spread of a pest includes movement of the pest by flight, wind dispersal, transport by vectors such as insects or birds and natural migration. If the pest is entering the PRA area by natural spread, or is likely to enter in the immediate future, phytosanitary measures may have little effect. Control measures applied in the area of origin could be considered. Similarly, containment or eradication, supported by suppression and surveillance, in the PRA area after entry of the pest could be considered.
- Measures for human travellers and their baggage could include targeted inspections, publicity and fines or incentives. In a few cases, treatments may be possible.
- Contaminated machinery or modes of transport (ships, trains, planes, road transport) could be subjected to cleaning or disinfestation.

3.4.5 Options within the importing country

Certain measures applied within the importing country may also be used. These could include careful surveillance to try and detect the entry of the pest as early as possible, eradication programmes to eliminate any foci of infestation and/or containment action to limit spread.

3.4.6 Prohibition of commodities

If no satisfactory measure to reduce risk to an acceptable level can be found, the final option may be to prohibit importation of the relevant commodities. This should be viewed as a measure of last resort and should be considered in light of the anticipated efficacy, especially in instances where the incentives for illegal import may be significant.

3.5 Phytosanitary certificates and other compliance measures

Risk management includes the consideration of appropriate compliance procedures. The most important of these is export certification (see ISPM No. 7, *Export certification system*). The issuance of phytosanitary certificates (see the draft ISPM,

Guidelines for Phytosanitary Certificates) provides official assurance that a consignment is “considered to be free from the quarantine pests specified by the importing contracting party and to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party”. It thus confirms that the specified risk management options have been followed. An additional declaration may be required to indicate that a particular measure has been carried out. Other compliance measures may be used subject to bilateral or multilateral agreement.

3.6 Conclusion of pest risk management

The result of the pest risk management procedure will be either that no measures are identified which are considered appropriate or the selection of one or more management options that have been found to lower the risk associated with the pest(s) to an acceptable level. These management options form the basis of phytosanitary regulations or requirements.

The application and maintenance of such regulations is subject to certain obligations, in the case of contracting parties to the IPPC.

3.6.1 Monitoring and review of phytosanitary measures

The principle of "modification" states: "As conditions change, and as new facts become available, phytosanitary measures shall be modified promptly, either by inclusion of prohibitions, restrictions or requirements necessary for their success, or by removal of those found to be unnecessary" (ISPM No. 1, *Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*).

Thus, the implementation of particular phytosanitary measures should not be considered to be permanent. After application, the success of the measures in achieving their aim should be determined by monitoring during use. This is often achieved by inspection of the commodity on arrival, noting any interceptions or any entries of the pest to the PRA area. The information supporting the pest risk analysis should be periodically reviewed to ensure that any new information that becomes available does not invalidate the decision taken.

4. Documentation of Pest Risk Analysis

4.1 Documentation requirements

The IPPC and the principle of "transparency" (ISPM No. 1, *Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*) require that countries should, on request, make available the rationale for phytosanitary requirements. The whole process from initiation to pest risk management should be sufficiently documented so that when a review or a dispute arises, the sources of information and rationale used in reaching the management decision can be clearly demonstrated.

The main elements of documentation are:

- purpose for the PRA
- pest, pest list, pathways, PRA area, endangered area
- sources of information
- categorized pest list
- conclusions of risk assessment
 - probability

- consequences
- risk management
 - options identified
 - options selected.

INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES

GUIDELINES FOR PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATES



**Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention
Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations
Rome, 2001**

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE	1
REFERENCES	1
DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS	1
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	4

REQUIREMENTS FOR PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATES

1. General Considerations	5
1.1 Purpose of phytosanitary certificates	5
1.2 Mode of issue	6
1.3 Attachments	6
1.4 Unacceptable certificates	6
1.4.1 Invalid phytosanitary certificates	6
1.4.2 Fraudulent certificates	6
1.5 Requirements made by importing countries with respect to preparation and issue of phytosanitary certificates	6
2. Specific Principles and Guidelines for Preparation and Issue of Phytosanitary Certificates	7
2.1 Requirements for completing the phytosanitary certificate	7
2.2 Phytosanitary certificate for re-export	10
2.2.1 Conditions for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export	10
2.2.2 Conditions for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for an imported consignment	10
2.2.3 Transit	11
Appendix	
Model Phytosanitary Certificate	12
Model Phytosanitary Certificate for Re-Export	13

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

This standard describes principles and guidelines for the preparation and issue of phytosanitary certificates and phytosanitary certificates for re-export.

REFERENCES

- Export certification system*, 1997. ISPM Pub. No. 7, FAO, Rome.
Glossary of phytosanitary terms, 1999. ISPM Pub. No. 5, FAO, Rome.
New Revised Text of the International Plant Protection Convention, 1997. FAO, Rome.
Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites, 1999. ISPM Pub. No. 10, FAO, Rome.

DEFINITIONS, ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Additional declaration	A statement that is required by an importing country to be entered on a phytosanitary certificate and which provides specific additional information pertinent to the phytosanitary condition of a consignment
Commodity	A type of plant, plant product or other article being moved for trade or other purpose
Consignment	A quantity of plants, plant products and/or other articles being moved from one country to another and covered, when required, by a single phytosanitary certificate (a consignment may be composed of one or more commodities or lots)
Consignment in transit	Consignment which passes through a country without being imported, and without being exposed in that country to contamination or infestation by pests. The consignment may not be split up, combined with other consignments or have its packaging changed (formerly country of transit)
Country of origin (of regulated articles other than plants and plant products)	Country where the regulated articles were first exposed to contamination by pests
Country of origin (of a consignment of plants)	Country where the plants were grown
Devitalization	A procedure rendering plants or plant products incapable of germination, growth or further reproduction
Free from (of a consignment, field or place of production)	Without pests (or a specific pest) in numbers or quantities that can be detected by the application of phytosanitary procedures
Harmonization	The establishment, recognition and application by different countries of phytosanitary measures based on common standards
Import permit	Official document authorizing importation of a commodity in accordance with specified phytosanitary requirements

Inspection	Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles to determine if pests are present and/or to determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations
ISPM	International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures
National Plant Protection Organization	Official service established by a government to discharge the functions specified by the IPPC
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
Pest	Any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products
Pest free area	An area in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained
Pest free place of production	Place of production in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period
Pest free production site	A defined portion of a place of production in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a pest free place of production
Phytosanitary certificate	Certificate patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC
Phytosanitary certification	Use of phytosanitary procedures leading to the issue of a phytosanitary certificate
Phytosanitary measure	Any legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests
Phytosanitary regulation	Official rule to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests, or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests, including establishment of procedures for phytosanitary certification
Place of production	Any premises or collection of fields operated as a single production or farming unit. This may include production sites which are separately managed for phytosanitary purposes
Plant products	Unmanufactured material of plant origin (including grain) and those manufactured products that, by their nature or that of their processing, may create a risk for the introduction and spread of pests
Plants	Living plants and parts thereof, including seeds and germplasm

Practically free	Of a consignment, field, or place of production, without pests (or a specific pest) in numbers or quantities in excess of those that can be expected to result from, and be consistent with good cultural and handling practices employed in the production and marketing of the commodity
Quarantine pest	A pest of potential economic importance to the area endangered thereby and not yet present there, or present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled
Re-exported consignment	Consignment which has been imported into a country from which it is then exported without being exposed to infestation or contamination by pests. The consignment may be stored, split up, combined with other consignments or have its packaging changed (formerly Country of re-export)
Regulated article	Any plant, plant product, storage place, packaging, conveyance, container, soil and any other organism, object or material capable of harbouring or spreading pests, deemed to require phytosanitary measures, particularly where international transportation is involved
Regulated non-quarantine pest	A non-quarantine pest whose presence in plants for planting affects the intended use of those plants with an economically unacceptable impact and which is therefore regulated within the territory of the importing contracting party
Regulated pest	A quarantine pest or a regulated non-quarantine pest
Test	Official examination, other than visual, to determine if pests are present or to identify pests
Treatment	Officially authorized procedure for the killing, removal or rendering infertile of pests

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

This standard describes principles and guidelines to assist National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) with the preparation and issue of phytosanitary certificates and phytosanitary certificates for re-export. Model certificates are provided in the Annex of the *New Revised Text of the International Plant Protection Convention* adopted in 1997 and are appended to this standard for reference. Explanations are given on the various components of the model certificates indicating the information needed for their appropriate completion.

REQUIREMENTS FOR PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATES

1. General Considerations

Article V.2a of the New Revised Text of the IPPC states that: *"Inspection and other related activities leading to issuance of phytosanitary certificates shall be carried out only by or under the authority of the official national plant protection organization. The issuance of phytosanitary certificates shall be carried out by public officers who are technically qualified and duly authorized by the official national plant protection organization to act on its behalf and under its control with such knowledge and information available to those officers that the authorities of importing contracting parties may accept the phytosanitary certificates with confidence as dependable documents."* (See also ISPM No. 7, *Export certification system*).

Article V.3 states: *"Each contracting party undertakes not to require consignments of plants or plant products or other regulated articles imported into its territories to be accompanied by phytosanitary certificates inconsistent with the models set out in the Annex to this Convention. Any requirements for additional declarations shall be limited to those technically justified."*

As clarified at the time of the adoption of the new revised text of the IPPC, it is understood that 'public officers who are technically qualified and duly authorized by the national plant protection organization' include officers from the national plant protection organization. 'Public' in this context means employed by a level of government, not by a private company. 'Include officers from the national plant protection organization' means that the officer may be directly employed by the NPPO, but does not have to be directly employed by the NPPO.

1.1 Purpose of phytosanitary certificates

Phytosanitary certificates are issued to indicate that consignments of plants, plant products or other regulated articles meet specified phytosanitary import requirements and are in conformity with the certifying statement of the appropriate model certificate. Phytosanitary certificates should only be issued for this purpose.

Model certificates provide a standard wording and format that should be followed for the preparation of official phytosanitary certificates. This is necessary to ensure the validity of the documents, that they are easily recognized, and that essential information is reported.

Importing countries should only require phytosanitary certificates for regulated articles. These include commodities such as plants, bulbs and tubers, or seeds for propagation, fruits and vegetables, cut flowers and branches, grain, and growing medium. Phytosanitary certificates may also be used for certain plant products that have been processed where such products, by their nature or that of their processing, have a potential for introducing regulated pests (e.g. wood, cotton). A phytosanitary certificate may also be required for other regulated articles where phytosanitary measures are technically justified (e.g. empty containers, vehicles and organisms).

Importing countries should not require phytosanitary certificates for plant products that have been processed in such a way that they have no potential for introducing regulated pests, or for other articles that do not require phytosanitary measures.

NPPOs should agree bilaterally when there are differences between the views of the importing country and exporting country regarding the justification for requiring a phytosanitary certificate. Changes regarding the requirement for a phytosanitary certificate should respect the principles of transparency and non-discrimination.

1.2 Mode of issue

The phytosanitary certificate is an original document, or under specific circumstances is a certified copy issued by the NPPO, that accompanies the consignment and is presented to the relevant officials upon arrival in the importing country.

Alternatively, electronic certification may be used provided that:

the mode of issue and security is acceptable by the importing countries
the information provided is consistent with the appropriate model(s)
the intent of certification under the IPPC is realized
the identity of the issuing authority can be adequately established.

1.3 Attachments

Official attachments to the phytosanitary certificate should be limited to those instances where the information required to complete the certificate exceeds the available space on the certificate (see also point 2). Any attachments containing phytosanitary information should bear the phytosanitary certificate number, and should be dated, signed and stamped the same as the phytosanitary certificate. The phytosanitary certificate should indicate, in the appropriate section, that the information belonging in that section is contained in the attachment. The attachment should not contain any information that would not be put on the phytosanitary certificate itself, had there been enough space.

1.4 Unacceptable certificates

Importing countries should not accept certificates that they determine to be invalid or fraudulent. The issuing authorities should be notified as soon as possible regarding unacceptable or suspect documents (see ISPM on Notification of non-compliance and emergency actions). The NPPO of the exporting country should take corrective action when necessary and maintain systems for vigilance and security to ensure that a high level of confidence is associated with phytosanitary certificates issued by that authority.

1.4.1 Invalid phytosanitary certificates

Reasons for rejecting a phytosanitary certificate and/or for requesting additional information include:

illegible
incomplete
period of validity expired or not complied with
inclusion of unauthorized alterations or erasures
inclusion of conflicting or inconsistent information
use of wording that is inconsistent with the model certificates herein
certification of prohibited products
non-certified copies.

1.4.2 Fraudulent certificates

Fraudulent certificates include those:

not authorized by the NPPO
issued on forms not authorized by the issuing NPPO
issued by persons or organizations or other entities that are not authorized by NPPO
containing false or misleading information.

1.5 Requirements made by importing countries with respect to preparation and issue of phytosanitary certificates

Importing countries frequently specify requirements that should be observed with respect to the preparation and issue of phytosanitary certificates. They commonly include:

- language (countries may require that certificates be completed in a specific language or one of a list of languages -- countries are encouraged to include one of the official languages of FAO);
- period of validity (importing countries may specify the period of time allowed for issue following inspection and/or treatment, dispatch of the consignment from the country of origin following issue, and validity of certificate);
- completion (countries may require that the certificate is completed by typing, or in handwritten legible capital letters)
- units (countries may require that the description of the consignment and quantities declared should be done in specified units).

2. Specific Principles and Guidelines for Preparation and Issue of Phytosanitary Certificates

Phytosanitary certificates and phytosanitary certificates for re-export should include only information related to phytosanitary matters. They should not include statements that requirements have been met and should not include references to animal or human health matters, pesticide residues or radioactivity, or commercial information such as letters of credit.

To facilitate cross-referencing between the phytosanitary certificates and documents not related to phytosanitary certification (e.g. letters of credit, bills of lading, CITES certificates), a note may be attached to the phytosanitary certificate which associates the phytosanitary certificate with the identification code, symbol or number(s) of the relevant document(s) which require cross-referencing. Such a note should only be attached when necessary and should not be considered an official part of the phytosanitary certificate.

All components of the phytosanitary certificates and phytosanitary certificates for re-export should normally be completed. Where no entry is made, the term "None" should be entered or the line should be blocked out (to prevent falsification).

2.1 Requirements for completing the phytosanitary certificate (Headings in bold refer to the components of the model certificate)

The specific components of the phytosanitary certificate are explained as follows:

No. _____

This is the certificate identification number. It should be a unique serial number associated with an identification system that allows "trace-back", facilitates audits and serves for record keeping.

Plant Protection Organization of _____

This component requires the name of the official organization and the name of the country that is issuing the certificate. The name of the NPPO may be added here if it is not part of the printed form.

TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of _____

The name of the importing country should be inserted here. In cases where the shipment transits through a country which has specific transit requirements, including the need for phytosanitary certificates, the names of both importing country and country of transit may be inserted. Care should be taken to ensure that the import and/or transit regulations of each country are met and appropriately indicated. In cases where the shipment is imported and re-exported to another country, the names of both importing countries may be inserted, provided the import regulations of both countries have been met.

Section I. Description of Consignment

Name and address of exporter: _____

This information identifies the source of the consignment to facilitate "trace back" and audit by the exporting NPPO. The name and address should be located in the exporting country. The name and

address of a local exporter's agent or shipper should be used, where an international company with a foreign address is the exporter.

Declared name and address of consignee: _____

The name and address should be inserted here and should be in sufficient detail to enable the importing NPPO to confirm the identity of the consignee. The importing country may require that the address be a location in the importing country.

Number and description of packages: _____

Sufficient detail should be included in this section to enable the NPPO of the importing country to identify the consignment and its component parts, and verify their size if necessary. Container numbers and/or railcar numbers are a valid addition to the description of the packages and may be included here, if known.

Distinguishing marks: _____

Distinguishing marks may be indicated at this point on the phytosanitary certificate, or else on a stamped and signed attachment to the certificate. Distinguishing marks on bags, cartons or other containers should be included only where they assist in identifying the consignment. Where no entry is made, the term "None" should be entered or the line should be blocked out (to prevent falsification).

Place of origin: _____

This refers to place(s) from which a consignment gains its phytosanitary status, i.e. where it was possibly exposed to possible infestation or contamination by pests. Normally, this will be the place where the commodity was grown. If a commodity is stored or moved, its phytosanitary status may change over a period of time as a result of its new location. In such cases the new location may be considered as the place of origin. In specific circumstances, a commodity may gain its phytosanitary status from more than one place. In these cases where pests from one or more place may be involved, NPPOs should decide which place or places of origin most accurately describe the situation which has given the commodity its phytosanitary status. In such cases, each place should be declared. It is noted that in exceptional cases, such as with mixed seed lots which have more than one country of origin it is necessary to indicate all possible origins.

Countries may require that "pest free area", "pest free place of production", or "pest free production site" be identified in sufficient detail in this section. In any case, at least the country of origin should be indicated.

Declared means of conveyance: _____

Terms such as "sea, air, road, rail, mail, and passenger" should be used. The ship's name and voyage number or the aircraft's flight number should be included if known.

Declared point of entry: _____

This should be the first point of arrival in the country of final destination, or if not known, the country name. The point of entry of the first country of importation should be listed where more than one country is listed in the "TO:" section. The point of entry for the country of final destination should be listed in cases where the consignment only transits through another country. If the country of transit is also listed in the "TO:" section, the points of entry into the transit country as well as the final destination country may be listed (e.g. point A via point B).

Name of produce and quantity declared: _____

The information provided here should be sufficiently descriptive of the commodity (which should include the commodity class, i.e. fruit, plants for planting, etc.) and the quantity expressed as accurately as possible to enable officials in the importing country to adequately verify the contents of the consignment. International codes may be used to facilitate identification (e.g. customs codes) and internationally recognized units and terms should be used where appropriate. Different phytosanitary requirements may apply to the different end uses (for example, consumption as compared to

propagation) or state of a product (e.g. fresh compared to dried); the intended end use or state of the product should be specified. Entries should not refer to trade names, sizes, or other commercial terms.

Botanical name of plants: _____

The information inserted here should identify plants and plant products using accepted scientific names, at least to genus level but preferably to species level.

It may not be feasible to provide a botanical description for certain regulated articles and products of complex composition such as stock feeds. In these cases, NPPOs should agree bilaterally on a suitable common name descriptor, or the words “Not applicable” or “N/A” may be entered.

Certifying statement

This is to certify that the plants, plant products or other regulated articles described herein have been inspected and/or tested according to appropriate official procedures and are considered to be free from the quarantine pests specified by the importing contracting party and to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party, including those for regulated non-quarantine pests.

They are deemed to be practically free from other pests. (Optional clause)

In instances where specific import requirements exist and/or quarantine pests are specified, the certificate is used to certify conformity with the regulations or requirements of the importing country.

In instances where import requirements are not specific and/or quarantine pests are not specified, the exporting country can certify for any pests believed by it to be of regulatory concern.

The exporting countries may include the optional clause on their phytosanitary certificates or not.

“... *appropriate official procedures* ...” refers to procedures carried out by the NPPO or persons authorized by the NPPO for purposes of phytosanitary certification. Such procedures should be in conformity with ISPMs where appropriate. Where ISPMs are not relevant or do not exist, the procedures may be specified by the NPPO of the importing country.

“... *considered to be free from quarantine pests* ...” refers to freedom from pests in numbers or quantities that can be detected by the application of phytosanitary procedures. It should not be interpreted to mean absolute freedom in all cases but rather that quarantine pests are not believed to be present based on the procedures used for their detection or elimination. It should be recognized that phytosanitary procedures have inherent uncertainty and variability, and involve some probability that pests will not be detected or eliminated. This uncertainty and probability should be taken into account in the specification of appropriate procedures.

“... *phytosanitary requirements* ...” are officially prescribed conditions to be met in order to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests. Phytosanitary requirements should be specified in advance by the NPPO of the importing country in legislation, regulations, or elsewhere (e.g. import permits and bilateral agreements and arrangements).

“... *importing contracting party* ...” refers to governments that have adhered to the IPPC including Members of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures until the amendments of 1997 come into force.

Section II. Additional Declaration

Additional declarations should be only those containing information required by the importing country and not otherwise noted on the certificate. Additional declarations should be kept to a minimum and be concise. The text of additional declarations may be specified in, for example, phytosanitary regulations, import permits or bilateral agreements. Treatment(s) should be indicated in Section III.

Section III. Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment

Treatments indicated should only be those which are acceptable to the importing country and are performed in the exporting country or in transit to meet the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country. These can include devitalization and seed treatments.

Stamp of organization

This is the official seal, stamp or mark identifying the issuing NPPO. It may be printed on the certificate or added by the issuing official upon completion of the form. Care should be taken to ensure that the mark does not obscure essential information.

Name of authorized officer, date and signature

The name of the issuing official is typed or hand-written in legible capital letters (where applicable). The date is also to be typed or hand-written in legible capital letters (where applicable). Only abbreviations may be used to identify months, so that the month, day and year are not confused.

Although portions of the certificate may be completed in advance, the date should correspond to the date of signature. Certificates should not be post- or pre-dated, or issued after dispatch of the consignment unless bilaterally agreed. The NPPO of the exporting country should be able to verify the authenticity of signatures of authorized officers upon request.

Financial liability statement

The inclusion of a financial liability statement in a phytosanitary certificate is optional.

2.2 Phytosanitary certificate for re-export

The components of the phytosanitary certificate for re-export are the same as for the phytosanitary certificate (see Section 2.1) except for the section covering certification. In this section, the NPPO indicates by inserting ticks in the appropriate boxes whether the certificate is accompanied by the original phytosanitary certificate or its certified copy, whether the consignment has been repacked or not, whether the containers are original or new, and whether an additional inspection has been done. ISPM No. 7 (*Export Certification Systems*) provides guidance on the need for additional inspection.

If the consignment is split up and the resulting consignments are exported separately, then phytosanitary certificates for re-export and certified copies of the original phytosanitary certificate will be required to accompany any such consignments.

2.2.1 Conditions for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for re-export

When a consignment is imported into a country, then exported to another, the NPPO should issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export (see model). The NPPO should only issue a certificate for the export of an imported consignment if the NPPO is confident that the importing country's regulations are met. Re-export certification may still be done if the consignment has been stored, split up, combined with other consignments or re-packaged, provided that it has not been exposed to infestation or contamination by pests. The original phytosanitary certificate or its certified copy should also accompany the consignment.

2.2.2 Conditions for issuing a phytosanitary certificate for an imported consignment

If the consignment has been exposed to infestation or contamination by pests, or has lost its integrity or identity, or has been processed to change its nature, the NPPO should issue a phytosanitary certificate and not the phytosanitary certificate for re-export. The country of origin should still be indicated on the phytosanitary certificate. The NPPO must be confident that the importing country's regulations are met.

If the consignment has been grown for a specific time (depending on the commodity concerned, but usually one growing season or more) the consignment can be considered to have changed its country of origin.

2.2.3 Transit

If a consignment is not imported, but is in transit through a country without being exposed to infestation or contamination by pests, the NPPO does not need to issue either a phytosanitary certificate or a phytosanitary certificate for re-export. If however, the consignment is exposed to infestation or contamination by pests, the NPPO should issue a phytosanitary certificate. If the consignment is split up, combined with other consignments or repackaged, the NPPO should issue a phytosanitary certificate for re-export.

Model Phytosanitary Certificate

No. _____
 Plant Protection Organization of _____
 TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of _____

I. Description of Consignment

Name and address of exporter: _____
 Declared name and address of consignee: _____
 Number and description of packages: _____
 Distinguishing marks: _____
 Place of origin: _____
 Declared means of conveyance: _____
 Declared point of entry: _____
 Name of produce and quantity declared: _____
 Botanical name of plants: _____

This is to certify that the plants, plant products or other regulated articles described herein have been inspected and/or tested according to appropriate official procedures and are considered to be free from the quarantine pests specified by the importing contracting party and to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party, including those for regulated non-quarantine pests.

They are deemed to be practically free from other pests.*

II. Additional Declaration**III. Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment**

Date _____ Treatment _____ Chemical (active ingredient) _____
 Duration and temperature _____
 Concentration _____
 Additional information _____

Place of issue _____

(Stamp of Organization) Name of authorized officer _____

Date _____ (Signature) _____

No financial liability with respect to this certificate shall attach to (name of Plant Protection Organization) or to any of its officers or representatives.*

* Optional clause

Model Phytosanitary Certificate for Re-Export

Plant Protection Organization of _____ (contracting party of re-export)
 TO: Plant Protection Organization(s) of _____ (contracting party(ies) of import)

No. _____

I. Description of Consignment

Name and address of exporter: _____
 Declared name and address of consignee: _____
 Number and description of packages: _____
 Distinguishing marks: _____
 Place of origin: _____
 Declared means of conveyance: _____
 Declared point of entry: _____
 Name of produce and quantity declared: _____
 Botanical name of plants: _____

This is to certify that the plants, plant products or other regulated articles described above _____ were imported into (contracting party of re-export) _____ from _____ (contracting party of origin) covered by Phytosanitary certificate No. _____, *original certified true copy of which is attached to this certificate; that they are packed repacked in original *new containers, that based on the original phytosanitary certificate and additional inspection , they are considered to conform with the current phytosanitary requirements of the importing contracting party, and that during storage in _____ (contracting party of re-export), the consignment has not been subjected to the risk of infestation or infection.

* Insert tick in appropriate boxes

II. Additional Declaration

III. Disinfestation and/or Disinfection Treatment

Date _____ Treatment _____ Chemical (active ingredient) _____
 Duration and temperature _____
 Concentration _____
 Additional information _____

Place of issue _____

(Stamp of Organization)

Name of authorized officer _____

Date _____ (Signature) _____

No financial liability with respect to this certificate shall attach to _____ (name of Plant Protection Organization) or to any of its officers or representatives.**

** Optional clause

**INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

**GUIDELINES FOR THE NOTIFICATION OF
NON-COMPLIANCE AND EMERGENCY ACTION**



**Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention
Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations
Rome, 2001**

CONTENTS**INTRODUCTION**

SCOPE	1
REFERENCES	1
DEFINITIONS, ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	1
OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS	4

REQUIREMENTS

1. Purpose of Notifications	5
2. The Use of Notification Information	5
3. Provisions of the IPPC Related to Notification	5
4. Basis for Notification	5
4.1 Significant instances of non-compliance	6
4.2 Emergency action	6
5. Timing of Notification	6
6. Information Included in a Notification	6
6.1 Required information	6
6.2 Supporting information	7
6.3 Forms, codes, abbreviations, or acronyms	7
6.4 Language	7
7. Documentation and Means of Communication	7
8. Pest Identification	7
9. Investigation of Non-compliance and Emergency Action	8
9.1 Non-compliance	8
9.2 Emergency action	8
10. Transit	8
11. Re-export	8

INTRODUCTION

SCOPE

This standard describes the actions to be taken by countries regarding the notification of:

- a significant instance of failure of an imported consignment to comply with specified phytosanitary requirements, including the detection of specified regulated pests
- a significant instance of failure of an imported consignment to comply with documentary requirements for phytosanitary certification
- an emergency action taken on the detection in an imported consignment of a regulated pest not listed as being associated with the commodity from the exporting country
- an emergency action taken on the detection in an imported consignment of organisms posing a potential phytosanitary threat.

REFERENCES

Determination of pest status in an area, 1998. ISPM Pub. No. 8, FAO, Rome.

Export certification systems, 1997. ISPM Pub. No. 7, FAO, Rome.

Glossary of phytosanitary terms, 1999. ISPM Pub. No. 5, FAO, Rome.

Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates (ISPM in draft).

New Revised Text of the International Plant Protection Convention, 1997. FAO, Rome.

DEFINITIONS, ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Area	An officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries
Certificate	An official document which attests to the phytosanitary status of any consignment affected by phytosanitary regulations
Commodity class	A category of similar commodities that can be considered together in phytosanitary regulations
Consignment	A quantity of plants, plant products and/or other articles being moved from one country to another and covered, when required, by a single phytosanitary certificate (a consignment may be composed of one or more commodities or lots)
Consignment in transit	Consignment which passes through a country without being imported, and without being exposed in that country to contamination or infestation by pests. The consignment may not be split up, combined with other consignments or have its packaging changed
Detention	Keeping a consignment in official custody or confinement for phytosanitary reasons
Emergency action	A prompt phytosanitary action undertaken in a new or unexpected phytosanitary situation
Introduction	The entry of a pest resulting in its establishment

IPPC	The International Plant Protection Convention, as deposited in 1951 with FAO in Rome and as subsequently amended
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
Official	Established, authorized or performed by a National Plant Protection Organization
Pest	Any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products
Pest status (in an area)	Presence or absence, at the present time, of a pest in an area, including where appropriate its distribution, as officially determined using expert judgement on the basis of current and historical pest records and other information
Phytosanitary action	An official operation, such as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment, undertaken to implement phytosanitary regulations or procedures
Phytosanitary certificate	Certificate patterned after the model certificates of the IPPC
Phytosanitary measure	Any legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests
Phytosanitary regulation	Official rule to prevent the introduction and/or spread of quarantine pests, or to limit the economic impact of regulated non-quarantine pests, including establishment of procedures for phytosanitary certification
Regulated pest	A quarantine pest or a regulated non-quarantine pest
RPPO	Regional Plant Protection Organization
Spread	Expansion of the geographical distribution of a pest within an area
Treatment	Officially authorized procedure for the killing, removal or rendering infertile of pests

OUTLINE OF REQUIREMENTS

The New Revised Text of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) makes provision for contracting parties to report significant instances of non-compliance of imported consignments with phytosanitary requirements, including those related to documentation or to report appropriate emergency action, which is taken on the detection in the imported consignment of an organism posing a potential phytosanitary threat. The importing contracting party is required to notify the exporting contracting party as soon as possible regarding significant instances of non-compliance and emergency actions applied to imported consignments. The notification should identify the nature of non-compliance in such a way that the exporting contracting party may investigate and make the necessary corrections. Importing contracting parties may request a report of the results of such investigations.

Required information for notification includes the reference number, the date of notification, the identity of the NPPOs of the importing and exporting countries, the identity of the consignment and date of first action, the reasons for the action taken, information regarding the nature of non-compliance or emergency action, and the phytosanitary measures applied. Notification should be timely and follow a consistent format.

An importing country should investigate any new or unexpected phytosanitary situation where emergency action is taken in order to determine if actions are justified and if changes in phytosanitary requirements are needed. Exporting countries should investigate significant instances of non-compliance to determine the possible cause. Notifications for significant instances of non-compliance or emergency action associated with re-export are directed to the re-export country. Those associated with transit consignments are directed to the exporting country.

REQUIREMENTS

1. Purpose of Notifications

Notifications are provided by the importing country to the exporting country to identify significant failures of imported consignments to comply with specified phytosanitary requirements or to report emergency action that is taken on the detection of a pest posing a potential threat. The use of notification for other purposes is voluntary, but in all instances should only be undertaken with the aim of international cooperation to prevent the introduction and/or spread of regulated pests (IPPC Articles I and VIII). In the case of non-compliance the notification is intended to help in investigating the cause of the non-compliance, and to facilitate steps to avoid recurrence.

2. The Use of Notification Information

Notification is normally bilateral. Notifications and information used for notification are valuable for official purposes but may also be easily misunderstood or misused if taken out of context or used imprudently. To minimize the potential for misunderstandings or abuse, countries should be careful to ensure that notifications and information about notifications are distributed in the first instance only to the exporting country. In particular, the importing country may consult with the exporting country and provide the opportunity for the exporting country to investigate instances of apparent non-compliance, and correct as necessary. This should be done before changes in the phytosanitary status of a commodity or area, or other failures of phytosanitary systems in the exporting country are confirmed or reported more widely (see also good reporting practices for interceptions in ISPM No. 8, *Determination of pest status in an area*).

3. Provisions of the IPPC Related to Notification

The establishment of systems for the routine practice of notification is based on several provisions of the IPPC, summarized as follows:

- Art VII.2f states importing contracting parties shall, as soon as possible, inform the exporting contracting party concerned or, where appropriate, the re-exporting contracting party concerned, of significant instances of non-compliance with phytosanitary certification. The exporting contracting party or, where appropriate, the re-exporting contracting party concerned, should investigate and, on request, report the result of its investigation to the importing contracting party concerned.
- Art VII.6 states contracting parties may take appropriate emergency action on the detection of a pest posing a potential threat to its territories or the report of such a detection. Any such action shall be evaluated as soon as possible to ensure that its continuance is justified. The action taken shall be immediately reported to contracting parties concerned, the Secretary, and any regional plant protection organization of which the contracting party is a member.
- Art VIII.1 states that contracting parties shall cooperate in achieving the aims of the Convention.
- Art VIII.2 states that contracting parties shall designate a contact point for the exchange of information.

Countries that are not contracting parties to the IPPC are encouraged to use notification systems described in this standard (IPPC Article XVIII).

4. Basis for Notification

In most instances, notification is provided as the result of the detection of regulated pests in imported consignments. There are also other significant instances of non-compliance that require phytosanitary action and notification. In new or unexpected phytosanitary situations, emergency actions may be taken which should also be notified to the exporting country.

4.1 Significant instances of non-compliance

Countries may agree bilaterally on what instances of non-compliance are considered significant for notification purposes. In the absence of such agreements, the importing country may consider the following to be significant:

- failure to comply with phytosanitary requirements
- detection of regulated pests
- failure to comply with documentary requirements, including:
 - absence of phytosanitary certificates
 - uncertified alterations or erasures to phytosanitary certificates
 - serious deficiencies in information on phytosanitary certificates
 - fraudulent phytosanitary certificates
- prohibited consignments
- prohibited articles in consignments (e.g. soil)
- evidence of failure of specified treatments
- repeated instances of prohibited articles in small, non-commercial quantities carried by passengers or sent by mail.

Significant instances of non-compliance of an imported consignment with phytosanitary requirements should be notified to the exporting country whether or not the consignment requires a phytosanitary certificate.

4.2 Emergency action

Emergency actions are taken on the detection in an imported consignment of:

- regulated pests not listed as being associated with the commodity from the exporting country
- organisms posing a potential phytosanitary threat.

5. Timing of Notification

Notifications should be provided promptly once non-compliance or the need for emergency action has been confirmed and phytosanitary actions taken. Where there is a significant delay in confirming the reason for the notification (e.g. identification of an organism), a preliminary notification may be provided.

6. Information Included in a Notification

Notifications should use a consistent format and include certain minimum information. NPPOs are encouraged to provide additional information where such information is considered relevant and important or has been specifically requested by the exporting country.

6.1 Required information

Notifications should include the following information:

- *Reference number* - the reporting country should have a means of tracing the communication sent to an exporting country. This could be a unique reference number or the number of the phytosanitary certificate associated with the consignment
- *Date* - the date on which notification is sent should be noted
- *Identity of the NPPO* of the importing country
- *Identity of the NPPO* of the exporting country
- *Identity of consignment* - consignments should be identified by the phytosanitary certificate number if appropriate or by references to other documentation and including commodity class and scientific name (at least plant genus) for plants or plant products

- *Identity of consignee and consignor*
- *Date of first action* on the consignment
- *Specific information regarding the nature of the non-compliance and emergency action* including:
 - identity of pest (see also section 8 below)
 - where appropriate, whether part or all of the consignment is affected
 - problems with documentation
 - phytosanitary requirements to which the non-compliance applies
- *Phytosanitary actions taken* - the phytosanitary actions should be specifically described and the parts of the consignment affected by the actions identified
- *Authentication marks* - the notifying authority should have a means for authenticating valid notifications (e.g. stamp, seal, letterhead, authorized signature).

6.2 Supporting information

Upon request, supporting information should be made available to the exporting country and may include as appropriate:

- copy of the phytosanitary certificate or other relevant documents
- diagnostic results
- pest association, i.e. in which part of the consignment the pest was found or how it affects the consignment
- other information deemed to be useful for the exporting country to be able to identify and correct non-compliance.

6.3 Forms, codes, abbreviations or acronyms

Where forms, codes, abbreviations or acronyms are used in notification or supporting information, countries should make appropriate explanatory material available on request.

6.4 Language

The language(s) used for notification and supporting information will be the language(s) preferred by the notifying country except where bilaterally agreed otherwise. Where information is requested through contact points, information should be supplied in one of the FAO languages (IPPC Article XIX.3e).

7. Documentation and Means of Communication

The notifying country should keep notification documents, supporting information and associated records for at least one year after the date of notification. Electronic notifications should be used for efficiency and expediency whenever possible.

Notification should be sent to the IPPC contact point or, where a contact point has not been identified, to the NPPO of the exporting country unless bilateral arrangements exist which specify to whom the notification should be sent. Communication from official contact points is considered to be authentic unless the NPPO of the importing country indicates other official sources.

8. Pest Identification

The identification of organisms detected in imported consignments is required to determine if they are, or should be, regulated pests and to thereby justify phytosanitary or emergency action. Appropriate identification may not be possible where:

- the specimen(s) are of a life stage or condition that makes them difficult to identify
- appropriate taxonomic expertise is not available.

Where identifications are not possible the reason should be stated on the notification.

When identifying pests, importing countries should:

- be able to describe, on request, the procedures used for diagnosis and sampling, including the identity of the diagnostician and/or laboratory, and should retain, for an appropriate period (one year following the notification or until necessary investigation has been carried out), evidence such as appropriate specimens or material to allow validation of potentially controversial determinations
- indicate the life-stage of the pest and its viability where appropriate
- provide identification to species level where possible or to a taxonomic level that justifies the official actions taken.

9. Investigation of Non-compliance and Emergency Action

9.1 Non-compliance

The exporting country should investigate significant instances of non-compliance to determine the possible cause with a view to avoid recurrence. Upon request, the results of the investigation should be reported to the importing country. Where the results of the investigation indicate a change of pest status, this information should be communicated according to the good practices noted in ISPM No. 8, *Determination of pest status in an area*.

9.2 Emergency action

The importing country should investigate the new or unexpected phytosanitary situation to justify the emergency actions taken. Any such action should be evaluated as soon as possible to ensure that its continuance is technically justified. If continuance of actions is justified, phytosanitary measures of the importing country should be adjusted, published and transmitted to the exporting country.

10. Transit

For a consignment in transit, any instance of non-compliance with the requirements of the transit country or any emergency action taken should be notified to the exporting country. Where the transit country has reason to believe that the non-compliance or new or unexpected phytosanitary situation may be a problem for the country of final destination, the transit country may provide a notification to the country of final destination. The country of final destination may copy its notifications to any transit country involved.

11. Re-export

In cases associated with a phytosanitary certificate for re-export, the obligation and other provisions pertaining to the exporting country apply to the re-exporting country.

GLOSSARY OF PHYTOSANITARY TERMS

Supplement No. 1

Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concept of official control for regulated pests

1. Purpose

The words *officially controlled* express an essential concept in the definition of a quarantine pest. *The Glossary of phytosanitary terms* defines official as "established, authorized or performed by an NPPO" and control as "suppression, containment or eradication of a pest population". However, for phytosanitary purposes, the concept of *official control* is not adequately expressed by the combination of these two definitions. The purpose of this guideline is to describe more precisely the interpretation of the concept of official control and its application in practice.

2. Scope

This guideline refers only to the official control of regulated pests. For the purposes of this guideline, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.

3. Definition

Official control is defined as:

The active enforcement of mandatory phytosanitary regulations and the application of mandatory phytosanitary procedures with the objective of eradication or containment of quarantine pests or for the management of regulated non-quarantine pests.

4. General Requirements

Official control is subject to the "principles of plant quarantine as related to international analysis.

In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where define the infested area(s), endangered area(s) and protected area(s).

Official control includes:

- eradication and/or containment in the infested area(s)
- surveillance in the endangered area(s)
- measures related to controls on movement into and within the protected area(s) including measures applied at import.

All official control programmes have elements that are mandatory. At minimum, programme evaluation and pest surveillance are required in official control programmes to determine the

need for and effect of control to justify measures applied at import for the same purpose. Measures applied at import should be consistent with the principle of non-discrimination (see section 5.1 below).

For quarantine pests, eradication and containment may have an element of suppression. For regulated non-quarantine pests, suppression may be used to avoid unacceptable economic impact as it applies to the intended use of plants for planting.

5. Specific Requirements

5.1 Non-discrimination

The principle of non-discrimination between domestic and import requirements is fundamental. In particular, requirements for imports should not be more stringent than the effect of official control in an importing country. There should therefore be consistency between import and domestic requirements for a defined pest:

import requirements should not be more stringent than domestic requirements
domestic and import requirements should be the same or have an equivalent effect
mandatory elements of domestic and import requirements should be the same
the intensity of inspection of imported consignments should be the same as equivalent processes in domestic control programmes
in the case of non-compliance, the same or equivalent actions should be taken on imported consignments as are taken domestically
if a tolerance is applied within a national programme, the same tolerance should be applied to equivalent imported material. In particular, if no action is taken in the national official control programme because the infestation level does not exceed a particular level, then no action should be taken for an imported consignment if its infestation level does not exceed that same level. Compliance with import tolerance is generally determined by inspection or testing at entry, whereas the tolerance for domestic consignments should be determined at the last point where official control is applied
if downgrading or reclassifying is permitted within a national official control programme, similar options should be available for imported consignments.

5.2 Transparency

The import and domestic requirements for official control should be documented and made available, on request.

5.3 Technical justification (risk analysis)

Domestic and import requirements should be technically justified and result in non-discriminatory risk management.

5.4 Enforcement

The domestic enforcement of official control programmes should be equivalent to the enforcement of import requirements. Enforcement should include:

a legal basis
operational implementation
evaluation and review
official action in case of non-compliance.

5.5 Mandatory nature of official control

Official control is mandatory in the sense that all persons involved are legally bound to perform the actions required. The scope of official control programmes for quarantine pests is completely mandatory (e.g. procedures for eradication campaigns), whereas the scope for regulated non-quarantine pests is mandatory only in certain circumstances (e.g. official certification programmes).

5.6 Area of application

An official control programme can be applied at national, sub-national or local area level. The area of application of official control measures should be specified. Any import restrictions should have the same effect as the measures applied internally for official control.

5.7 NPPO authority and involvement in official control

Official control should:

- be established or recognized by the national government or the NPPO under appropriate legislative authority
- be performed, managed, supervised or, at minimum, audited/reviewed by the NPPO
- have enforcement assured by the national government or the NPPO
- be modified, terminated or lose official recognition by the national government or the NPPO.

Responsibility and accountability for official control programmes rests with the national government. Agencies other than the NPPO may be responsible for aspects of official control programmes, and certain aspects of official control programmes may be the responsibility of sub-national authorities or the private sector. The NPPO should be fully aware of all aspects of official control programmes in their country.

References:

Report of the ICPM open-ended working group on official control, 22-24 March 2000, Bordeaux, France, IPPC Secretariat, FAO, Rome.

Report of the Working Group on the Formation of a Standards Committee

1. At its Second Session in October 1999, the ICPM agreed on general considerations for standard setting and adopted new standard-setting procedures to be annexed to the Rules of Procedure that were provisionally adopted by the ICPM at its First Session in November 1998. However, the standard-setting procedures, and hence the finalization of the Rules of Procedure for the ICPM, could not be completed at the Second Session of the ICPM because the structure and membership of the Standards Committee were not agreed. The ICPM established an Informal Working Group to consider all options for the establishment of a Standards Committee and make recommendations to the ICPM, taking account of matters including:

- size of the Committee;
- representation of the membership of the Interim Commission;
- nomination and acceptance procedures for Committee members;
- required expertise;
- duration of membership;
- terms of reference;
- rules of procedure;
- observer status; and
- working languages.

2. The Informal Working Group met 11-14 April 2000 at FAO Headquarters in Rome. Representatives of the governments of Australia, Germany, Japan, Kenya, New Zealand, Thailand, the United States, and Uruguay were in attendance. Discussions followed the outline of charges given to the group by the ICPM. Recommendations of the meeting are set out in paragraphs 3-9 below.

3. The Informal Working Group considered a range of different models for the structure of the Standards Committee. These included models with:

- the inclusion of RPPOs in different ways; and
- the establishment of a selection committee to determine the membership of the Standards Committee and other committees as required by the ICPM. This point is reflected in the functions of the Standards Committee as proposed by the Informal Working Group.

4. The Informal Working Group recommends the establishment of a large Standards Committee composed of twenty-one government-designated experts. The purpose of this design is to provide wide global representation without creating a financial drain on the resources available to the ICPM for its work programme. As government-designated experts, resources required for Standards Committee members to participate in the Committee are normally provided by the Standards Committee member's government. This has financial consequences for Members. The ICPM may wish to suggest that financial assistance for travel and subsistence may be made available to representatives from developing countries to the extent that such funding is available.

5. The Informal Working Group recommends the establishment of a group of seven experts from within the Standards Committee to form a Working Group which would undertake the detailed technical examinations of the draft specifications and ISPMs. The Working Group members are nominated by the Standards Committee and subsequently appointed by the Director-General of FAO. Funding for travel and subsistence required for the Working Group would be funded by FAO. However, individual members of the Working Group are encouraged to waive ICPM funding as described in the financial considerations for standard-setting recommended by the ICPM at its Second Session.

6. The Informal Working Group recommends that the ICPM undertake periodic biennial review of the Standards Committee and its procedures, taking into account experience and changing conditions.

7. The Informal Working Group notes that RPPOs may apply for observer status as in Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure for the ICPM. The role of RPPOs should be included in periodic biannual reviews.
8. The Informal Working Group notes that governments should provide the time, resources, and support necessary for Standards Committee members to adequately fulfil their roles.
9. The Informal Working Group recommends the ICPM establish the Standards Committee proposed by the meeting and adopt the Terms of Reference (Appendix IX) and Rules of Procedure (Appendix X) proposed by the meeting.

Terms of Reference for the Standards Committee

1. Establishment of the Standards Committee

The Standards Committee (SC) has been established by the Third Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures.

2. Scope of the Standards Committee

The Standards Committee manages the standard-setting process and assists in the development of International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) which have been identified by the ICPM as priority standards.

3. Objective

The main objective of the Standards Committee is to prepare draft ISPMs according to the standard-setting procedures in the most expeditious manner for adoption by the ICPM.

4. Structure of the Standards Committee

The Standards Committee consists of 20 members, including three members drawn from each the FAO Regions, and two from North America. The distribution for each region will be:

- Africa (3)
- Asia (3)
- Europe (3)
- Latin America and the Caribbean (3)
- Near East (3)
- North America (2)
- Southwest Pacific(3)

An expert group of seven members, the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) is selected by the Standards Committee from its membership.

The functions of the SC-7 are determined by the Standards Committee and include the review and revision of specifications, working group drafts and drafts from the consultation process. Temporary or permanent working groups and drafting groups may be established by the Standards Committee as required to assist the SC-7.

5. Functions of the Standards Committee

The Standards Committee serves as a forum for:

- approval of draft specifications or amendment of specifications;
- finalization of specifications;
- designation of the members of the SC-7 and identify tasks of the group;
- designation of membership of working groups and drafting groups as required;
- review of draft ISPMs;
- approval of draft standards to be submitted to ICPM Members for consultation;
- establishment of open-ended discussion groups where appropriate;
- revision of draft ISPMs in cooperation with the Secretariat taking into account comments of ICPM Members and RPPOs;
- approval of final drafts of ISPMs for submission to the ICPM;
- review of existing ISPMs and those requiring reconsideration;
- assigning stewardship for each ISPM¹⁷; and
- other functions related to standard setting as directed by the ICPM.

6. IPPC Secretariat

The Secretariat provides administrative, technical and editorial support as required by the Standards Committee. The Secretariat is responsible for reporting and record keeping regarding the standard-setting program.

¹⁷ The assigning of stewardship involves designating an individual to be responsible for managing the development of a particular standard from its inception to its completion according to the specifications for the standard and any additional directions provided by the SC and IPPC Secretariat.

Rules of Procedure for the Standards Committee

Rule 1. Membership

Members should be senior officials designated by governments and have qualifications in a scientific biological discipline (or equivalent) in plant protection, and experience and skills particularly in the:

- practical operation of a national or international phytosanitary system;
- administration of a national or international phytosanitary system; and
- application of phytosanitary measures related to international trade.

Each FAO Region may devise its own procedures for selecting its three members of the Standards Committee. The Secretariat is notified of the selections that are submitted to the ICPM for confirmation.

The Standards Committee is responsible for selecting the SC-7 members from within its membership for confirmation by FAO. Members selected for the SC-7 will meet the above-mentioned qualifications and experience .

Rule 2. Period of Membership

Members of the Standards Committee shall serve for two years, with a maximum of six years. Only seven members are replaced every 2 years to ensure continuity.

Membership of SC-7 lapses with membership of the Standards Committee or upon resignation. Replacements to the Standards Committee are decided by the FAO Region concerned. Replacements to the SC-7 are selected by the Standards Committee.

Rule 3. Chair

The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the Standards Committee are elected by the Standards Committee and serve for two years, with a possibility of re-election for an additional term of two years.

The Chair of the SC-7 is elected by members of the SC-7. The term is for 2 years with the possibility of re-election.

Rule 4. Sessions

Meetings of the Standards Committee are normally held at FAO-Headquarters in Rome.

The Standards Committee meets at least twice per year primarily to facilitate the approval procedures within the standard setting process. One of these meetings may be held in conjunction with the ICPM meeting.

Regular sessions:

Unless otherwise decided by the ICPM, meetings that are not held in conjunction with the ICPM meeting shall be held in the first week of October. The Standards Committee may authorize the SC-7 or special-purpose groups to meet more frequently than the Standards Committee within the limits of available resources.

Extraordinary sessions:

The Standards Committee, in consultation with the Bureau of the ICPM may call an extraordinary session of the Standards Committee within the limits of available resources.

A majority of the Standards Committee shall constitute a quorum.

Rule 5. Approval

Approvals relating to specifications or draft standards are sought by consensus. Final drafts of ISPMs which have been approved by the Standards Committee are submitted to the ICPM without undue delay.

Rule 6. Observers

For observer status, Rule 7 of the Rules of Procedure of the ICPM will apply.

Rule 7. Reports

Standards Committee meeting records shall be kept by the Secretariat. The report of the meetings shall include:

- approval of draft specifications for ISPMs;
- finalization of specifications with a detailed explanation including reasons for changes; and
- reasons why a draft standard has not been approved.

The Secretariat shall provide to ICPM Members the rationale of the Standards Committee for accepting or not accepting proposals for modifications to specifications or draft standards.

Reports shall be adopted by the Standards Committee before they are made available to Members of the ICPM and RPPOs.

Rule 8. Language

The business of the Standards Committee shall be conducted in the English language.

Rule 9. Amendments

Amendments to the Rules of Procedures and the Terms of Reference may be promulgated by the ICPM as required.

Dispute Settlement Procedures

A. INTRODUCTION

1. At its Second Session in October 1999, the ICPM adopted general considerations and dispute settlement procedures proposed by the Informal Working Group on Dispute Settlement Procedures to fulfil one of the functions charged to the ICPM in its Terms of Reference (ICPM INF-2). The ICPM also agreed that the Informal Working Group would undertake to further elaborate certain aspects associated with the procedures as follows:

- a) undertake to develop rules and procedures for the approval of Expert Committee reports by the ICPM or its subsidiary body;
- b) analyse the need for the establishment of a subsidiary body on dispute settlement and make recommendations on structure, functions, and membership;
- c) undertake to develop rules and procedures for the establishment of expert rosters and the selection process;
- d) develop standard formats for dispute settlement reports;
- e) examine the possible roles and functions of regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) in IPPC dispute settlement procedures;
- f) develop standard terms of reference that may be used by the Expert Committee;
- g) develop rules concerning the attendance of observers in Expert Committee procedures;
- h) explore the possibilities for enhancing developing countries' ability to participate effectively in dispute settlement procedures;
- i) consider guidelines concerning the sharing of expenses associated with dispute settlement;
- j) address any other matters referred to it by the ICPM regarding dispute settlement.

2. The Informal Working Group met 9-12 May 2000 at FAO Headquarters in Rome. Representatives of the governments of Brazil, Finland, New Zealand, Portugal, and the United States were in attendance. Documents provided by the Chairperson (Finland) and the United States served as references. Discussions followed the outline of charges given to the group by the ICPM. Proposals from the meeting were subsequently reviewed, modified for correctness, and approved by the FAO Legal Office for submission to the ICPM as presented below.

B. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

3. In considering the need for a subsidiary body of the ICPM devoted specifically to oversight, administration, and support of IPPC dispute settlement procedures, the Informal Working Group considered several factors. In particular, it noted that a subsidiary body would provide needed support to the role of the ICPM with regard to dispute settlement in the WTO and other organizations while generally strengthening and specializing the dispute settlement function of the IPPC. It would promote a high level of consistency and professionalism in procedures and reports, including all points in Expert Committee procedures (point 4 of the existing dispute settlement procedure). In addition, it is envisioned that a subsidiary body would reduce workload pressures on the Secretariat.

4. In considering the nature of a subsidiary body, the Informal Working Group suggests that the group should not be large, as it should be cost-effective and be able to respond quickly when necessary. It was considered that expertise and a balance of perspectives were essential elements. In particular, it was agreed that the group should be composed of individuals with the qualifications and commitment to assist in guiding a global phytosanitary dispute settlement system that considers the needs and perspectives of both developing and developed countries.

5. In considering options for the composition and structure of a subsidiary body, the Informal Working Group noted a number of possibilities including the option of using only the ICPM and

Secretariat as is currently the practice. This was considered to be inadequate to meet future needs of Members if the IPPC dispute settlement procedures were to be made attractive as an option for dispute settlement. In particular it was considered difficult and awkward to manage many aspects of the dispute settlement procedures based on annual meetings of all Members. In addition, it was anticipated that direct support to the Secretariat would be minimal in such a scenario.

6. As an option it was considered that the Bureau of the ICPM could be used as the subsidiary body for dispute settlement. This was deemed more appropriate but was found to have the disadvantage of uncertainty regarding the level of interest and expertise that may be found in the Bureau and the membership would lack continuity beyond two years. Likewise, the idea of ad hoc working groups formed at ICPM meetings had limited appeal as this approach also did not encourage continuity or account for expertise.

7. The most viable options considered by the Informal Working Group were to either form a subgroup selected from the membership of the Standards Committee (proposed seven members) or establish a subsidiary body of the similar size directly from the membership of the ICPM. (see recommendations below).

C. FUNCTIONS OF A SUBSIDIARY BODY ON DISPUTE SETTLEMENT

8. It is proposed that a subsidiary body on dispute settlement assume the following functions:
- a) provide guidance to the Secretariat and disputing parties in selecting appropriate dispute resolution methods and may assist in conducting or administering consultation, good offices, mediation, or arbitration;
 - b) propose nominations for independent experts in IPPC Expert Committee procedures where the disputing parties cannot agree on experts proposed by the Secretariat;
 - c) approve reports of Expert Committees including verification of all points in Expert Committee procedures (point 4 of the adopted procedure); and
 - d) undertake other functions as directed by the ICPM, which may include:
 - i) assist the Secretariat with requests from WTO or other organizations;
 - ii) report on IPPC dispute settlement activities as well as dispute settlement activities undertaken or completed by other organizations that have implications for the phytosanitary community;
 - iii) assist in identifying appropriate experts;
 - iv) assist in review and maintenance of expert rosters; and
 - v) identify appropriate training opportunities.

D. STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP OF A SUBSIDIARY BODY

9. Options for the composition of a subsidiary body. The size and composition of the subsidiary body may be determined based on:

- a) geographical representation (e.g. one delegate from each FAO region) (quorum of 4; at least three members from developing countries); and
- b) developed and developing country representation (e.g. 2 or 3 OECD + 2 or 3 G77).

The Informal Working Group suggests that, while it is desirable for the subsidiary body to consist of seven or fewer experts, and its composition be based on either geographical representation or developed/developing country status, it is considered essential that members have an interest and experience in dispute resolution. (See recommendations below)

10. Qualifications of subsidiary body members. Experts should have:
- a) experience in phytosanitary systems;
 - b) familiarity with the IPPC and standards;

- c) experience with regulations/legislation; and
- d) preferably some form of dispute settlement or conflict resolution knowledge, qualifications and/or experience.

Governments should recognize the time, resources, and support necessary for subsidiary body members to adequately fulfil their roles before nominating them.

11. Selection of Chairperson. The subsidiary body elects its Chairperson from among its membership.
12. Duration of membership. Members of the subsidiary body serve for a minimum of two years, and a maximum of six years.
13. Review. The need for a subsidiary body, and its functions and operation will be reviewed by the ICPM after three years, taking into account experience and changing conditions.

E. RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE SUBSIDIARY BODY

14. Except as indicated below, the rules of procedure of the ICPM will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the subsidiary body.
15. Meetings. The subsidiary body meets at least once per year, preferably at the occasion of the regular session of the ICPM. Other meetings shall be set by the Chairperson of the subsidiary body as needed, in particular, for the review and approval of Expert Committee reports and the development of reports for the ICPM. The subsidiary body will normally work by mail, facsimile and e-mail, and in the most cost-effective manner within the available resources.
16. Observers. Meetings of the subsidiary body are generally open according to Rule VII of the Rules of Procedure for the ICPM, but the subsidiary body may determine that certain meetings or business need to be conducted without observers, in particular where confidential or controversial information is involved.
17. Language. The working language of the subsidiary body will be English.
18. Decision-making. The subsidiary body strives for consensus on all decisions but may vote where necessary using a 2/3 majority to take decisions. Decisions shall include dissenting opinions where requested.
19. Amendments. Amendments to the functions and procedures of the subsidiary body will be promulgated by the ICPM as required.
20. Confidentiality . The subsidiary body shall exercise due respect for confidentiality where sensitive information is identified by disputing parties.

F. PROCEDURE FOR APPROVAL OF EXPERT COMMITTEE REPORTS

21. The procedure for approval of Expert Committee reports is as follows (see also Decision-making above):
 - a) an initial report, including dissenting views, if any, is prepared by the Expert Committee;
 - b) the Expert Committee may make the initial report available to the disputing governments for informal consultation;
 - c) the initial report is transmitted to the Secretariat and the FAO Legal Office in English;
 - d) comments from FAO are transmitted to the Expert Committee;
 - e) a 2nd draft report is prepared by the Expert Committee, if necessary, considering comments from FAO;

- f) the 2nd draft report is submitted to the subsidiary body for approval (verifying that the steps of the Expert Committee procedure and standard review and reporting format have been followed); and
- g) the final report as approved by the subsidiary body is submitted by Expert Committee to the Director-General of FAO for distribution to the disputing parties.

G. EXPERT ROSTERS

22. Establishment of rosters. The expert roster is established and maintained by the Secretariat. The roster is composed of phytosanitary experts and other individuals with expertise relevant to plant protection or the application of phytosanitary measures. Rosters are made available on request to official contact points.

23. Experts for the roster are nominated by ICPM Members through official contact points. The Secretariat may also seek or accept through official contact points other specialized expertise as necessary for additions to the roster. RPPOs or other organizations may provide advice in this regard.

24. Applications for inclusion on the roster are made by submission through contact points of a completed FAO Personal History Form (PHF) and/or Curriculum Vitae. Minimum information to be supplied includes:

- name, age and contact information;
- current position;
- nationality;
- language ability;
- period of availability;
- scientific and technical (including phytosanitary) background;
- professional experience; and
- knowledge, experience or qualifications with dispute settlement procedures.

25. The roster will be validated by the Secretariat every three years by requesting that the nominating organization or individual provide updated information. Experts may be removed from the roster based on a request by the expert or ICPM Members, or where information is not verified or updated when requested by the Secretariat.

H. SELECTION OF EXPERTS

26. Experts designated by the disputing parties. Each disputing party designates a representative for the Expert Committee. Where several parties are involved in a dispute, parties initiating or responding to the dispute consult to choose only one expert (ensuring that the Expert Committee consists of only two experts nominated by disputing parties and only five members total).

27. Selection of independent experts

- a) Criteria used by the IPPC Secretariat. In selecting independent experts to propose for an Expert Committee, the IPPC Secretariat considers the following factors:
 - i) scientific/technical background relevant to the dispute;
 - ii) independence (no financial or other personal interest in the outcome of the dispute); and
 - iii) ability to serve in his/her individual capacity as an expert.

The Secretariat should avoid nominating experts from the disputing parties, recognizing that at times it may be necessary to nominate experts from the disputing parties to obtain the most appropriate expertise.

- b) Selection procedure. The Secretariat and parties propose independent experts for selection by parties. Where parties cannot agree on experts, the subsidiary body may

nominate experts. Where the parties cannot agree on experts nominated by the subsidiary body, no expert committee can be formed.

I. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

28. Costs associated with specific dispute settlement procedures between parties. Parties determine the distribution of all costs when developing the Terms of Reference for the dispute. It is recommended that parties adopt a flexible attitude toward the provision of resources to facilitate the dispute settlement process, including the provision of assistance to developing countries to increase the possibilities for their use of IPPC dispute settlement procedures.

29. Costs associated with the experts include:

- i) administration and arrangements for expert meetings;
- ii) interpretation/translation where necessary;
- iii) travel and subsistence (includes fees and salaries for the three independent experts unless agreed otherwise).

J. RULES FOR OBSERVERS IN THE EXPERT COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

30. The disputing parties and the Chairman of the Expert Committee agree on observers to be included and the rules of conduct for observers in Expert Committee proceedings. Where there is no agreement on the number and type of observers, no observers are allowed. Where the presence of observers is agreed, but there is not agreement on the conduct of such observers, observers will only be allowed to attend but cannot participate.

K. ENHANCING PARTICIPATION OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

31. The ICPM and disputing parties are encouraged to consider the special needs of developing countries, in particular to identify technical assistance for dispute settlement. Dispute settlement procedures of the IPPC may involve:

- Secretariat assistance subject to available resources;
- developed countries voluntarily provide all or partial funding for dispute settlement with developing countries when the developed country has initiated the dispute; and
- training on dispute settlement procedures may be added to other training activities.

L. ROLE OF RPPO'S

32. RPPOs may have any role in dispute settlement that is agreed by disputing parties and the RPPO. It is recommended that RPPOs assuming such a role develop the capability to adequately administer such procedures.

33. In the case of IPPC Expert Committee procedures, RPPOs may:

- assist in obtaining nominations for expert rosters;
- assist with administrative support and provision of facilities or resources for dispute settlement among parties within their region;
- facilitate consultations for contracting parties within their region; and
- provide technical or other support on request of member governments.

M. GENERAL FORMAT FOR EXPERT COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

34. **If Parties do not agree on the Terms of Reference for the Expert Committee, no Expert Committee can be established.**

35. Principle Terms of Reference. The Expert Committee is required to:

- obtain a signed agreement between parties on the procedure;
- arrange for the presentation of information;

evaluate the information and formulate recommendations; and
prepare *IPPC Dispute Settlement Expert Committee Report*

36. Elements of these tasks:

- a) Obtain a signed agreement between parties which covers the following:
 - i) Identification of parties and issues
 - 1) identify party(ies) initiating the dispute settlement procedures;
 - 2) identify party responding to the dispute;
 - 3) identify Expert Committee and Chairperson;
 - 4) identify observers (according to Rule I);
 - 5) initiating party identifies and defines the issue(s) at dispute, specifying the points alleged to be in conflict with the interpretation or application of the IPPC or ISPMs; and
 - 6) Parties identify tasks of the expert committee – clarify expectation.
 - ii) Proceedings:
 - 1) means of presentation of information;
 - 2) language(s) to be used for documents and discussion (note: report must be in English);
 - 3) conduct of Observers;
 - 4) distribution of costs (subject to provisions of Section H);
 - 5) location and facilities;
 - 6) administrative support arrangements, including whether/how proceedings are recorded; and
 - 7) timetable, including submission of information, number of meetings, and presentation of report.
- b) Arrange for presentation of information.
The Expert Committee solicits the submission of information from disputing parties. Methods of presentation may include documents only, and/or verbal presentations as agreed in advance. The Expert Committee may seek additional information from the disputing parties or other sources, as it deems necessary and contingent upon explicit agreement of the disputing parties.
- c) Evaluate information and formulate recommendations:
 - i) review scientific and other information;
 - ii) assess relationship of the issue and information to the specified provisions of the IPPC and ISPMs; and
 - iii) formulate conclusions and recommendations as required.
- d) Prepare *IPPC Dispute Settlement Expert Committee Report*
The Expert Committee prepares the *IPPC Dispute Settlement Expert Committee Report* with the following elements:

Executive summary

Introduction

- identify disputing parties;
- statement of background and issue(s) at dispute;

Technical aspects of the dispute

- summary of positions of disputing parties;
- summary of Expert Committee analyses of scientific and technical aspects
- assessment of the relationship of the issue to the specified provisions of the IPPC and ISPMs
- conclusions of the Expert Committee

Dissenting views (if any)

Recommendations

- proposal(s) for resolution and options if appropriate

Attachments

- TOR
- identity of Expert Committee
- list of documents and source (if not confidential)
- other information deemed useful by the Expert Committee

N. FORMAT FOR IPPC SECRETARIAT REPORTS ON FORMAL CONSULTATIONS AND OTHER DISPUTE SETTLEMENTS THAT MEMBERS WISH TO HAVE RECORDED

37. Results of consultations: The Secretariat's report on the results of informal or formal consultations includes the following elements:

- statement of background and issue(s) under consultation;
- identity of consulting parties;
- summary of positions of consulting parties; and
- outcome.

38. Other disputes Members wish to have recorded: Reports of the Secretariat on other disputes Members wish to have recorded by the ICPM follow the format for the *IPPC Dispute Settlement Expert Committee Report* described above and is based on information supplied by Members in this format.

Report of the Joint Consultation on IPPC-CBD

1. A consultation to discuss potential collaboration between the CBD and IPPC was held 6-8 February 2001 in Bangkok, Thailand. A small group of government representatives with technical expertise in IPPC or CBD issues were invited by the Chairperson of the ICPM to participate. The meeting was conducted as a follow-up to recommendations made by the Exploratory open-ended working group on the phytosanitary aspects of GMOs, biosafety and invasive species conducted 13-16 June 2000 in Rome, Italy.
2. The meeting supported the earlier recommendations and further elaborated on specific mechanisms by which the CBD and IPPC could collaborate. The attached report of the meeting summarizes the main conclusions reached in the consultation.
3. The ICPM is invited to consider the report of this meeting in conjunction with recommendations made by the Exploratory open-ended working group on the phytosanitary aspects of GMOs, biosafety and invasive species (ICPM 01/07).

A. INTRODUCTION

4. The results of the ICPM Exploratory Open-ended Working Group on the Phytosanitary Aspects of GMOs, Biosafety and Invasive Species which met in Rome in June 2000 and discussions held at the Global Invasive Species Programme meeting in Cape Town in September 2000 led to the proposal that a programme of collaboration between the IPPC and CBD be initiated. The Chair of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM) invited experts familiar with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), in particular in relation to the implementation of Article 8(h) and experts familiar with the implementation of the IPPC to consider this proposal further.
5. The meeting noted that some LMOs have the potential to be invasive species. It also noted however that LMOs have been handled as a special issue in the CBD under the Cartagena Protocol and are often treated separately in national legislation. For this reason, the meeting focused on invasive alien species in relation to the implementation of Article 8(h) of the CBD without specifically considering LMOs.
6. The purpose of the meeting was to:
 - explore areas of potential collaboration between CBD and IPPC; and
 - provide proposals for the consideration of SBSTTA and / or the ICPM for collaboration projects.
7. The meeting noted that both the CBD and the IPPC have recognized the imperative for capacity building particularly in developing countries in the areas of phytosanitary protection and invasive alien species and noted the strong similarity in subjects covered by technical assistance being proposed by the Conventions.
8. The meeting noted that many organizations and agreements are undertaking work relating to alien species and that the work of these organizations could contribute to the implementation of Article 8(h).¹⁸ The meeting noted that cooperation between those organizations is desirable and the CBD could play a coordination role in achieving this cooperation.

B. SCOPE OF THE INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION

9. The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) regulates pests of plants and any organism, object or material capable of harbouring pests or spreading pests that affect plants and plant

¹⁸ Article 8(h) of the CBD states that Contracting Parties shall as far as possible and as appropriate: "prevent the introduction of, control or eradicate those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or species."

products with the purpose of preventing the spread and introduction of these pests and promoting measures for their control.

10. Its scope covers organisms that cause damage to plants, including indirect damage (e.g. flatworms that predate earthworms). It also covers biological control agents that control pests of plants. Pests are defined as any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products. This includes invasive plants (i.e. weeds). It was noted that the IPPC term “plants” includes organisms such as fungi.

11. The IPPC provides for a comprehensive system for plant protection and establishes international standards for phytosanitary measures¹⁹ that are recognized by the SPS Agreement. The standards address issues including the prevention, early detection, eradication and control of invasive alien species that are plant pests.

C. PROVISIONS OF THE IPPC AND INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES (ISPMs) RELEVANT TO THE CBD

12. The provisions and standards of the IPPC actively support the implementation of Article 8(h). The areas covered include:

- providing legal and regulatory frameworks;
- assessing and managing potential plant pest risks;
- applying measures to prevent unintentional introduction of plant pests;
- detecting, controlling, and eradicating plant pests in both areas under cultivation and wild flora;
- protecting areas that may be threatened by plant pests;
- assessing and managing the intentional introduction of organisms that may be pests of plants and biological control agents;
- certifying that risk management procedures have been applied for exports;
- exchanging of scientific and regulatory information relevant to plant pests;
- cooperating between countries to minimize the impact of plant pests; and
- building capacity and technical assistance for developing countries.

13. These activities are the responsibility of the National Plant Protection Organizations or equivalent bodies, which have been established in most countries. Regional Plant Protection Organizations serve as coordinating bodies.

D. CONSIDERATION OF ISPMs

14. The meeting considered the existing standards and the draft standard for *Pest risk analysis of quarantine pests* in the context of Article 8(h) of the CBD.

15. **ISPM 1 *Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade***: The meeting noted that the language of ISPM 1 is no longer consistent with the New Revised Text of the IPPC and that major revision is required. It recommended that the issue of including environmental concerns be addressed when the standard is revised. It was noted that the standard was programmed for review, but little priority was given to the revision of this standard.

16. **ISPM 2 *Guidelines for pest risk analysis*** and **DRAFT *Guidelines for pest risk analysis for quarantine pests***: The meeting noted that pest risk analysis²⁰ (PRA) is a particularly critical element in

¹⁹ Phytosanitary measure refers to “any legislation, regulation or official procedure having the purpose to prevent the introduction and/or spread of pests.”

²⁰ Pest risk analysis is “the process of evaluating biological or other scientific and economic evidence to determine whether a pest should be regulated and the strength of any phytosanitary measures to be taken against it.”

preventing the spread and introduction of plant pests. Addressing standards relating to PRA should be a priority for collaborative work.

17. It recommended that the IPPC seek input from the CBD as the IPPC further elaborates risk analysis standards that address environmental considerations.

18. **ISPM 3 Code of conduct for the import and release of exotic biological control agents:** The meeting recommended an amendment to include consideration of risk of spread of biological control organisms to other countries.

19. **ISPM 4 Guidelines for the establishment of pest free areas:** The meeting considered that the standard could be used for the establishment of pest free areas specifically for the protection of biodiversity.

20. **ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms:** The meeting recommended that the IPPC work with CBD to produce a common translation dictionary that would reduce potential misunderstandings for the IPPC and CBD constituencies arising from the use of differing terminology. The work would also consider the way key concepts are expressed and addressed in the core documentation of the two Conventions.

21. **ISPM 6 Guidelines for surveillance:** The meeting considered that the standard could be valuably used by countries in implementation of the CBD particularly in detection of new pest incursions, but recommended the development of supporting practical manuals.

22. **ISPM 7 Export certification system:** The meeting noted that the export certification process provides a mechanism to insure compliance with countries' importation requirements and those requirements can protect biodiversity. In addition, export certification could potentially be used for responding to Interim Guiding Principle 9a.

23. **ISPM 8 Guidelines for determination of pest status in an area:** The meeting considered the standard could be valuably used by countries in implementation of the CBD particularly in detection of new pest incursions.

24. **ISPM 9 Guidelines for pest eradication programmes:** The meeting considered that the standard could be valuably used by countries in implementation of the CBD particularly in eradication of new pest incursions. The meeting was informed that CBD may consider providing biodiversity specific advice to countries on eradication. The meeting recommended that ISPM 9 should be considered if this advice is developed.

25. **ISPM 10 Guidelines for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites:** The meeting considered that the standard was not applicable to the implementation of Article 8(h).

26. The meeting noted that there is a need for IPPC and CBD to identify any gaps in coverage or improvements needed in standards to ensure that environmental concerns, including threats to species, ecosystems and habitats, are taken into account.

E. AREAS FOR COLLABORATION

Participation

27. The meeting recommended that the Secretariats establish regular participation, as appropriate, of representatives of the two conventions at their various meetings. Representation should be appropriate to the type of meeting.

Information exchange

28. The meeting recommended that the Secretariats should ensure timely and free access to relevant and appropriate information between the Conventions in particular related to:
- meetings and processes;
 - development of technical advice, standards, databases and other support for Parties; and
 - capacity building efforts.

Standards and other guidance for implementation

29. The meeting noted that there is a need for IPPC and CBD to identify any gaps in coverage or improvements needed in standards to ensure that environmental concerns, including threats to species, ecosystems and habitats, are taken into account.

30. Guidance for implementation may include:
- where the IPPC develops standards of relevance to the implementation of Article 8(h), CBD experts should be engaged in an appropriate manner;
 - where the CBD is developing guidance to parties in the implementation of Article 8(h), IPPC experts should be engaged in an appropriate manner;
 - each organization, on request, will assist the other by clarifying, explaining and elaborating guidance for implementation; and
 - issues identified in the discussions on ISPMs (see previous section).

31. The meeting also recommended the development of a standard for procedures that would allow all intentional introduction of plants and plant related organisms to be assessed for their potential to be plant pests.

Development of terminology and concepts

32. The meeting recommended that key concepts used in core documents be identified and the relationship between the concepts used in the two Conventions explained. The meeting noted that “economic importance” in the IPPC is interpreted to include environmental considerations. This includes the ways in which pests may threaten ecosystems, habitats and species. It was recommended that a key task is for both the IPPC and CBD to clarify the following terms:

- economic importance;
- environmental impact; and
- how these terms relate to threats to ecosystems, habitats and species.

33. The meeting also noted that the IPPC covered both direct and indirect damage to plants, which is of relevance to the implementation of Article 8(h). It therefore recommended that the concept and definition of indirect damage be clarified.

Science and research

34. Where scientific concerns are of relevance to both organizations, the development of joint programmes could be considered.

Database relationships

35. Both organizations have a common interest in this area and it is recommended that they work together where possible. This should minimize duplication and maximize use of resources.

Capacity development

36. Both organizations facilitate capacity development for countries. Dialogue between the organizations should be aimed at minimizing the duplication of efforts and maximizing the use of resources.

Additional points

37. Based on the areas of cooperation identified, the meeting recognized that there are a number of areas for cooperative action. The meeting recommended that the Secretariats of both organizations together develop mechanisms for collaboration on the implementation of Article 8(h). This may include the development of a work programme and a specific Memorandum of Understanding.

Concluding remarks

38. The meeting noted the value of this first liaison meeting and recommended that future meetings be arranged on a regular basis to review and enhance the degree of collaboration. The meeting recommended that the liaison should be at an appropriate technical level. It was agreed that the Chair of the ICPM would liaise with the Chair of the SBSTTA to identify a mechanism to further this proposal. It was recommended that the two Secretariats should develop an appropriate mechanism for on going collaboration to develop this proposal.

**Statements of the ICPM Exploratory Open-ended Working Group on
Phytosanitary Aspects of GMOs²¹, Biosafety, and Invasive Species
13-16 June 2000 -- FAO, Rome**

A. PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND ACTIVITIES OF THE IPPC

1. The purpose of the Convention is “*to secure common and effective action to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products, and to promote appropriate measures for their control*” (Art 1.1). This is done with the desire to provide a framework for the development and application of harmonized phytosanitary measures and the elaboration of international standards, and taking into account internationally approved principles governing the protection of plant, human, and animal health, and the environment.
2. Plants are not limited to cultivated plants and protection is not limited to direct damage from pests. The IPPC definition of a pest is “*any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products*”. The coverage of the IPPC definition of plant pests includes weeds and other species that have indirect effects on plants. Therefore the scope of the Convention applies to the protection of wild flora resulting in an important contribution to the conservation of biological diversity.
3. The IPPC provides for rights and obligations supported by a system of standards and procedures for identifying pests that threaten plant health, assessing their risk, and determining the strength of measures to be used against their introduction and spread. Under the IPPC, most countries have established regulatory organizations experienced in assessing and managing the risk of pests that threaten plant health.
4. Although the IPPC clearly has applications to the spread of pests associated with international trade, the Convention is not limited in this respect. International cooperation in many forms falls within the scope of the Convention. The IPPC works collaboratively with other relevant organizations to avoid duplication and encourage harmonization for the implementation of obligations under other instruments.

B. ROLE OF THE IPPC REGARDING LMOs/PRODUCTS OF MODERN BIOTECHNOLOGY

The Working Group:

5. *Notes* that, consistent with the IPPC mandate to protect plant health, plant pest concerns that may be presented by LMOs/products of modern biotechnology fall within the scope of the IPPC.
6. *Notes* that IPPC risk analysis and management systems are appropriate for assessing and managing, if necessary, the direct or indirect risks of pests to cultivated and wild flora and plant products that may be presented by LMOs/products of modern biotechnology.
7. *Notes* that IPPC systems and procedures are relevant to, and adequate for, managing the risks posed by LMOs/products of modern biotechnology as they relate to the protection of plant health.
8. *Notes* that the existing national mechanisms and structures for phytosanitary systems may form a basis or a model for developing other practical approaches to managing risks associated with LMOs/products of modern biotechnology.

²¹ The working group considered that the term “LMOs/products of modern biotechnology” was more appropriate than GMOs. Living Modified Organism (LMO) is defined by the CBD in the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

C. NECESSITY OF DRAFTING INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES REGARDING LMOs/PRODUCTS OF MODERN BIOTECHNOLOGY

The Working Group:

9. Notes that plant pest risks associated with LMOs/products of modern biotechnology fall clearly within the scope of the IPPC.

10. *Recommends* that as a matter of urgency an IPPC expert working group in coordination with CBD experts, and other relevant expertise, is established to develop a detailed standard specification for consideration at the ICPM. The terms of reference will include:

- i) consideration of the existing international regulatory frameworks and guidelines;
- ii) the identification of areas within pest risk analysis (PRA) standards and other ISPMs that are relevant to the phytosanitary aspects of LMOs/products of modern biotechnology;
- iii) the identification of plant pest risks associated with LMOs/products of modern biotechnology that are not adequately addressed by existing ISPMs; and
- iv) the identification of elements relevant to the assessment of the plant pest risk associated with LMOs/products of modern biotechnology.

11. *Recommends* that the IPPC Secretariat cooperate with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Secretariat and ensure that appropriate information on the IPPC is provided to appropriate meetings on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the CBD.

12. *Recommends* that the Interim Standards Committee not re-open the September 1999 draft ISPM *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests* (under country consultation at the time of the working group meeting) to incorporate provisions for LMOs/products of modern biotechnology but consider adding a reference to the development of a supplementary standard.

D. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INVASIVE SPECIES AND QUARANTINE PESTS

The Working Group:

13. *Notes* that species that may be invasive and that directly or indirectly affect plants or plant products or that may be used as biological control agents should be assessed, monitored and managed if necessary according to IPPC provisions and standards.

14. *Notes* that those species that are identified under paragraph 15 and that are absent (not present) from an area (or if present, are limited in distribution and subject to official control) should be considered quarantine pests and should be subjected to measures according to IPPC provisions and standards.

E. ROLE OF THE IPPC REGARDING ALIEN INVASIVE SPECIES

The Working Group:

15. *Notes* that the IPPC provides for rights and obligations, and has established standards and procedures that are designed to prevent the introduction and spread of pests of plants and plant products, which include alien invasive species.

16. *Notes* that the implementation of IPPC including its provisions and standards is directly relevant to the national implementation of Art. 8(h) and other relevant articles and activities of the CBD and the further development of the CBD work programme on alien species. Furthermore it is directly relevant and overlaps with the apparent intention of the Interim Guiding Principles of the CBD.

17. *Notes* that many provisions and standards of the IPPC are directly relevant to, or overlap with, the apparent scope and intention of the Interim Guiding Principles of the CBD.

Relevant areas include:

- providing legal and regulatory frameworks;
- building capacity and technical assistance for developing countries;
- assessing and managing potential plant pest risks;
- protecting areas that may be threatened by plant pests;
- applying measures to prevent unintentional introduction of plant pests;
- certifying that risk management procedures have been applied;
- assessing and managing the intentional introduction of organisms that may be pests of plants including claimed beneficial and biological control organisms;
- exchanging of scientific and regulatory information relevant to plant pests;
- cooperating between countries to minimize the impact of plant pests; and
- detecting, controlling, and eradicating pests in agricultural and wild flora.

18. *Notes* that in addition to IPPC provisions relevant to the Interim Guiding Principles of the CBD, the IPPC also has established standards and operational procedures developed from long experience in managing plant pest risk.

19. *Recommends* that the IPPC Secretariat seek clarification of the terminology and concepts used in, and the responsibilities imposed by, the Interim Guiding Principles be sought from the CBD.

20. *Strongly urges* NPPOs to communicate the scope and responsibility of the IPPC to officials in their countries involved in the CBD workplan on alien invasive species (including the Interim Guiding Principles).

21. *Recommends* that the Secretariat of the IPPC prepare a factual outline of the relationships between specific IPPC Articles and standards and the topics identified in the individual Interim Guiding Principles. This is intended to assist IPPC members in in-country consultations.

F. THE NECESSITY OF DRAFTING INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES REGARDING ALIEN INVASIVE SPECIES

The Working Group:

22. *Notes* that environmental concerns related to plant pests are specified in International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) No. 2 *Guidelines for pest risk analysis*. Further detail is provided in the September 1999 draft ISPM *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests* but needs further elaboration to help contracting parties better assess environmental concerns related to plant pests.

23. *Recommends* that the ICPM review standards as soon as possible to ensure that they adequately address environmental risks of plant pests.

24. *Recommends* that delay in the approval of the September 1999 draft ISPM *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests* to allow further elaboration on environmental concerns related to plant pests should be avoided.

25. *Recommends* that in order to clarify the role of the IPPC and assist contracting parties with their rights and obligations, the ICPM develop a supplementary standard to the PRA standard addressing in detail the environmental risks associated with plant pests as a matter of urgency.

26. *Recognizes* that under the IPPC's existing mandate, to take account of environmental concerns, further clarification should include consideration of the following five proposed points relating to potential environmental risks of plant pests:

- reduction or elimination of endangered (or threatened) native plant species;
- reduction or elimination of a keystone plant species (a species which plays a major role in the maintenance of an ecosystem);
- reduction or elimination of a plant species which is a major component of a native ecosystem;
- causing a change to plant biological diversity in such a way as to result in ecosystem destabilization;
- resulting in control, eradication or management programs that would be needed if a quarantine pest were introduced, and impacts of such programs (e.g. pesticides or release of non-indigenous predators and parasites) on biological diversity.

27. *Notes* that some countries use IPPC-PRA methodology and management systems for dealing with environmental impacts of plant pests mainly in the horticulture, agriculture and forestry sectors, but in accordance with the IPPC mandate, these systems are used more widely in other countries.

G. CAPACITY BUILDING REGARDING IPPC ASPECTS OF LMOs/PRODUCTS OF MODERN BIOTECHNOLOGY AND ALIEN INVASIVE SPECIES

28. *Notes* that capacity requirements depend largely on the availability of ISPMs. Capacity needs and their build-up regarding LMOs/products of modern biotechnology and alien invasive species need to be analysed, planned and implemented as soon as new ISPMs or amendments of existing ISPMs concerning these LMOs/products of modern biotechnology and alien invasive species have been developed.

The Working Group:

29. *Recommends* that countries identify capacity building needs in this area. The survey questionnaire available on the web site <<http://icpm.massey.ac.nz>> may be a useful aid to this process.

30. *Recommends* that IPPC aspects of LMOs/products of modern biotechnology and alien invasive species, and relevant environmental risk issues be included in appropriate IPPC capacity building activities.

31. *Recommends* that the ICPM recognize the special needs of developing countries in this area and work to develop a program to address these needs.

32. *Recommends* that ICPM work with CBD and other relevant bodies to develop and deliver appropriate programs that meet the needs of countries in regard to common areas of interest.

H. COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION REGARDING LMOs/PRODUCTS OF MODERN BIOTECHNOLOGY AND ALIEN INVASIVE SPECIES

The Working Group:

33. *Notes* that the 5th Conference of Parties meeting of the CBD requested the Secretariat of the CBD to cooperate with other international bodies such as the IPPC.

34. *Recommends* that when appropriate the Bureau and the Secretariat invite members of the ICPM to attend relevant meetings on behalf of the ICPM.

35. *Recommends* that the IPPC Secretariat seek observer status with the CBD for the IPPC in its own right.

36. *Recommends* that the IPPC Secretariat work closely with the CBD Secretariat and attend relevant CBD meetings, and that the CBD be invited by the IPPC Secretariat to attend relevant IPPC meetings.

37. *Recommends* that the IPPC Secretariat cooperate with other standard setting bodies to ensure that common areas of interest are adequately covered.

38. *Strongly urges* members of the ICPM to communicate IPPC interests and issues to in-country officials with responsibility for CBD matters, including the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), and issues dealing with the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to ensure that the obligations under the IPPC are understood and considered as appropriate in developing positions. This includes:

- contacting the appropriate in-country officials;
- informing them of the IPPC and how those objectives are met by countries (legislation, policies, programs);
- outlining how and which standards for phytosanitary measures contribute to those objectives;
- assisting in-country preparations for CBD, SBSTTA, Cartagena Protocol and related activities.

39. *Recommends* that communication and cooperation issues be addressed as part of the strategic planning process of the ICPM.

ICPM Guidelines for the Recognition of Regional Plant Protection Organizations

In order to be recognized as a Regional Plant Protection Organization (RPPO) in the sense of Article IX of the New Revised Text of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), an RPPO should:

- 1. Be established under an inter-governmental agreement with the capacity to accomplish the objectives of the International Plant Protection Convention in its region.*
- 2. Have, as a minimum, the following functions:*
 - coordinate the activities among National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) in the regions covered, in order to achieve the objectives of the Convention;*
 - harmonize phytosanitary measures;*
 - participate in activities to promote the objectives of the IPPC; and gather and disseminate information.*

Report of the Working Group on Information Exchange

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Second Session of the ICPM agreed that the Chairperson would initiate the development of an information exchange programme. The Chairperson began this process with an informal ad hoc meeting September 2000 in Rome to identify aspects of information exchange that may be addressed by the ICPM. This was followed by a Working Group meeting January 2001 in Paris that examined the issues in greater detail.

2. The Working Group considered the provisions of the IPPC related to information exchange and listed these as activities according to the status of their implementation as:

- procedures already implemented;
- procedures under development; and
- procedures requiring no action by the ICPM.

3. The Working Group also considered that the interpretation of certain provisions of the IPPC regarding information exchange required clarification. The Working Group recommended interpretations and formulated programme recommendations based on these interpretations.

4. Recommendations of the meeting are summarized as:

- general recommendations;
- specific recommendations; and
- technical assistance programme recommendations.

5. Tables 1-3 summarize the status of implementation. Table 4 lists interpretations that are recommended by the Working Group.

II. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

6. The Working Group considered the nature of an information system that would provide an efficient mechanism for the information exchange requirements identified in the IPPC. The Working Group recommended that the ICPM anticipate a fully Internet-based system administered by the Secretariat with oversight by an ICPM support group. It proposed that the system be known as the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) and rely upon countries for reporting and data management.

7. Two primary objectives of the system would be to make full use of links to national Websites and links to RPPOs. The Working Group recommended that these sites clearly identify which information is provided to meet the information exchange obligations of contracting parties to the IPPC.

8. The Working Group recognized that many countries may not yet have Internet access or the possibility to put in place a national Website. It anticipated that, at minimum, each NPPO would have access to a reasonably up-to-date computer and, until Internet capability was available, could be provided with CD-ROM copies of the IPP at periodic intervals. The Working Group also recommended that the posting of national information for countries without national Websites would be by:

- provision in the IPP of Web pages available for NPPO use (controlled remotely by the NPPO);
- and
- NPPOs (including those no or limited Internet access) sending relevant information to the IPPC Secretariat using special templates to supply information in an electronic format.

9. The Working Group considered the nature of the information to be included in the IPP and recommended that the information would include:

A. REPORTING OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE IPPC

10.

- Pest reports (Articles IV.2 (b) & VIII.1 (a))
- Description of the NPPOs (Article IV.4)
- Phytosanitary restrictions, requirements and prohibitions (Article VII.2 (b))
- List of regulated pest lists (Article VII.2 (i))
- Emergency actions (Article VII.6)
- Official contact points (Article VIII.2)

B. SECRETARIAT INFORMATION

11. Provision of ISPMs, meeting reports, work programme activities, and other items of interest to ICPM Members and the general public.

C. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

12. There is a large section of information that countries are not obligated to provide but may voluntarily provide because it would be of considerable use to other countries. This includes:

- phytosanitary diagnostics information (laboratories, experts, collections etc.);
- official pest risk analyses;
- technical and biological information (data sheets, databases, maps, pest lists etc.);
- treatments; and
- post-entry quarantine facilities.

13. Access to the information would be provided through the IPP, recognizing that a CD-ROM is periodically needed for countries with limited or no Internet access.

D. LINKS TO OTHER INFORMATION RESOURCES

14. The Working Group recommended that the IPP include links to other resources that are helpful to NPPOs (e.g. EcoPort, ProMed, CABI, etc.).

III. SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

15. The Working Group considered specific information exchange obligations in the Convention and recommended interpretations for the understanding and application of each as described below.

Pest reports (Articles IV.2 (b) & VIII.1(a))

16. An ISPM on pest reporting is under development and is expected to be submitted to the ICPM for adoption in 2002. The present draft recommends that countries meet their pest reporting obligations using a global system put in place by the ICPM. The Working Group recommends that the Secretariat, in the framework of the IPP, develop a template for reporting that can be used by member countries with or without Internet access. It was noted that recommendations on a reporting time limit should be included in this ISPM. This system could also be used for transmitting information on pest free areas.

Description of the NPPO (including organizations that act under the authority of the NPPO) (Article IV.4)

17. The meeting recommended that the description of the official plant protection organization according to Article IV.4 should also identify the organizations that act under the authority of the NPPO as provided in Article IV.2 (a-g).

Phytosanitary restrictions, requirements and prohibitions (Article VII.2 (b))

18. The Working Group recommended that all information on restrictions, requirements, and prohibitions be:

- made available in electronic format;
- available through national or RPPO websites and/or national Web pages within the IPPC website linked through IPP; and
- published in at least one FAO language (as noted in Article XIX.2(b)), preferably in English.

List of regulated pest (Article VII.2(i))

19. An ISPM on the preparation of lists of regulated pests is under development and is expected to be submitted to the ICPM for adoption in 2002. The Working Group recommended that countries supply the data according to the ISPM in the form of a link to a national or RPPO Website or in electronic format to the Secretariat. However, in view of the importance of the availability of such pest lists, the Working Group recommended that countries provide pest lists in the currently available format (preferably electronically) with the aim of moving toward an Internet-based format as soon as possible.

Emergency actions (Article VII.6)

20. The Working Group noted that descriptions for the concepts of emergency actions and emergency measures are under development. It recommended that Article VII.6 be understood to involve both actions and measures (refer also to Principle 14 in ISPM #1). While emergency actions are usually only reported to affected trade partners, emergency measures should be reported to the relevant trade partners, the Secretariat and RPPOs.

21. The Working Group noted the WTO system of emergency notification and suggested that the IPPC and WTO systems be considered together to avoid duplication. It recommended that the Secretariat provide a similar form and procedures for countries to use to notify emergency measures. It was proposed that this be used in the same manner as for pest reporting.

Official contact point (Article VIII.2)

22. The Secretariat has invited countries to identify their designated contact points in conformity with their obligations under the interim measures corresponding to Article VIII.2. The information is provided by the contracting party, i.e., the Ministry of Foreign Affairs or equivalent. Listings for contact points are managed, updated, and made available by the Secretariat.

IV. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME RECOMMENDATIONS

23. The Working Group noted the concerns of developing countries regarding aspects of information management, including:

- the need for up-to-date surveillance data on pest incidence to facilitate trade;
- PRA training, inspection;
- institutional framework (in particular a sustainable information system, sustainable financial mechanisms, feedback mechanisms, and dissemination and communication across sectors);
- Internet access combined with information technology training at minimum for every contact point
- diagnostic facilities and expertise at points of entry; and
- the lack of resources for adequate representation at relevant international meetings.

24. The Working Group also noted the benefits of cooperation, sharing information, and harmonizing phytosanitary measures on a regional and sub-regional basis.

25. The Working Group highlighted the importance of institutional frameworks in the development and maintenance of plant health systems. This included factors such as communication with the public and commercial sectors, sustainable financing, etc.

Table 1. IPPC information exchange requirements already implemented

The following information exchange procedures have already been implemented by the IPPC Secretariat and are ongoing in nature.

Article	Responsible party	Function	Receiving parties	Medium / Languages	Status
VIII.2	Contracting party	Contact point for the exchange of information	Not specified	On paper in 5 languages On the Web in 3 languages	Implemented, ongoing Implemented, ongoing
XII.4(a)	Secretary	International standards	All contracting parties within sixty days of adoption	On paper and electronically in 5 languages On the Web in 3 languages	Implemented, ongoing Implemented, ongoing
XII.5	Secretary	Translations of international standards	Commission	On paper and electronically in 5 languages	Implemented, ongoing
XVII	Director-General of FAO	Adherence to IPPC	Contracting parties	On paper in one FAO language FAO Legal Office database	Implemented, ongoing

Table 2. IPPC information exchange requirements under development

The following information exchange procedures have already been initiated. Once implemented they shall all be ongoing in nature.

Article	Responsible party	Function	Receiving parties	Status / Possible Mechanism
IV.2(b) & VIII.1(a)	NPPO Contracting party	Pest reporting* Exchange of information on plant pests, particularly the reporting of the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests that may be of immediate or potential danger	Not specified by the Convention, but should follow Commission procedures	Development of an ISPM on pest reporting, scheduled for possible adoption at ICPM 4 <i>Bilateral, regional or global mechanism need to be discussed and developed</i>
IV.4	NPPO	Description of NPPO and changes (as described in Art IV.2 (a-g))	Secretary	Secretariat to draft letter to NPPOs <i>Mechanism initiated</i>
VII.2 (f)	Importing contracting party	Significant instances of non-compliance with phytosanitary certification	Exporting or re-exporting contracting party	Development of an ISPM on non-compliance
	Exporting contracting party	Result of its investigation	Importing country on request	Scheduled for possible adoption at ICPM 3 <i>Bilateral communication only</i>
VII.2(i)	Contracting party	Lists of regulated pests	Secretary, RPPOs of which they are members, other contracting parties on request	Development of an ISPM
VII.6	Contracting party	Emergency action	Contracting parties concerned, Secretary, RPPOs of which the contracting party is a member.	Covered by the ISPM on non-compliance
XII.4(c)	Secretary	Lists of regulated pests	All contracting parties and RPPOs	Scheduled for possible adoption at ICPM 4 Recommended as an interim action in its present

Article	Responsible party	Function	Receiving parties	Status / Possible Mechanism
XIII.3	Director-General of FAO	Report of Dispute Resolution Committee	Contracting parties concerned	format (electronically) Rules of procedure for dispute resolution Scheduled for possible adoption at ICPM 3 <i>Director-General of FAO to implement</i>

* Art. IV 2(b) & VIII 1(a) were identified by Resolution 12/97 of the 29th FAO Conference and the meeting participants as requiring a high priority status for reporting to the Secretary.

Table 3. IPPC information exchange requirements that need no ICPM action

Article	Responsible party	Function	Receiving parties	Status
VIII.1(c)	Contracting party, to the extent practicable	Technical and biological information necessary for PRA	Other contracting parties	This deals with bilateral cooperation and no action is required by the ICPM. However, the proposed IPP may give access to any information which countries choose to provide

Table 4. IPPC information exchange requirements that need further consideration and possible discussion by the ICPM

The following information exchange obligations generated considerable discussion. The working group made the following recommendations for the text in the NRT of the IPPC that needed interpretation.

Article	Responsible party	Function	Receiving parties according to the Convention	Recommendations
IV.4	NPPO	Organizational arrangements for plant protection	Other contracting parties upon request	This requirement does not relate to the general structure of an NPPO (mentioned in the first sentence), but to organizational arrangements described in Article IV.2 & 3
VII.2(b)	Contracting party	Publish and transmit phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions	Any contracting party or parties that they believe may be directly affected by such measures	The Working Group recommends that the Contracting Parties make phytosanitary requirements more widely available than in the past through inclusion in the IPP (available to all countries whether affected or not)
VII.2(c)	Contracting party	Rationale for phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions	On request, to any contracting party	'Rationale' is understood to refer to compliance with the requirements stated in Article VI.1(a) and (b)
VII.2(d)	Contracting party	Consignments of particular plants or plant products to be imported only through specified points of entry	Secretary, RPPOs of which the contracting party is a member, all contracting parties which the contracting party believes to be directly affected, other contracting parties upon request	Recommend to the ICPM that this point is already covered by Art. VII.2(b) and this information should be reported as part of the information reported under VII.2(b)

VII.2(j)	Contracting party, to best of ability	Adequate information on pest status in order to support categorization of pests, and for the development of appropriate phytosanitary measures	Contracting parties, on request	Recommends the term 'pest status' is understood to be the same meaning as 'pest status' in ISPM #8. 'Categorization' is understood to refer to the differentiation of regulated and non-regulated pests. ISPM #6 provides guidance on what is meant by 'adequate' information
VII.6	Contracting party	Emergency action	Contracting parties concerned, Secretary, RPPOs of which the contracting party is a member	Clarification being provided in the ISPM on non-compliance. Additional clarification may be provided through the Glossary
VIII.2	Contracting party	Contact point for the exchange of information	Not specified	Recommends that designation is understood to be the official notification of the contact point to the IPPC Secretariat
XII.4(d)	Secretary	Phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions	Not specified	Recommends that this paragraph be understood to refer to the phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions of those countries wishing to use the IPPC Website for making available to other members. Other Members would use their own Websites (or their RPPOs) making their phytosanitary requirements, restrictions and prohibitions available

Technical Assistance

1. The Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM), at its Second Session in October 1999, was asked to provide guidance to the Secretariat regarding strategies to assist developing countries in fulfilling their obligations under the New Revised Text of the IPPC. The ICPM was also informed of developments regarding a pilot project that was initiated by the Government of New Zealand. The pilot project is based on a questionnaire used for identifying the phytosanitary capacities and needs of countries. It was explained that an additional stage in this initiative involved a survey of donors by the Secretariat to assist in identifying sources of technical assistance and the current state of technical assistance as it relates to phytosanitary capacity building.

2. The ICPM will recall that it endorsed the continuation, improvement and expansion of the pilot project and decided to establish an open-ended working group to:

1. define possible coordinating roles for the ICPM in the area of technical assistance;
2. review the results of the New Zealand pilot project; and based on the results of this review,
3. recommend future activities of the ICPM in technical assistance.

3. The Secretariat convened a Technical Consultation on Technical Assistance in conjunction with the ICPM meeting on Strategic Planning 6-10 March 2000 in Bangkok, Thailand to begin to address the charges identified by the ICPM. The meeting was attended by representatives of national plant protection organizations from: Bangladesh, Australia, Canada, Viet Nam, USA, Uruguay, Thailand, Sweden, South Africa, Nigeria, Indonesia, Japan and New Zealand. Representatives of the APPPC and Comunidad Andina attended as observers. The meeting was chaired by Mr Hedley, Chairperson of the ICPM, and also attended by the IPPC Secretariat.

4. The meeting developed draft statements regarding the coordinating role of the ICPM and future activities. These were also considered in the context of strategic planning. The New Zealand pilot project was reviewed with the result that specific recommendations regarding the further development of the pilot project were provided to the project development team. It was agreed that the project would again be reviewed at a second meeting of the Technical Consultation on Technical Assistance, held 2-6 October 2000. The second meeting was again associated with the meeting on Strategic Planning and included most of the same Members attending the first meeting, with the addition of IICA as an observer. The second meeting considered further developments in the pilot project and finalized its recommendations to the ICPM regarding coordinating roles of the ICPM and future activities of the ICPM in technical assistance.

5. Following is the report of the Technical Consultation to the ICPM.

A. COORDINATING ROLES OF THE ICPM

6. The objectives of the IPPC will only be realized if all Members are able to participate in global efforts to these ends. The ICPM serves as a forum for:

1. identifying technical assistance needs;
2. coordinating the ICPM's global and regional technical assistance initiatives; and
3. promoting bilateral technical assistance.

These activities are to reinforce the implementation of the IPPC, including in particular the understanding and use of ISPMs.

7. Coordination includes:

1. enhancing awareness by gathering and disseminating information on global and regional forms of technical assistance;
2. identifying and developing phytosanitary capacity assessment mechanisms; and

3. arranging for resources to facilitate attendance of developing country Members to meetings.

B. REVIEW OF THE NEW ZEALAND PILOT PROJECT

8. The meeting:
 1. considered the pilot project and its enhancements;
 2. expressed its gratitude to the government of New Zealand and complimented the developers for their efforts;
 3. provided specific suggestions for further improvement of the questionnaire;
 4. noted that the questionnaire deals directly with aspects of implementing ISPMs, but that the efficacy and sustainability of technical assistance also requires institutional elements of national phytosanitary systems which are often assumed to be present.

9. The meeting recommended:
 1. the pilot project be finalized and the questionnaire transferred to the Secretariat as a diagnostic tool for self-assessment by both developed and developing countries to be used to identify needs and also where capacity exists;
 2. the questionnaire become known as the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE);
 3. the PCE be further developed to include institutional and regulatory aspects of national phytosanitary systems;
 4. the Secretariat undertake to maintain and update the PCE (or make appropriate arrangements for maintaining and updating); and
 5. that PCE results be kept as confidential as desired by the particular country.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS ON FUTURE ACTIVITIES OF THE ICPM TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME

10. The meeting recommended that ICPM:
 1. recognize that Secretariat staff time devoted to the FAO-Technical Cooperation Programme represents a contribution to the ICPM's technical assistance programme (although not managed or directed by the ICPM);
 2. consider a proposal on the possibility of establishing a trust fund specifically for ICPM initiatives regarding technical assistance;
 3. establish an ad hoc Working Group on technical assistance (as needed);
 4. develop a system for determining general priorities (e.g. training program, internet access);
 5. develop a system for meeting priority needs (e.g. ongoing regional workshops on implementing standards with donor funds);
 6. encourage individual Members to utilize the PCE to determine their own needs and priorities, and to formulate national plans for the improvement of their phytosanitary systems and for technical assistance where appropriate;
 7. develop a programme for the promotion of technical assistance in the phytosanitary area;
 8. determine with the Secretariat priorities for the Secretariat's technical assistance activities;
 9. support the development of guidance for countries to use in the evaluation of institutional and regulatory aspects of national systems, including:
 - a) the development of diagnostic tools (PCE) for countries to assess their regulatory and institutional capacity to support technical functions for implementation of the IPPC;
 - b) the exploration of possibilities for a common framework for institutional evaluation and capacity building, within the ambit of the SPS (in particular with OIE), relating to institutional, regulatory, and technical assistance of common interest.

11. The meeting recommended that the Secretariat:
 1. prepare annual reports on ongoing activities regarding phytosanitary technical assistance;
and
 2. maintains a list of general phytosanitary technical assistance needs submitted by Members.

Strategic Planning

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (ICPM), at its second session in October 1999, recommended that as part of the work programme of the ICPM in 2000, interested Members develop a strategic plan for the work of the Interim Commission. This was to begin with a questionnaire soliciting Members' inputs, followed by an analysis of the responses and ultimately resulting in the formulation of a 5-year strategic plan to be submitted to the Third Session of the ICPM in April 2001. The Secretariat convened a Technical Consultation on Strategic Planning in conjunction with an ICPM meeting on technical assistance 6-10 March 2000 in Bangkok, Thailand. The purpose of this meeting was to begin the strategic planning process by developing the questionnaire to be sent to Members. The meeting was attended by representatives of national plant protection organizations from: Bangladesh, Australia, Canada, Vietnam, USA, Uruguay, Thailand, Sweden, South Africa, Nigeria, Indonesia, Japan and New Zealand. Representatives of the APPPC and Comunidad Andina attended as observers. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Hedley, Chairperson of the ICPM, and also attended by the IPPC Secretariat.

2. The meeting developed a draft strategic plan that was distributed to Members for comments in the form of a questionnaire. Thirty-nine Members provided responses to the Secretariat. Responses were summarized by the Secretariat and submitted to a second meeting of the Technical Consultation on Strategic Planning held 2-6 October that included most of the same Members attending the first meeting, with the addition of IICA as an observer. The second meeting considered the comments of Members in reformulating the draft plan for submission to the ICPM for adoption. It is anticipated that similar processes will be used for periodic review and updating of the strategic plan by the ICPM.

II. ELEMENTS OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

3. The process of strategic planning used by the Technical Consultation involves formulation of a position statement, mission statement, strategic directions and goals, described as follows.

4. Position statement: This statement provides summary information on the current status of the ICPM and the external environment. The statement describes, very briefly, the ICPM's formation, members, administration, present functions, external environment, and challenges. The statement is a summary of the information used as the basis for the development of the strategic plan.

5. Mission statement: This statement describes succinctly what the ICPM aims to achieve. All strategic directions and goals should be covered by the mission statement.

6. Strategic directions: These describe basic themes for activities of the ICPM. All the activities and outputs planned by the ICPM should be found within one or more of the strategic directions.

7. Goals: These are the achievements desired within each strategic direction for the particular time period covered by the plan.

8. Goals are considered for their priority, timing, and the means for their accomplishment, including consideration of the time, human and financial resources available. This is then used as the basis for proposing a work programme that is scheduled into a provisional calendar of activities. A clear understanding of the capacity of the ICPM and Secretariat to undertake the work programme, and options for increasing capacity where necessary, is critical for deciding the level of implementation that is practical. Careful consideration must also be given to mechanisms for funding, staff, oversight, direction and other support required for successful implementation.

9. The ICPM is provided with several documents based on the recommendations of the Technical Consultations on strategic planning with information from the Secretariat and the

Chairperson. The present document covers the Position statement, Mission statement, Strategic directions and Goals. Associated documents are organized as follows:

- ICPM01/14 (Annex 1) – Timing, priority, and means
- ICPM01/14 (Annex 2) – Capacity and work programme
- ICPM01/14 (Annex 3) – Provisional calendar
- ICPM01/INF 5 – Comments from the Chair on ICPM capacity
- ICPM01/INF 6 – Secretariat's budget summary
- ICPM01/INF 7 – Summary of trust fund options

A. POSITION STATEMENT

10. The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) is an international treaty ratified in 1952, first amended in 1979, and then again in 1997. The purpose of the Convention is to secure common and effective action to prevent the spread and introduction of pests of plants and plant products.

11. The IPPC as amended in 1997 provides for the establishment of a Commission on Phytosanitary Measures. However, the amendments do not come into force until two-thirds of the contracting parties have accepted the amendments. Governments have initiated the acceptance process. Nineteen (19) of the needed seventy-two governments have deposited instruments of acceptance with FAO. It is anticipated that several years will be required for the amendments to come into force. As an interim measure, FAO Conference, in 1997, established the ICPM. The ICPM will continue to exist until the amendments come into force and it will then be superseded by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures. While the ICPM operates as an interim body, its membership is open to FAO Members and contracting parties to the IPPC. The functions of the ICPM are the same as those listed for the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures in Art XI.2.

12. The ICPM has a unique formal role in the area of plant protection as the global forum for the discussion of areas of common action under the IPPC. These include in particular the establishment of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs) that provide norms for safe and fair international trade that are recognized by the WTO. Although the ICPM is a relatively new body, the IPPC has a wide membership and nearly fifty years history of implementation resulting in the development of significant expertise, experience, and goodwill among Members. The ICPM provides a means for liaison with other organizations and opportunities for interaction including possibilities for sharing resources.

13. Basic funding for the ICPM is through FAO, which is the depository for the IPPC and provides the Secretariat with its infrastructure – including legal support. Lack of adequate resources are a limiting factor to the implementation of the work programme of the ICPM and additional resources need to be sought, particularly to establish a greater number of standards as soon as possible. The consequences of these limited resources are significant when considering the requirements of the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement) for the availability of ISPMs to promote harmonization.

14. Further limiting factors to the implementation of the work programme include differences in development status and technological capacity of members, differing levels of participation and expectations of countries. Despite the increased importance of the IPPC due to linkage with the WTO SPS Agreement, the IPPC is not widely known or understood. Further contributing to this are the newness of the ICPM procedures and its interim status following the recent amendment of the Convention.

15. The ICPM has adopted its own rules and procedures. It has set up an Interim Committee on Standards, the membership of which is still under discussion. The ICPM has adopted two ISPMs at each of its two meetings, bringing to ten the total number of ISPMs adopted to date (previous ISPMs were adopted by FAO Conference prior to the formation of the ICPM). Procedures to assist with dispute settlement are being developed so the ICPM may offer a complementary role to other international dispute settlement systems. Members of the ICPM are investigating the role it could have

in technical assistance to raise the phytosanitary capacity of developing countries. The ICPM does not have any clear role yet in the sharing of regulatory and scientific information, and has weak links with the research community.

16. Although the ICPM has prepared priority lists for the development of standards, it has not prepared a strategic plan to make clear its strategic directions and goals or drawn up a long term plan of its intended activities, e.g. preparing a comprehensive body of ISPMs. At the second meeting of the ICPM a timetable of meetings for 2000 was endorsed by members.

17. There are nine regional plant protection organizations (RPPOs) that have coordinating functions in their respective regions. One of their roles is to help to achieve the objectives of the IPPC. The organizations are disparate in that they have widely differing numbers of members, authority, constitutions and capabilities. Their relationship with the IPPC Secretariat and the ICPM, and the opportunities for increased interaction, remain to be clarified.

18. The primary use of phytosanitary measures in most countries has been in the protection of agriculture, horticulture and forestry from the ingress of exotic pests and/or their spread within countries. Whilst recognizing the imperative of protecting natural ecosystems and that IPPC principles applied to cultivated systems are equally valid for wild flora and biodiversity, the ICPM has not developed explicit systems to deal with environmental issues. The increasing importance of environmental issues, such as alien invasive species, is of immediate concern to ICPM Members. The issue of alien invasive species is also addressed by the Convention on Biological Diversity.

19. The increasing volume and speed of the movement of goods and people is placing pressure on phytosanitary systems and creating greater demand for standards, while at the same time many governments are finding it difficult to meet the increasing demands for resources. There is an increased reliance on national and regional phytosanitary standards due to the lack of ISPMs in many areas of need. There is also an increasing demand to restrict the spread of organisms that threaten biological diversity. The use of computers and the Internet has meant that greater complexity in import requirements can be managed by national plant protection organizations (NPPOs), which means in turn that greater demands are placed on exporting countries. The means of dealing with these pressures has not been examined by the ICPM on either the political front or with effected private sector groups or environmental organizations. The process of undertaking the construction of import regulations is a matter of increasing detail, complexity and contention. In this situation, an increasing divergence between developed and developing countries will be difficult to avoid if steps are not taken urgently. Likewise, the Commission needs to ensure that all Members are fully able to implement the Convention.

B. MISSION STATEMENT

20. *To secure common action in protecting the world's cultivated and natural plant resources from the spread and introduction of plant pests while minimizing interference with the international movement of goods and people. This is accomplished by providing a global forum for promoting the full implementation of the International Plant Protection Convention through the:*

- 1. development, adoption and monitoring of the implementation of international standards for phytosanitary measures;*
- 2. exchange of information;*
- 3. provision of dispute settlement mechanisms;*
- 4. development of phytosanitary capacity of Members by promoting the provision of technical assistance;*
- 5. maintenance of an effective and efficient administrative framework;*
- 6. promotion of IPPC and cooperation with other relevant international organizations.*

C. STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS AND GOALS

21. Strategic Direction No. 1: The development, adoption and monitoring of the implementation of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs)

Setting international phytosanitary standards is a basic and unique role identified in the IPPC, particularly given the status accorded IPPC standards as a result of the WTO SPS Agreement. Internationally accepted phytosanitary standards form the basis for the harmonization of phytosanitary measures that protect natural and cultivated plant resources while ensuring fair and safe trade.

Goals for Strategic Direction No. 1

- 1.1 Increasing the number of standards by improving the standard-setting mechanism
 - 1.1.1 Development of mechanisms that ensure that ISPMs take into account the protection of the environment
 - 1.1.2 Establishment of a procedure to identify and prioritize the development and review (including submissions procedures) of standards
 - 1.1.3 Development of procedures to provide for sponsorship of specific standards
 - 1.1.4 Development of standards on fundamental concepts
- 1.2 Greater transparency in the standard setting process
 - 1.2.1 Enhancing the participation by developing countries in IPPC activities, in particular standard setting
- 1.3 Monitoring the implementation of standards
 - 1.3.1 Elaboration of explanatory documents corresponding to ISPMs
 - 1.3.2 Encourage RPPO cooperation in the development of ISPMs
 - 1.3.3 Encourage RPPOs to assist their members in the implementation of ISPMs

22. Strategic direction No. 2: Information exchange

This strategic direction covers members and the IPPC Secretariat's obligations to provide information as specified in the IPPC and information exchange that may be specified by the ICPM or in ISPMs, including such information as pest lists, pest reports, and phytosanitary measures. Information exchange activities ensure that members communicate officially on phytosanitary regulations and other issues of phytosanitary significance, and determine the means by which the IPPC Secretariat makes them available to other members.

Goals for Strategic Direction No. 2

- 2.1 Promotion of increased access and use of electronic communication/Internet, including establishment of Internet linkages where appropriate
- 2.2 Development of a central linkage mechanism for provision of official information by countries, e.g. phytosanitary regulations, pest lists, pest distribution, PRA, etc.
- 2.3 Development of systems to identify sources of information on pests
- 2.4 Establishment of procedures for pest reporting and information exchange, including cooperation with RPPOs

23. Strategic Direction No. 3: The provision of dispute settlement mechanisms

This relates to the non-binding dispute settlement provisions contained in Article XIII of the New Revised Text of the IPPC. The ICPM is charged to develop rules and procedures for dispute settlement under the IPPC. The Convention explicitly recognizes the complimentary role of the IPPC in this area given the formal binding dispute settlement process that exists under the WTO.

Goals for Strategic Direction No. 3

- 3.1 Promotion of dispute avoidance (e.g. a regular ICPM agenda item)
 - 3.1.1 Development of information material concerning the requirements for effective preparation of a dispute settlement
- 3.2 Providing supporting information on IPPC and other dispute settlement systems
 - 3.2.1 Establishment of an inventory of other dispute settlement systems

- 3.2.2 Providing rulings/precedents from dispute settlements (e.g. WTO)

24. Strategic Direction No. 4: The development of the phytosanitary capacity of Members by promoting the provision of technical assistance

Article XX in the New Revised Text of the IPPC requires members to promote the provision of technical assistance to developing contracting parties, either bilaterally or through appropriate international organizations with the purpose of facilitating implementation of the IPPC. Adequate capacity and infrastructure for all Members are critical to accomplish the IPPC's goals.

Goals for Strategic Direction No. 4

- 4.1 Development of a method for individual countries to evaluate their phytosanitary capacity as well as their needs and demands for technical assistance
- 4.1.1 Update and enhance Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)
- 4.2 Promotion of capacity building with regard to the understanding and application of international standards (e.g. through regional workshops) including before these standards are implemented
- 4.3 Promotion of and assistance with the establishment, revision and updating of national legislation
- 4.4 Establishment of systems that attract technical assistance from donors
- 4.5 Promotion of the improvement and development of RPPOs
- 4.5.1 Assistance to RPPOs to establish information systems
- 4.6 Establishment of a process within the ICPM to identify and rank priorities for the ICPM's activities in technical assistance

25. Strategic direction No. 5: The maintenance of an effective and efficient administrative framework

To function effectively, the ICPM must establish organizational structures and procedures, identify funding mechanisms, and address various support and administrative functions, including internal review and evaluation mechanisms. This strategic direction is to make provision for the ICPM to address its administrative issues and strategies, making continual improvement to ensure its business practices are effective and efficient.

Goals for Strategic Direction No. 5

- 5.1 Encouragement of Members to deposit their instrument of acceptance for the new revised text
- 5.2 Encouragement of non-contracting parties to adopt the IPPC
- 5.3 Ensuring budget transparency
- 5.4 Identification of means for increasing resources, e.g. trust fund; trust fund with special conditions (under control of ICPM); other voluntary contributions; FAO regular programme increase; in-kind contributions
- 5.5 Secretariat capacity increased through the use of FAO resources
- 5.6 Establishment of a business plan for resource requirements
- 5.7 Establishment of internal planning, review and evaluation mechanisms
- 5.7.1 Report on activities of the Secretariat
- 5.7.2 Regular updating of strategic plan and operational programme
- 5.8 Identification of other issues where common action of the ICPM required

26. Strategic Direction No. 6: Promotion of IPPC and cooperation with relevant international organizations

This strategy direction recognizes the need to communicate IPPC issues, obligations, processes and

interests to all concerned, including other bodies with similar or overlapping interests, and to encourage RPPOs to promote regionally the implementation of the IPPC.

Goals for Strategic Direction No. 6

- 6.1 Promotion of the IPPC
 - 6.1.1 International (50th Anniversary) Congress in 2002
- 6.2 Establish relations, identify areas of common interest, and where appropriate, develop coordinated activities and joint programmes with other relevant organizations including the CBD, OIE, Codex and WTO
- 6.3 Communication of IPPC issues, obligations, processes and interests to all concerned, including other bodies with similar or overlapping interests
- 6.4 Encourage RPPOs to promote regionally the implementation of the IPPC (e.g. through regional workshops)
- 6.5 Strengthen cooperation and coordination with relevant organizations on technical assistance

ANNEX 1

27. Tables indicating the timing, priorities and means for achieving goals recommended by the ICPM Technical Consultation on Strategic Planning.

Table 1. Strategic Direction No. 1: The development, adoption and monitoring of the implementation of international standards for phytosanitary measures (ISPMs)

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
1.1 Increasing the number of standards by improving the standard-setting mechanism	Ongoing	High	
1.1.1 Development of mechanisms that ensure that ISPMs take into account the protection of the environment	Ongoing	High	ICPM, Bureau and Secretariat
1.1.2 Establishment of a procedure to identify and prioritize the development and review (including submissions procedures) of standards	2001	Medium	ICPM 3
1.1.3 Development of procedures to provide for sponsorship of specific standards	2001	Medium	ICPM
1.1.4 Development of standards on fundamental concepts	2002	High	ICPM
1.2 Greater transparency in the standard setting process	Ongoing	High	ICPM
1.2.1 Enhancing the participation by developing countries in IPPC activities, in particular standard setting	Ongoing	High	Exploratory discussion at the ICPM
1.3 Monitoring the implementation of standards	Later	Low	SPWG
1.3.1 Elaboration of explanatory documents corresponding to ISPMs	2001	Medium	ISC
1.3.2 Encourage RPPO cooperation in the development of ISPMs	Ongoing	Low	SPWG
1.3.3 Encourage RPPOs to assist their members in the implementation of ISPMs	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM

Table 2. Strategic Direction No. 2: Information exchange

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
2.1 Promotion of increased access and the use of electronic communication/Internet, including establishment of Internet linkages where appropriate	Ongoing	Medium	Secretariat
2.2 Development of a central linkage mechanism for provision of official information by countries, e.g. phytosanitary regulations, pest lists, pest distribution, PRA, etc.	2001	High	Secretariat
2.3 Development of systems to identify sources of information on pests	2002	High	Working group
2.4 Establishment of procedures for pest reporting and information exchange, including cooperation with RPPOs	In process	High	ISC

Table 3. Strategic Direction No. 3: Dispute settlement

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
3.1 Promotion of dispute avoidance (e.g. a regular ICPM agenda item)	Ongoing	Medium	Report to ICPM
3.1.1 Development of information material concerning the requirements for effective preparation of a dispute settlement	2002 and beyond	Medium	Subsidiary body
3.2 Providing supporting information on IPPC and other dispute settlement systems	2002 and beyond	Medium	Subsidiary body
3.2.1 Establishment of an inventory of other dispute settlement systems	2002 and beyond	Medium	Subsidiary body
3.2.2 Providing rulings/precedents from dispute settlements (e.g. WTO)	2002 and beyond	Medium	Subsidiary body

Table 4. Strategic Direction No. 4: The development of phytosanitary capacity of Members by promoting the provision of technical assistance

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
4.1 Development of a method for individual countries to evaluate their phytosanitary capacity as well as their needs and demands for technical assistance	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM
4.1.1 Update and Enhance Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)	In process	Medium	Secretariat and Members
4.2 Promotion of capacity building with regard to the understanding and application of international standards (e.g. through regional workshops)	Ongoing	High	Regional workshops
4.3 Promotion of and assistance with the establishment, revision and updating of national legislation	Later	High	Secretariat
4.4 Establishment of systems that attract technical assistance from donors	2002	High	Bureau
4.5 Promotion of the improvement and development of RPPOs	Ongoing	Medium	Members and the Secretariat
4.5.1 Assistance to RPPOs to establish information systems	Ongoing	Medium	Members and the Secretariat
4.6 Establishment of a process within the ICPM to identify and rank priorities for the ICPM's activities in technical assistance	2001	High	Working group

Table 5. Strategic Direction No. 5: The maintenance of an effective and efficient administrative framework

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
5.1 Encouragement of to Members deposit their instrument of acceptance for the new revised text	Ongoing and 2001	High	Secretariat and FAO Legal Office
5.2 Encouragement of non-contracting parties to adopt the IPPC	Ongoing	High	
5.3 Ensuring budget transparency	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
5.4 Identification of means for increasing resources, e.g. trust fund; trust fund with special conditions (under control of ICPM); other voluntary contributions; FAO regular programme increase; in-kind contributions	2001 and later	High	Bureau and Secretariat with Working group
5.5 Secretariat capacity increased through the use of FAO resources	2001	High	Bureau and Members
5.6 Establishment of a business plan for resource requirements	2001	High	Bureau and Secretariat with Working group
5.7 Establishment of internal planning, review and evaluation mechanisms	2002	High	Working Group
5.7.1 Report on activities of the Secretariat	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
5.7.2 Regular updating of strategic plan and operational programme	Ongoing	High	Working group
5.8 Identification of other issues where common action of the ICPM required	Ongoing	Low	ICPM

Table 6. Strategic Direction No. 6: Promotion of IPPC and cooperation with other international bodies

Goals	Timing	Priority	Means
6.1 Promotion of the IPPC	Ongoing	High	Members and Secretariat
6.1.1 International (50th Anniversary) Congress in 2002	Urgent	High	Secretariat and Bureau
6.2 Establish relations, identify areas of common interest, and where appropriate, develop coordinated activities and joint programmes with other relevant organizations including the CBD, OIE, Codex, WTO	Ongoing	High	Secretariat and Bureau
6.3 Communication of IPPC issues, obligations, processes and interests to all concerned, including other bodies with similar or overlapping interests	Ongoing	High	Secretariat
6.4 Encourage RPPOs to promote regionally the implementation of the IPPC (e.g. through regional workshops)	Ongoing	High	ICPM
6.5 Strengthen cooperation and coordination with relevant organizations on technical assistance	Ongoing	Medium	ICPM/Secretariat

ANNEX 2

ICPM Work Programme

28. The work programme envisioned for the ICPM through the strategic planning process involves new initiatives and the expansion of existing activities related to:

- standard-setting;
- information exchange;
- dispute settlement;
- technical assistance;
- communication; and
- ICPM administration.

29. The design of a work programme to meet the expectations of the ICPM will depend on:

- the desired level of activity and rate of development; and
- the capacity of the ICPM and Secretariat (funding and personnel resources).

30. A significant portion of the work falls within the responsibility of the Secretariat, in particular with regard to coordination and support. However, the effectiveness of the work programme is also dependent upon the level of interest and participation by Members and the willingness of Members to share and accept various points of view. Meetings to share information and views, and to interact directly in technical and business discussions have provided, and are expected to continue to provide, the primary means for progressing the work of the ICPM in a collaborative and transparent manner.

31. At the present time, the work programme of the ICPM is administered by the Secretariat, the Bureau, and the Interim Standards Committee. Proposals for other administrative and technical bodies to support the ICPM currently include:

- replacing the Interim Standards Committee with a 21-member Standards Committee including a 7-member Expert Working Group (ICPM01/4)
- establishment of a Subsidiary Body for dispute settlement (ICPM01/5)
- establishment of a Support Group for information exchange (ICPM01/19); and
- an ad hoc Working Group on technical assistance (ICPM01/13)

32. Other bodies that may be considered include ad hoc or permanent groups organized specifically for:

- strategic planning;
- resource and trust fund oversight;
- the technical review of measures; and
- other ICPM activities or initiatives.

33. Except for the Standards Committee that is currently expected to meet twice each year, the groups described above may or may not be required to meet on a routine basis depending on the need, priority and available resources. In addition, increasingly more communication is possible without meetings through the use of new technologies, in particular e-mail. However, it is anticipated that certain meetings from among the various possibilities will be required each year to adequately support the ICPM work programme and should therefore be included in the work programme. These are identified below as "ICPM business meetings".

34. The base level of implementation for a one-year work programme involves:

- one meeting of the ICPM;
- one meeting of the Standards Committee;
- two expert working groups to draft standards;
- one Glossary/Review group;

- one Technical Consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations; and
- one ICPM business meeting.

35. Extension of the basic work programme to follow proposals from strategic planning and assuming the provision of adequate resources includes:

- an additional meeting of the Standards Committee and meetings of the expert working group as necessary;
- additional expert working groups to draft standards;
- regional technical consultations on draft standards;
- technical consultations, expert working groups and joint working groups with other organizations on special topics;
- one meeting of an expert working group for the technical review of measures;
- several ICPM business meetings (information exchange, technical assistance, strategic planning, dispute settlement, etc.); and
- seminars, workshops, and other activities related to technical assistance.

36. The level of implementation for the work programme depends on funding and personnel resources as well as the priorities set by the ICPM. It should also be recognized that other aspects of the work programme require a degree of flexibility to accommodate changing circumstances.

37. Although the ICPM has recommended two meetings of the Interim Standards Committee each year, only one meeting can be fully funded by FAO. A second meeting is possible where countries voluntarily cover the costs associated with their experts participation and the savings is sufficient to organize an additional meeting.

38. Adopting the proposal for a 21-member Standards Committee (ICPM01/4) also has financial implications which could result in either greater or lesser costs to the work programme depending on the number of participants requiring assistance.

39. Assuming that the ICPM places a high priority on the Standards Committee and it will be possible to continue with two meetings each year, the Secretariat proposes that the earlier meeting (currently in May) devote its effort primarily to the approval of draft standards being sent to governments for consultation. This would allow governments to routinely plan for consultation each year in the period June to September. The second meeting of the Standards Committee (in October/November) would then consider the comments submitted by governments and devote its efforts primarily to finalizing standards for submission to the ICPM.

40. For certain standards that may be drafted in the January to May period, this provides the possibility for completion within one year. For standards drafted later in the year, the development period requires minimum 18 months. This provides the opportunity for an additional expert working group or extended consultation if required.

41. An important advantage of harmonization, particularly for developing countries, is that it provides the opportunity for countries to base their phytosanitary measures on standards rather than undertake the analyses needed to justify measures. ISPMs adopted to date have been designed to provide the foundation for higher levels of specificity in future standards thereby increasing the opportunities for national measures to be based on standards.

42. As the IPPC moves further into standard-setting that involves specific measures, the need for consistency and a transparent and systematic process for the technical review of measures specified in ISPMs becomes more critical. The drafting of ISPMs for wood packing and systems approaches have been hampered by the lack of criteria and procedures for evaluating the efficacy of specific measures. Other organizations (e.g. the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the Office International des Epizooties) have had similar experiences which emphasize the advantages of a systematic process over ad hoc processes.

43. For strategic planning purposes, the Secretariat has anticipated the need for consultations to identify criteria and establish procedures. The Secretariat further anticipates the need for periodic meetings of an expert group for the technical review of measures based on the criteria and systems that may be put in place by the ICPM.

ANNEX 3

Provisional calendar

44. Following are calendars describing the implementation of the work programme 2000-2004. The calendar for 2000 reflects the work programme of the past year. Calendars for 2001-2004 are provisional. These calendars propose a schedule for routine events and distinguish the basic work programme and possibilities for extending implementation. They are designed to help:

- establish a regular program;
- identify scheduling possibilities;
- identify resource requirements; and
- categorize activity areas.

45. The calendar is based on a model that follows the existing arrangements with the addition of activities corresponding to the availability of time, personnel and the possibilities for support by the Secretariat.

Table 1. Model ICPM Activity Calendar*

	Administration	Expert Working Groups (WGs) for ISPMs	Technical Consultations (TCs) and Expert WGs on special topics	Seminars, workshops and other technical assistance
January	<i>Information exchange</i>			<i>workshop</i>
February		Glossary/Review	<i>WG on a special topic</i>	
March		WG - new ISPM		<i>workshop</i>
April	ICPM			
May	Standards Committee			
June		<i>WG - new ISPM</i>	<i>WG on a special topic</i>	<i>workshop</i>
July		<i>WG - new ISPM</i>		
August			<i>Regional TCs on ISPMs</i>	
September	<i>Dispute settlement</i>	<i>WG - new ISPM</i>	TC among RPPOs	<i>workshop</i>
October	<i>Strategic planning Technical assistance</i>	WG - new ISPM	<i>WG for the technical review of measures</i>	
November	<i>Standards Committee</i>			<i>workshop</i>
December	Preparation of ICPM documents			

*Basic FAO-funded work programme indicated in **bold**; additions are indicated in *italic*.

Notes:

- The listing of **Administration** meetings includes examples based on current programme structures. Meetings may be more or less frequent and may be informal, ad hoc, or permanent, depending on circumstances and decisions taken by the ICPM.
- **Expert Working Groups (WGs) for ISPMs** are distinguished from other expert meetings to indicate their routine nature and specific function in support of standard-setting. Glossary/Review refers to the current Glossary Working Group with the added responsibility for the review of existing standards on a periodic basis or as specified by the ICPM.
- **Technical Consultations and Expert Working Groups on special topics** include open-ended working groups, expert and other consultations, exploratory meetings, and other meetings designed to address specific technical concepts, issues, interpretations, and applications related to the understanding and implementation of the IPPC.
- **Workshops, seminars, and other technical assistance** includes technical assistance initiatives that may be specified by the ICPM as well as those that may be undertaken by the Secretariat in direct support of ICPM initiatives and objectives.

46. Following is the calendar of 2000. The calendar includes:

- routine events (e.g., the TC among RPPOs);
- activities specified by the ICPM (e.g., WGs for standards and special topics); and
- activities that were undertaken by the Secretariat (e.g., workshops).

Table 2. Calendar of 2000

	Administration	Expert Working Groups (WGs) for ISPMs	Technical Consultations (TCs) and Expert WGs on special topics	Seminars, workshops and other technical assistance
January		WG on pest listing		
February				
March	Informal WG on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance	Glossary WG	Open-ended WG on official control	
April	Informal WG on the composition of the Standards Committee			
May	Interim Standards Committee WG on Dispute settlement procedures			
June		WG on wood packing WG on RNQP	Exploratory WG on Phytosanitary Aspects of GMOs, Biosafety, and Invasive Species	Workshop on forest biosecurity Workshop on PRA
July		WG on systems approaches		
August		WG on pest reporting	Regional TC on standards in consultation	Workshop on PRA
September		Ad hoc WG on information exchange		Workshop on PRA
October	Informal WG on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance		TC among RPPOs	Workshop on Inspection Methodology
November	Interim Standards Committee			Workshop on PRA
December	Prepared documents for ICPM-3			

Table 3. Calendar 2001 - 2005

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
January					
February		Glossary Economic importance	Glossary (including discussion on uncertainty)	Glossary	Glossary
March		ICPM -Pest listing -Pest reporting -RNQP -Systems approach Dispute settlement committee	ICPM -Economic importance -Wood packaging -Import regulatory system -Inspection methodology -PRA for environmental impact -Irradiation Dispute settlement committee	ICPM -Surveillance for citrus canker -Efficacy of phytosanitary measures -LMOs -PRA for RNQP Dispute settlement committee	ICPM -Low pest prevalence
April					
May	Standards Committee -Pest listing -Pest reporting -Wood packaging -RNQP -Systems approach	Standards Committee -Wood packaging -Economic importance -Import regulatory system -Irradiation -Inspection methodology -Risk analysis for environmental impact	Standards Committee -Surveillance for citrus canker -LMOs -PRA for RNQP -Efficacy of phytosanitary measures	Standards Committee -Low pest prevalence	
June					
July	PRA for environmental impact	Surveillance for citrus canker	Low pest prevalence		
August	Regional Technical Consultation(s)	Regional Technical Consultation(s)	Regional Technical Consultation(s)	Regional Technical Consultation(s)	
September	Surveillance for citrus canker Development of discussion paper on LMOs	LMOs PRA for RNQP			
October	PRA for RNQP Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance RPPO Technical Consultation	Efficacy of phytosanitary measures Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance RPPO Technical Consultation	Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance RPPO Technical Consultation	Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance RPPO Technical Consultation	
November	Standards Committee -Pest listing -Pest reporting -RNQP -Systems approaches -Irradiation	Standards Committee -Wood packaging -Import regulatory system -Economic importance -Irradiation -Inspection methodology -PRA for environmental impact	Standards Committee -Surveillance for citrus canker -LMOs -PRA for RNQP -Efficacy of phytosanitary measures	Standards Committee -Low pest prevalence	
December					

**PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR THE FOURTH INTERIM COMMISSION ON
PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES**

1. Opening of the Session
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Report by the Chairperson
4. Report of the Secretariat
5. Adoption of International Standards
6. Items Arising from the Third Session of the Interim Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
7. Work Programme for Harmonization
8. Status of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)
9. Other Business
10. Date and Venue of the Next Meeting
11. Adoption of the Report

LIST OF DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS**LISTE DES DÉLÉGUÉS ET OBSERVATEURS****LISTA DE DELEGADOS Y OBSERVADORES**

Chairperson : John HEDLEY
Président : (New Zealand)
Presidente :

Vice-Chairpersons: Orlando MORALES VALENCIA
Vice-Présidents : (Chile)
Vicepresidentes : V. RAGUNATHAN
(India)

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

MEMBRES DU COMITÉ

MIEMBROS DEL COMITÉ

ALGERIA/ALGÉRIE/ARGELIA

Représentant

Ahmed HACHEMI
Représentant permanent adjoint
de la République algérienne auprès
de la FAO
Ambassade de la République algérienne
démocratique et populaire
Via Barnaba Oriani, 26
00197 Rome
Italie
Tel.: 39-06-80687620
Fax: 39-06-8083436

Suppléant

Sid Ali MOUMEN
Directeur de la Protection des végétaux
et des contrôles techniques
Ministère de l'Agriculture
Boulevard Colonel Amirouche, 12
Alger
Algérie
Tel.: 213-21-749566
Fax: 213-21-429349
E-mail: moumen_sa@yahoo.com

ANGOLA

Représentant

Kia Mateva KIALA
Conseiller
Représentant permanent adjoint
de la République d'Angola auprès
de la FAO
Ambassade de la République d'Angola
Via Filippo Bernardini, 21
00165 Rome
Italie
Tel.: 39-06-39366902 / 6941
Fax: 39-06-634960
E-mail: kialakia@tiscalinet.it

ARGENTINA/ARGENTINE

Representante

Sra. Diana María GUILLÉN
Directora Nacional de Protección Vegetal
SENASA (Servicio Nacional de Sanidad y
Calidad Agroalimentaria)
Paseo Colón, 367 - 7 piso
Buenos Aires 1063
Argentina
Tel.: 54-1143316041 ext. 1706/10
Fax: 54-1143427588
E-mail: dguillen@inea.com.ar

ARMENIA/ARMÉNIE

Representative

Levon RUKHKYAN
Chief of Science and Education
Department
Ministry of Agriculture
Nalbandyan Street, 48
375010 Yerevan
Armenia
Tel.: 3741-524860
Fax: 3741-523793
E-mail: newton@infocom.am

AUSTRALIA/AUSTRALIE

Representative

Brian STYNES
General Manager
Plant Biosecurity
Biosecurity Australia
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries
and Forestry
GPO Box 858
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Tel.: 61-2-62724042
Fax: 61-2-62723307
E-mail: brian.stynes@affa.gov.au

Associate

Christopher W. HOOD
 Senior Manager
 Plant Biosecurity
 Biosecurity Australia
 Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries
 and Forestry
 GPO Box 858
 Canberra ACT 2601
 Australia
 Tel.: 61-2-62724878
 Fax: 61-2-62723307
 E-mail: chris.w.hood@affa.gov.au

Alternate

William ROBERTS
 Chief Plant Protection Officer
 National Offices of Animal and
 Plant Health
 Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries
 and Forestry
 GPO Box 858
 Canberra ACT 2601
 Australia
 Tel.: 61-2-62716534
 Fax: 61-2-62725835
 E-mail: bill.roberts@affa.gov.au

Paul ROSS
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO
 Australian Embassy
 Via Alessandria, 215
 00198 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-852721
 Fax: 39-06-85272230
 E-mail: paul.ross@dfat.gov.au

AUSTRIA/AUTRICHE

Representative

Michael KURZWEIL
 Senior Officer, Phytosanitary Affairs
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and
 Environment and Water Management
 Stubenring, 1
 A-1012 Wien
 Austria
 Tel.: 43-1-711002819
 Fax: 43-1-5138722
 E-mail: michael.kurzweil@bmlf.gv.at

Alternate

Ewald DANGL
 Legal Adviser
 Phytosanitary Measures
 Federal Ministry of Agriculture
 Stubenring, 1
 A-1012 Vienna
 Austria
 Tel.: 43-1-711005842
 Fax: 43-1-711006503
 E-mail: ewald.dangl@bmlf.gv.at

**AZERBAIJAN/AZERBAÏDJAN/
AZERBAIJÁN**

Representative

Mehraj Mammad ALIYEV
 Head of Department of Plant Protection
 and Quarantine
 Ministry of Agriculture
 U. Hajibayov st., 40
 Government House, Box 370016
 Baku
 Azerbaijan
 Tel.: 99412-901563;902464
 Fax: 99412-901563

Alternate

Samir Husein MUSAYEV
 Senior Officer
 Department of International Relations
 Ministry of Agriculture
 U. Hajibayov st., 40
 Government House, Box 370016
 Baku
 Azerbaijan
 Tel.: 99412-980259
 Fax: 99412-980257
 email: msamir_minagre@hotmail.com

BANGLADESH

Representative

Mohammad MEJBAHUDDIN
 Economic Counsellor
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 of Bangladesh to FAO
 Embassy of Bangladesh
 Via Antonio Bertoloni, 14
 00197 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-8078541
 Fax: 39-06-8084853
 E-mail: embangrm@mclink.it

BELGIUM/BELGIQUE/BÉLGICA

Représentant

Dirk VERMAERKE
 Conseiller général à l'Inspection générale
 des végétaux et produits végétaux
 Ministère des classes moyennes et
 de l'Agriculture
 WTC III DG4 IG2
 Blvd. Simon Bolivar, 30
 1000 Bruxelles
 Belgique
 Tel.: 32-02-2083686
 Fax: 32-02-2083716
 E-mail: dirk.vermaerke@cmlag.fgov.be

BOLIVIA/BOLIVIE

Representante

Sra. Mireya DURAN
 Representante alterno
 Representación Permanente de Bolivia
 ante la FAO
 Via Brenta, 2a - Int. 28
 00198 Roma
 Italia
 Tel.: 39-06-8841001
 Fax: 39-06-8840740
 E-mail: embolroma@rmnet.it

BOTSWANA

Representative

Molatlhegi MODISE
 Chief Plant Protection Officer
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Division of Plant Protection
 Private Bag 0091
 Gaborone
 Botswana
 Tel.: 267-328745/6
 Fax: 267-328768
 E-mail: MolModise@gov.bw

BRAZIL/BRÉSIL/BRASIL

Representative

João Mauricio CABRAL DE MELLO
 Second Secretary
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 to FAO
 Via di S. Maria dell'Anima, 32
 00186 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-6789353
 Fax: 39-06-68398802
 E-mail: rebrafao@tin.it

Sra. Tania MENDES DIAS
 Directora de Defesa Vegetal
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Esplanada dos Ministérios, Block D
 Anexo B, Gabinete DDIIV
 Brasilia, D.F.
 Brazil
 Tel.: 55-61-3223250
 Fax: 55-61-2243874
 E-mail: tdias@agricultura.gov.br

Sr Rogério PEREIRA DIAS
 Defesa Vegetal
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Esplanada dos Ministérios, Block D
 Anexo B, Gabinete DDIIV
 Brasilia, D.F.
 Brazil
 Tel.: 55-61-2182675
 Fax: 55-61-2243874
 E-mail: rogeriodias@agricultura.gov.br

BULGARIA/BULGARIE

Representative

Krassimir KOSTOV
 Permanent Representative
 Permanent Representation of the Republic
 of Bulgaria to FAO
 Via Pietro Paolo Rubens, 21
 00197 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-3224640/3224643
 Fax: 39-06-3226122
 E-mail: kikostov@yahoo.com

CAMEROON/CAMEROUN/CAMERÚN

Représentant

Marc SAMATANA
 Directeur de la Production agricole
 Ministère de l'agriculture
 Yaoundé
 Cameroon

CANADA/CANADÁ

Representative

Blair HANKEY
 Deputy Permanent Representative
 of Canada to FAO
 Canadian Embassy
 Via Zara, 30
 00198 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-44598551
 Fax: 39-06-44598930

Alternate

Robert CARBERRY
 Director
 Plant Health and Production Division
 Canadian Food Inspection Agency
 Camelot Drive,59
 Nepean, Ontario
 Canada
 Tel.: 1-613-2252342
 Fax: 1-613-2286606
 E-mail: carberryr@em.agr.ca

Reinouw BAST-TJEERDE
 International Standards Advisor
 Plant Health and Production Division
 Canadian Food Inspection Agency
 Camelot Drive,59
 Nepean, Ontario
 Canada
 Tel.: 1-613-2252342
 Fax: 1-613-2286626
 E-mail: rbast@em.agr.ca

CAPE VERDE/CAP-VERT/CABO VERDE

Représentant

Arnaldo DELGADO
 Conseiller
 Représentant permanent adjoint auprès
 de la FAO
 Ambassade de la République du Cap-Vert
 Via Giosué Carducci, 4 int.3
 00187 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-4744678
 Fax: 39-06-4744643

CHILE/CHILI

Representante

Fernando PEÑA ROYO
 Ingeniero Agrónomo
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Av. Bulnes, 140
 Santiago de Chile
 Chile
 Tel.: 39-06-8417450
 Fax: 39-06-85350427

Angel SARTORI ARELLANO
 Embajador
 Representante Permanente
 de la República de Chile ante la FAO
 Via Po, 22
 00198 Roma
 Italia
 Tel.: 39-06-8417450
 Fax: 39-06-85350427

Suplente

Antonio PLAZA
 Segundo Secretario
 Representación Permanente de
 la República de Chile ante la FAO
 Via Po, 22
 00198 Roma
 Italia
 Tel.: 39-06-8417450
 Fax: 39-06-85350427

Orlando MORALES
 Secretario General del Servicio Agrícola
 y Ganadero
 Director Nacional Subrogante y Jefe del
 Departamento de Protección Agrícola
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Av. Bulnes ,140
 Santiago de Chile
 Chile

CHINA/CHINE

Representative

Youquan CHEN
 Deputy Division Director
 Department of Crop Production
 Management
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Nong Zhan Guan Nan Li, 11
 Beijing 100026
 China
 Tel.: 86-10-64192813
 Fax: 86-10-64192815
 E-mail: nyszzc@agri.gov.cn

Associate

Yimin CHEN
 Agricultural Officer
 Agriculture Fisheries & Conservation
 Hong Kong
 China

Alternate

Chunlin WANG
 Division Director
 Division of Plant Quarantine
 National Agro-Technical Extension
 and Service Center
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Maizidian Street, 20
 Beijing 100026
 China
 Tel.: 86-10-64194524
 Fax: 86-10-64194726
 E-mail: wangchunlin@agri.gov.cn

Minggang ZHAO
 Deputy Division Director
 State Administration for Entry-Exit
 Inspection and Quarantine
 No. A10 Chaowaidajie
 Beijing 100020
 China
 Tel.: 86-10-65993921
 Fax: 86-10-65993869

Weimin LI
 State Administration for Entry-Exit
 Inspection and Quarantine
 No. A10 Chaowaidajie
 Beijing 100029
 China

Quinghu FENG
 Department of International Treaty
 & Law,
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs
 Chaoyangmen Nandajie, 2
 Beijing
 China

COLOMBIA/COLOMBIE

Representante
 Bernardo E. ZULUATA BOTERO
 Representante Permanente Adjunto
 Embajada de la República de Colombia
 Via Giuseppe Pisanelli, 4, int. 10
 00196 Roma
 Italia
 Tel.: 39-06-3202405
 Fax: 39-06-3225798
 E-mail: emitalia@tin.it

**CONGO, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF
 THE/CONGO, REPUBLIQUE
 DEMOCRATIQUE DU/CONGO,
 REPUBBLICA DEMOCRATICA DEL**

Représentant
 Maurice PHOBA DINKA
 Chargé des Relations
 FAO/PAM/FIDA
 Ambassade de la République
 démocratique du Congo
 Via Barberini, 3
 00187 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-402010779
 Fax: 39-06-42010779

COSTA RICA

Representante
 Sra. Victoria GUARDIA
 Embajador
 Representante Permanente
 Misión Permanente de Costa Rica ante
 la FAO
 Via Bartolomeo Eustachio, 22
 00161 Roma
 Italia
 Tel.: 39-06-44251046
 Fax: 39-06-44251048
 E-mail: misfao@tiscalinet.it

Suplente
 Luis ECHEVERRIA CASASOLA
 Subdirector Sanidad Vegetal
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
 Apdo Postal 70-3006 Barreal Heredia
 Costa Rica
 Tel.: 506-2608300
 Fax: 506-2608301
 E-mail: lecheverria@protecnet.go.cr

Sra. Yolanda GAGO
 Ministro Consejero
 Representante Permanente Alterno
 Misión Permanente de Costa Rica
 ante la FAO
 Via Bartolomeo Eustachio, 22
 00161 Roma
 Italia
 Tel.: 39-06-44251046
 Fax: 39-06-44251048
 E-mail: emb.costa@mix.it

Sra. Katia MELONI
Asistente
Representación Permanente de la
República de Costa Rica ante la FAO
Via Bartolomeo Eustachio, 22
00161 Roma
Italia
Tel.: 39-06-44251046
Fax: 39-06-44251048
E-mail: misfao@tiscalinet.it

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

Représentant
Lucien KOUAME KONAN
Sous Directeur de la Protection des
Végétaux
Direction des productions végétales
Ministère de l'Agriculture et des
Ressources Animales
Abidjan 01
Côte d'Ivoire
E-mail: isysphyt@aviso.ci

Aboubakar BAKAYOKU
Représentant Permanent Adjoint
Ambassade de la République de
Côte d'Ivoire
Via Guglielmo Saliceto, 8
00161 Rome
Italie
Tel.: 39-06-44231129
Fax: 39-06-44292531
E-mail: ambaci@tiscalinet.it

CUBA

Representante
Humberto VAZQUEZ VEGA
Director General Sanidad Vegetal
Ministerio Agricultura
Ayuntamiento, 231
c/San Pedro y Lombilla
La Habana
Cuba
Tel.: 53-7-791339
Fax: 53-7-703277
E-mail: cnsv@ceniai.inf.cu

Suplente
Sra. Maria Julia CARDENAS BARRIOS
Subdirectora Centro Nacional Sanidad
Vegetal
Ministerio de Agricultura
Ayuntamiento, 231
c/San Pedro y Lombillo, Pza de la Revolución
La Habana
Cuba
Tel.: 53-7-700925
Fax: 53-7-703277
E-mail: cnsv@ceniai.inf.cu

CYPRUS/CHYPRE/CHIPRE

Representative
Andreas ROUSHIAS
Alternate Permanent Representative
Permanent Representation of the
Republic of Cyprus to FAO
Piazza Farnese, 44
00186 Rome
Italy
Tel.: 39-06-6865758
Fax: 39-06-68807356
E-mail: faoprcyp@tin.it

CZECH REPUBLIC/ REPUBLIQUE TCHEQUE/ REPUBLICA CHECA

Representative
Roman VÁGNER
International Relations Department
State Phytosanitary Administration
Ministry of Agriculture
Tesov, 17
11705 Praha 1
Czech Republic
Tel.: 420-2-21812270
Fax: 420-2-21812804
E-mail: roman.vagner@ATLAS.cz

**DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC
OF KOREA/
RÉPUBLIQUE POPULAIRE
DÉMOCRATIQUE DE CORÉE/
REPÚBLICA POPULAR
DEMOCRÁTICA DE COREA**

Representative

Hak Bong HYON
Deputy Representative
Permanent Representation of the
Democratic People's Republic of Korea
to FAO
Via Ludovico di Savoia, 23
00185 Rome
Italy
Tel.: 39-06-77209094
Fax: 39-06-77209111

Alternate

Hyong Chol RI
Second Secretary
Permanent Representation of the
Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea
to FAO
Via Ludovico di Savoia, 23
00185 Rome
Italy
Tel.: 39-06-77209094
Fax: 39-06-77209111

DENMARK/DANEMARK/DINAMARCA

Representative

Ms. Dorrit KRABBE
Head of Section
Ministry for Food, Agriculture and
Fisheries
Holberggade, 2
Copenhagen 1057
Denmark
Tel.: 45-33-922060
Fax: 45-33-124686
E-mail: dkr@fvm.dk

EL SALVADOR

Representante

Luis Rafael ARÉVALO
Director General de Sanidad Vegetal y
Animal
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
Final 1a Av. Norte y Av. Manuel Gallardo
Departamento de La Libertad
Nueva San Salvador
Tel.: 503-288-5220
Fax: 503-288-9029
E-mail: reg.fis@salnet.net

**EQUATORIAL GUINEA/
GUINÉE ÉQUATORIALE/
GUINEA ECUATORIAL**

Representante

Gregorio BOHO CAMO
Ministro de Estado de Agricultura,
Ganadería y Desarrollo Rural
Malabo
Ecuatorial Guinea

Gabriel Martín ESONO NDONG
Director General de los Servicios
Veterinarios
Malabo
Ecuatorial Guinea

Suplente

Sra. Emiliana MIA ANDEME
Malabo
Equatorial Guinea

ERITREA/ÉRYTHRÉE

Representative

Yohannes TENSUE
Alternate Permanent Representative
of Eritrea to FAO
Embassy of Eritrea
Via Boncompagni, 16
00187 Rome
Italy
Tel.: 39-06-4274 1293
Fax: 39-06-4208 6806

ESTONIA/ESTONIE

Representative

Ilmar MANDMETS
 Permanent Representative of Estonia to
 FAO
 Embassy of the Republic of Estonia
 Viale Liegi, 28
 00198 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-8440751
 Fax: 39-06-844075119
 E-mail: ilmar.mandmets@estemb.it

**EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (MEMBER
 ORGANIZATION)/
 COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE
 (ORGANISATION AFFILIEE)/
 COMUNIDAD EUROPEA
 (ORGANIZACION AFILIADA)**

Représentant

Dieter OBST
 Chef Adjoint d'Unité
 Direction Générale SANCO
 Unité Phytosanitaire
 Commission Européenne
 Rue de la Loi, 200
 B-1040 Bruxelles
 Belgique
 Tel.: 32-2-2952432
 Fax: 32-2-2369399
 E-mail: dieter.obst@cec.eu.int

Suppléant

Marc VEREECKE
 Administrateur Principal
 Direction Générale SANCO
 Unité Phytosanitaire
 Commission Européenne
 Rue de la Loi, 200
 B-1049 Bruxelles
 Belgique
 Tel.: 32-2-2963260
 Fax: 32-2-2969399
 E-mail: marc.vereecke@cec.eu.int

Mme Frances-Anne HUNTER
 Attachée
 Délégation de la Commission
 européenne auprès de la FAO
 Via IV Novembre, 149
 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-6793755
 Fax: 39-06-6797830
 E-mail: mc1922@mclink.it

FINLAND/FINLANDE/FINLANDIA

Representative

Ralph LOPIAN
 Senior Officer
 Head of Plan Protection Section
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 PL 30, 00023 Valtioneuvosto
 Finland
 Tel.: 358-9-1602449
 Fax: 358-9-1602443
 E-mail: ralph.lopian@mmm.fi

Alternate

Ms Tiina Mari MARTIMO
 Senior Officer
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 Department of Agriculture and Forestry
 Kaisaniemenkatu, 4A
 PO Box 232
 FIN-00171 Helsinki
 Finland
 Tel.: 358-9-16088660
 Fax: 358-9-1602443
 E-mail: tiinamari.martimo@mmm.fi

Ms Ulla-Maija FINSKAS
 Permanent Representative of
 Finland to FAO
 Embassy of the Republic of Finland
 Via Lisbona, 3
 00198 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-852 231 / 852-23318
 Fax: 39-06-854 0362
 E-mail: ulla.maija.finskas@formin.fi

FRANCE/FRANCIA

Représentant

Michel THIBIER
 Conseiller scientifique
 Représentant Permanent adjoint
 Représentation Permanente de la
 France auprès de l'OAA
 Corso del Rinascimento, 52
 00186 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-6865305
 Fax: 39-06-6892692
 E-mail: rpfrancefao@interbusiness.it

Suppléant

Mme Françoise PETTER
Sous-Direction de la qualité et de la
protection des végétaux
Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Pêche
Paris
France
Tel.: 33-1-495581-88
Fax: 33-1-49555949

Eric SCHOONEJANS
Biotechnologies
Direction de la Prévention des
Pollutions et des Risques
Ministère de l'Aménagement du
Territoire et de l'Environnement
Avenue Segur, 20
75302 Paris
France
Tel.: 33-1-42191417
Fax: 33-1-42191467
eric.schoonejans@environnement.gouv.fr

GERMANY/ALLEMAGNE/ALEMANIA

Representative

Ralf PETZOLD
Federal Ministry of Consumers
Protection, Food & Agriculture
Rochusstrasse, 1
53123 Bonn
Germany
Tel.: 49-228-52933527
Fax: 49-228-5294406
E-mail: petzold@bmvel.bund.de

Alternate

Ms Karola SCHORN
Federal Ministry of Consumers
Protection, Food & Agriculture
Rochusstrasse, 1
53123 Bonn
Germany
Tel.: 49-228-5293590
Fax: 49-228-5294406
E-mail: karola.schorn@bmvel.bund.de

Jens-Georg UNGER
Biologische Bundesanstalt für
Land-und Forstwirtschaft
38104 Braunschweig
Germany
Tel.: 49-531-2993370
Fax: 49-531-2993007
E-mail: AG.B5@BBA.de

GREECE/GRÈCE/GRECIA

Representative

Emmanuel MANOUSSAKIS
International Organizations
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
c/o Greek Embassy
Via Mercadante, 36
00198 Rome
Italy
Tel.: 39-06-85496630
Fax: 39-06-8415927

Christos LOIZOU
Plant Production and Protection
Directorate
Ministry of Agriculture
Acharnon Street, 5
Athens
Greece

GUATEMALA

Representante

Acisclo VALLADARES MOLINA
Embajador ante la Santa Sede
Representante Permanente de
Guatemala ante la FAO
Piazzale Gregorio VII, 65
00165 Roma
Italia
Tel.: 39-06-6381632
Fax: 39-06-39376981
E-mail: embaguate.fao@tin.it

Suplente

Guillermo DE LEON AGREDA
Coordinador Unidad Normas y
Regulaciones (UNR)
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería
y Alimentación
7a Avenida 12-90, Zona 13
Edificio Monja Blanca
Ciudad de Guatemala
Guatemala
E-mail: UNR@terra.com.gt

Sra. Rita CLAVERIE SCIOLLI
Representante Permanente Adjunto
de Guatemala ante la FAO
Via Colli della Farnesina, 128
00194 Roma
Italia
Tel.: 39-06-36307392
Fax: 39-06-3291639

Sra. Adelina VITERI DE BRUNO
 Representante Permanente Alterno de
 Guatemala ante la FAO
 Embajada de Guatemala
 Via Colli della Farnesina, 128
 00194 Roma
 Italia
 Tel.: 39-06-36307392
 Fax: 39-06-3291639

HONDURAS

Representante
 José Adalberto ZUNIGA REYES
 Coordinador proyecto
 nacional de vigilancia fitosanitaria
 Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
 Tegucigalpa
 HONDURAS

Suplente
 Sra. Mayra REINA
 Representante Permanente Alterno
 de la República de Honduras ante la FAO
 Representación Permanente de
 la República de Honduras
 Roma
 Italia
 Tel.: 39-06-3207236
 Fax: 39-6-3207973

HUNGARY/HONGRIE/HUNGRÍA

Representative
 István FÉSÜS
 Department of Plant Protection
 Ministry of Agriculture and Regional
 Development
 Kossuth Lajos-tér, 11
 1055 Budapest
 Hungary
 Tel.: 36-1-3014539
 Fax: 36-1-3014644
 E-mail: istvan.fesus@f.m.x400gw.itb.hu

INDIA/INDE

Representative
 V. RAGUNATHAN
 Plant Protection Advisor
 Directorate of Plant Protection,
 Quarantine & Storage
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Government of India
 B Wing, Shastri Bhavan, 409
 New Delhi-110 001
 India
 Tel.: 91-11-3385026
 Fax: 91-11-3384182
 E-mail: v.r.ragunathan@usa.net

Alternate
 Ms Neela GANGADHARAN
 Minister Agriculture and
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 of the Republic of India to FAO
 Embassy of the Republic of India
 Via XX Settembre, 5
 00187 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-4884642
 Fax: 39-06-4819539
 E-mail: ind.emb@flashnet.it

INDONESIA/INDONÉSIE

Representative
 Inyoman ARDHA
 Agricultural Attaché
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 of the Republic of Indonesia to FAO
 Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia
 Via Campania, 55
 00187 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-4200911
 Fax: 39-06-4880280
 E-mail: indoroma@box1.tin.it

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)/ IRAN (RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D')/ IRÁN (REPÚBLICA ISLÁMICA DEL)

Representative
 Mostafa JAFARI
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 Permanent Representation of the
 Islamic Republic of Iran to FAO
 Via Aventina, 8
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-5743594
 Fax: 39-06-5747636
 E-mail: pm.ir.iranfao@flashnet.it

IRAQ

Representative

Bader Jassim ALLAWI
 Ambassador
 Permanent Representative
 Permanent Representation of
 the Republic of Iraq to FAO
 Via della Camilluccia, 355
 00135 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-3014508
 Fax: 39-06-3014359

IRELAND/IRLANDE/IRLANDA

Representative

Tony DEVLIN
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 of Ireland to FAO
 Embassy of Ireland
 Piazza di Campitelli, 3
 00186 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-6979121
 Fax: 39-06-6792354
 E-mail: registry@irishembassy.it

ISRAEL/ISRAËL

Representative

Miriam FREUND
 Acting Deputy Director
 Plant Protection and Inspection Services
 Ministry of Agriculture
 P.O. Box 78
 Bet-Dagan 50250
 Israel
 Tel.: 972-3-9681561
 Fax: 972-3-9681582
 E-mail: miriamf@maog.gov.il

Representative

Eldad LANDSHUT
 Director
 Plant Protection and Inspection Services
 Ministry of Agriculture
 P.O.Box 78
 Bet-Degan 50250
 Israel
 Tel.: 972-3-9681500
 Fax: 972-3-9603005
 E-mail: eldadl@moag.gov.il

ITALY/ITALIE/ITALIA

Représentant

Bruno Caio FARAGLIA
 Funzionario Servizio Fitosanitario
 Ministère des politiques agricoles et
 forestières
 Via XX Settembre, 20
 00187 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-46656088
 Fax: 39-06-4814628
 E-mail: b.faraglia@politicheagricole.it

JAPAN/JAPON/JAPÓN

Representative

Kazuo OKUTOMI
 Director of Plant Quarantine Office
 Plant Protection Division
 Agricultural Production Bureau
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and
 Fisheries
 1-2-1 Kasumigaseki
 Chiyoda-Ku
 Tokyo
 Japan
 Tel.: 81-03-3502-8111
 Fax: 81-03-3591-6640

Alternate

Hiroshi AKIYAMA
 Director of Planning and
 Coordination Section
 Research Division
 Yokohama Plant Protection Station
 Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and
 Fisheries
 5-57 Kitanaka-dori
 Naka-ku, Yokohama
 Japan
 Tel.: 81-045-211-7164
 Fax: 81-045-211-0890
 E-mail: nysb0101@sp.ippn.ne.jp

Masato ITO
 Minister
 Permanent Representative
 of Japan to FAO
 Embassy of Japan
 Via Quintino Sella, 60
 00187 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-487991
 Fax: 39-06-4873316
 E-mail: nysb0101@sp.ippn.ne.jp

KENYA

Representative

Chagema KEDERA
 Managing Director
 Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service
 P.O. Box 49592
 Nairobi
 Kenya
 Tel.: 254-2-440087
 Fax: 254-2-448940
 E-mail: kephis@nbnet.co.ke

Alternate

Joseph K. BOINNET
 Second Secretary
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 to FAO
 Embassy of the Republic of Kenya
 Via Archimede, 164
 00197 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-8082714
 Fax: 39-06-8082707
 E-mail: kenroma@linet.it

**KOREA, REPUBLIC OF/
 CORÉE, RÉPUBLIQUE DE/
 COREA, REPÚBLICA DE**

Representative

Shin CHANG-HO
 Deputy Director
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 Integrated Government Building
 Choongang-dong, Gwacheon, 1
 Seoul
 Republic of Korea
 Tel.: 82-2-5001722
 Fax: 82-2-5072095
 E-mail: sch@maf.go.kr

Alternate

Kwon CHAE-SOON
 Deputy Director
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 National Plant Quarantine Service
 Republic of Korea
 E-mail: cskwon@maf.go.kr

LEBANON/LIBAN/LÍBANO

Représentant

Samir EL-KHOURY
 Ambassadeur
 Représentant permanent de la
 République Libanaise auprès de la FAO
 Ambassade de la République Libanaise
 Via Giacomo Carissimi,38
 00198 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-853 7211
 Fax: 39-06-841 1794

Suppléant

Fadi HAJJALI
 Représentant Permanent Suppléant
 Premier Secrétaire
 Ambassade de la République Libanaise
 Via Giacomo Carissimi, 38
 00198 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-8537211
 Fax: 39-06-8411794

**LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA/
 JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBYENNE/
 JAMAHIRIYA ÁRABE LIBIA**

Representative

Issam Mahgoub ZAWIA
 Counsellor
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 Permanent Representation
 of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya to FAO
 Via Nomentana, 365
 00189 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-8603880
 Fax: 39-06-8603880

MADAGASCAR

Représentant

MONJA
 Conseiller
 Représentant permanent adjoint
 de la République de Madagascar
 auprès de la FAO
 Ambassade de la République
 de Madagascar
 Via Riccardo Zandonai, 84A
 00187 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-630 0183
 Fax: 39-06-329 4306

MALAYSIA/MALAISIE/MALASIA

Representative

Ismail BIN IBRAHIM
 Director General Agriculture
 Department of Agriculture
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Wisma Tani
 50632 Kuala Lumpur
 Malaysia
 Tel.: 60-3-26928854
 Fax: 60-3-26985746
 E-mail: doa13@pop.moa.my

Alternate

Roseley BIN KHALID
 Agricultural Attaché
 Alternate Permanent Representative to
 FAO
 Embassy of Malaysia
 Via Nomentana, 297
 00162 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-8419296
 Fax: 39-06-8555110
 E-mail: malagrirn@pronet.it

MALI/MALÍ

Représentant

Modibo Mahamane TOURE
 Deuxième Conseiller de l'Ambassade
 Représentant Permanent suppléant
 auprès de la FAO
 Via Antonio Bosio, 2
 00161 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-44254068
 Fax: 39-06-44254029

MALTA/MALTE

Representative

Victor FARRUGIA
 Ministry for Agriculture and Fisheries
 Plant Health Division
 Barriera Wharf
 Valletta CMR 01
 Malta
 Tel.: 356-435898
 Fax: 356-433112
 E-mail: victor.farrugia@magnet.mt

MAURITANIA/MAURITANIE

Représentant

Ould Mohamed Ahid TOURAD
 Représentant Permanent Adjoint
 Ambassade de la République islamique
 de Mauritanie
 Via Paisiello, 26, int.5
 00198 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-85351530
 Fax: 39-06-85351441

MEXICO/MEXIQUE/MÉXICO

Representante

Sra. Maria Emilia BUSTOS RAMIREZ
 Investigador Asesor
 Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones
 Nucleares
 A.P. Postal 181027
 Cól. Escandin
 C.P. 11800
 México, D.F. 11800
 Tel.: 52-5-3297200 ext.2661
 Fax: 52-5-329732
 E-mail: ebr@nuclear.inin.mx

Suplente

Gustavo Alberto FRIAS TREVIÑO
 Director de Regulación Sanitaria
 Dirección General de Sanidad Vegetal
 SAGARPA
 Ministerio de Agricultura
 Ciudad de México
 Guillermo Pérez Valenzuela, 127
 El Carmen, Coyoacan
 México, D.F. 04100
 Tel.: 52-55545147
 Fax: 52-56580696
 E-mail: gfrias@sagar.gob.mx

MOROCCO/MAROC/MARRUECOS

Représentant

Mohammed Amal RAHEL
 Plant Quarantine and Phytosanitary Issue
 Management Specialist
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Plant Protection Service
 P.O. Box 1308
 Rabat
 Morocco
 Tel.: 212-37-297543
 Fax: 212-37-297544
 E-mail: rahel.amal@caramail.com

**NETHERLANDS/PAYS-BAS/
PAÍSES BAJOS**

Representative

Henk DURINGHOF
 Director
 Plant Protection Service
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature
 Management
 and Fisheries
 6700 Wageningen
 Netherlands
 Tel.: 31-317-496610
 Fax: 31-317-421701
 E-mail: h.a.duringhof@PD.Agro.nl

Alternate

Andries OLDENKAMP
 Plant Protection Service
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature
 Management
 and Fisheries
 PO Box 9102
 6700 Wageningen
 Netherlands
 Tel.: 31-317-496610
 Fax: 31-317-421701
 E-mail: A.Oldenkamp@PD.Agro.nl

Ms Mennie GERRITSEN-WIELARD
 Senior Staff-Officer Phytosanitary Affairs
 Plant Health Division
 Department of Agriculture, Nature
 Management and Fisheries
 PO Box 20401
 2500 EK The Hague
 Netherlands
 Tel.: 31-70-3785782
 Fax: 31-70-3786156
 E-mail: m.j.gerritsem@PD.Agro.nl

Ton VAN ARNHEM
 Senior Staff-Officer Phytosanitary Affairs
 Plant Health Division
 Department of Agriculture, Nature
 Management and Fisheries
 PO Box 20401
 2500 EK The Hague
 Netherlands
 Tel.: 31-70-3705094
 Fax: 31-70-3706156
 E-mail: A.C.Van.Arnhem@PD.Agro.nl

Jeroen T.M.G. STEEGHS
 Counsellor
 Deputy Permanent Representative
 Permanent Representation of the
 Kingdom of the Netherlands to FAO
 Via delle Terme Deciane, 6
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-5740306
 Fax: 39-06-5744927

**NEW ZEALAND/NOUVELLE-
ZÉLANDE/NUEVA ZELANDIA**

Representative

Richard IVESS
 Director,
 Plants Biosecurity
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 PO Box 2526
 Wellington
 New Zealand
 Tel.: 64-4-4744127
 Fax: 64-4-4989888
 E-mail: ivessr@maf.govt.nz

Alternate

Ms Ruth FRAMPTON
 Director
 Forest Biosecurity
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 PO Box 2526
 Wellington
 New Zealand
 Tel.: 64-4-4989639
 Fax: 64-4-4989888
 E-mail: framptonr@maf.govt.nz

John HEDLEY
 National Adviser
 International Agreements
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 PO Box 2526
 Wellington
 New Zealand
 Tel.: 64-4-4744170
 Fax: 64-4-4744257
 E-mail: hedleyj@maf.govt.nz

NORWAY/NORVÈGE/NORUEGA

Representative

Kåre ARSVOLL
Senior Adviser
Ministry of Agriculture
P.O.Box 8007 Dep.
N-0030 Oslo
Norway
Tel.: 47-22249242
Fax: 47-22249559
E-mail: kare.arsvoll@ld.dep.no

Alternate

Hilde PAULSEN
Adviser
Norwegian Agricultural Inspection Service
P.O. Box 3
N-1431 As.
Norway
Tel.: 47-64944400
Fax: 47-64944410
E-mail: hilde.paulsen@slt.dep.no

OMAN/OMÁN

Representative

Suliman AL-TAOUBI
Director of Plant Protection Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
PO Box 467
CO-U 113 Muscat
Oman
Tel.: 968-696251
Fax: 968-695909

PAKISTAN/PAKISTÁN

Representative

Adnan Bashir KHAN
Alternate Permanent Representative of
the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to FAO
Embassy of Pakistan
Via della Camilluccia, 682
00135 Rome
Italy
Tel.: 39-06-3294836
Fax: 39-06-36304736

PANAMA/PANAMÁ

Representante

Sra. Rossana L. AMEGLIO
Embajador ante la FAO
Representación Permanente de la
República de Panamá ante la FAO
Viale Regina Margherita, 239 - piso 4
00198 Roma
Italia
Tel.: 39-06-44265429
Fax: 39-06-44252332

Suplente

Horacio MALTEZ
Representante Permanente Adjunto
Representación Permanente de la
República de Panamá ante la FAO
Viale Regina Margherita 239, piso 4
00198 Roma
Italia
Tel.: 39-06-44265429
Fax: 39-06-44252332

PERU/PÉROU/PERÚ

Representante

Miguel BARRETO
Representante Permanente Alterno
ante la FAO
Embajada de la República del Perú
Via Francesco Siacci 4 - Int. 4
00197 Roma
Italia
Tel.: 39-06-80691510
Fax: 39-06-80691777
E-mail: emb.peru@agora.stm.it

PHILIPPINES/FILIPINAS

Representative

Ms Maria Luisa GAVINO
Assistant Agricultural Attaché
Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO
Embassy of the Republic of the Philippines
Viale delle Medaglie d'Oro, 112
00136 Rome
Italy
Tel.: 39-06-39746717
Fax: 39-06-39889274

POLAND/POLOGNE/POLONIA

Representative

Jacek ZANDARSKI
 Senior Specialist
 Centralne Laboratorium
 Main Inspectorate of Plant Protection
 87-100 Torun
 ul. Zwirki i Wigury, 73
 Poland
 Tel.: 48-56-6235698
 Fax: 48-56-6528228
 E-mail: cl-tor@pior.gov.pl

PORTUGAL

Representative

Antonio PACHECO DA SILVA
 Head of the Phytosanitarium Service
 Ministry of Agriculture, Rural
 Development and Fisheries
 Direcção-Geral de Protecção das culturas
 Tapada da Ajuda
 Lisboa 1300
 Portugal
 Tel.: 35-1-213623174
 Fax: 35-1-213623177
 E-mail: dgpe.fitosan@mail.telepac.pt

QATAR

Representative

Ali AL-HAJIRI
 Embassy of Qatar
 Via Antonio Bosio, 14
 00161 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-44245273
 Fax: 39-06-8084995

Alternate

Mohamed AL-THANI
 Second Secretary
 Alternate Permanent Representative to FAO
 Embassy of Qatar
 Via Antonio Bosio, 14
 00161 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-44249450
 Fax: 39-06-44245273

Akeel HATOOR
 Embassy of Qatar
 Via Antonio Bosio, 14
 00161 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-44249450
 Fax: 39-06-44245273

ROMANIA/ROUMANIE/RUMANIA

Représentant

Florica GOGU
 Entomology Department
 Ministry of Agriculture and Food
 Central Laboratory for Phytosanitary
 Quarantine
 11 Afumati st. Code: 72964
 Bucharest
 Romania
 Tel.: 40-1-2405445
 Fax: 40-1-2406891
 E-mail: carantina@mb.roknet.ro

Suppléant

Ioan PAVEL
 Représentant permanent adjoint de
 Roumanie auprès de la FAO
 Ambassade de Roumanie
 Via Nicolò Tartaglia, 36
 00197 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-8084529
 Fax: 39-06-8084995
 E-mail: amdiroma@libero.it

**SAUDI ARABIA/
ARABIE SAOUDITE/
ARABIA SAUDITA**

Representative

Ahmad ALAQUIL
 Minister Plenipotentiary to FAO
 Permanent Representation of the Kingdom
 of Saudi Arabia to FAO
 Via della Piramide Cestia, 63
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-5740901
 Fax: 39-06-5758916

Alternate

Bandar SHALHOOB
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 Permanent Representation of the Kingdom
 of Saudi Arabia to FAO
 Via della Piramide Cestia, 63
 00153 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-5740901
 Fax: 39-06-5758916

SENEGAL/SÉNÉGAL

Représentant

Moussa Bocar LY
 Ministre Conseiller
 Représentant Permanent adjoint
 auprès de la FAO
 Ambassade de la République du Sénégal
 Via Giulia, 66
 00186 Rome
 Italie
 Tel.: 39-06-6872381
 Fax: 39-06-6865212

Suppléant

Abdoukarim DIOUF
 Deuxième Conseiller
 Représentant Permanent suppléant
 du Sénégal auprès de la FAO
 Ambassade de la République du Sénégal
 Via Giulia, 66
 00186 Rome
 Italie

**SLOVAKIA/SLOVAQUIE/
ESLOVAQUIA**

Representative

Jozef KOTLEBA
 Plant Protection of Agriculture of
 the Slovak Republic
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Dobrovicova, 12
 Bratislava
 Slovak Republic

**SOUTH AFRICA/
AFRIQUE DU SUD/
SUDÁFRICA**

Representative

Michael HOLTZHAUSEN
 Deputy Director
 Directorate Plant Health and Quality
 Private Bag X258
 Pretoria 0001
 South Africa
 Tel.: 27-12-3196100
 Fax: 27-12-3196350
 E-mail: mikeh@nda.agric.za

SPAIN/ESPAGNE/ESPAÑA

Representante

Luis CORTINA
 Subdirector General Adjunto
 Sanidad Vegetal
 Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y
 Alimentación
 Av. Ciudad Barcelona, 6
 28007 Madrid
 España
 Tel.: 34-91-3478254
 Fax: 34-91-3478263
 E-mail: l.cortina@mapya.es

Suplente

Javier PIERNAVIEJA NIEMBRO
 Representante Permanente Adjunto
 de España ante la FAO y el PMA
 Embajada de España
 Largo dei Lombardi, 21
 00186 Roma
 Italia
 Tel.: 39-06-6878762
 Fax: 39-06-6873076
 E-mail: repfao.agri@iol.it

SUDAN/SOUDAN/SUDÁN

Representative

Mohamed Said Mohamed Ali HARBI
 Permanent Representative of
 Sudan to FAO
 Embassy of the Republic of the Sudan
 Via Lazzaro Spallanzani, 24
 00161 Roma
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-4403071
 Fax: 39-06-4402358

Nagat MUBARAK EL TAYEB
 Director
 Plant Quarantine
 Plant Protection Directorate
 Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
 P.O. Box 14
 Khartoum North
 Sudan
 Tel.: 249-13337482
 E-mail: neltayb@yahoo.com

SWEDEN/SUÈDE/SUECIA

Representative

Göran KROEKER
 Head of Service
 National Board of Agriculture
 S-551 82 Jönköping
 Sweden
 Tel.: 46-36155913
 Fax: 46-36122522
 E-mail: goran.kroeker@sjv.se

Alternate

Ms Ingrid ÅKESSON
 National Board of Agriculture
 S-551 82 Jönköping
 Sweden
 Tel.: 46-40415246
 Fax: 46-40460782
 E-mail: ingrid.akesson@sjv.se

Ms Marianne SJÖBLOM
 Ministry of Agriculture
 10333 Stockholm
 Sweden
 Tel.: 46-8-4051121
 Fax: 46-8-206494
 marianne.sjoblom@agriculture.ministry.se

Olli MATTILA
 Administrator
 General Secretariat of the Council of
 the European Union
 Rue de la Loi, 175
 B-1048 Brussels
 Belgium
 Tel.: 32-2-2858357
 Fax: 32-2-2857928
 E-mail: olli.mattila@consilium.eu.int

Ms Gilberte VAN DEN ABBEELE
 Official
 Council of the European Union
 General Secretariat
 Brussels
 Belgium
 Tel.: 32-2-2858082
 Fax: 32-2-2859425
 gilberte.vandenabeele@consilium.eu.int

SWITZERLAND/SUISSE/SUIZA

Représentant

Olivier FÉLIX
 Chef du Service
 Certification et Protection des végétaux
 Office fédéral de l'Agriculture
 Mattenhofstrasse, 5
 CH 3003 Berne
 Switzerland

**SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC/
 RÉPUBLIQUE ARABE SYRIENNE/
 REPÚBLICA ÁRABE SIRIA**

Representative

Moh. TAREQ AL HUSSEINI
 Head of Agricultural Quarantine Section
 Ministry of Agriculture and Agrarian
 Reform
 Hijaz Square
 Damascus
 Syria
 Tel.: 963-11-2230474
 Fax: 963-11-2247913

THAILAND/THAÏLANDE/TAIANDIA

Representative

Chao TIANTONG
 Minister (Agriculture)
 Permanent Representative to FAO
 Office of Agricultural Affairs
 Royal Thai Embassy
 Via Angelo Messedaglia, 6 - Int. 2
 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-3339347
 Fax: 39-06-33222034
 E-mail: thagri.rome@flashnet.it

Alternate

Anut VISETROJANA
 Policy and Plant Analyst
 Office of Agricultural Standards and
 Inspections
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 Royal Thai Government
 Rajadamnern Nok Avenue
 Bangkok
 Thailand 10200
 Tel.: 662-6298979
 Fax: 662-6298978
 E-mail: oasi@assiaaccess.net.th

TURKEY/TURQUIE/TURQUÍA

Representative

Ahmet SAYLAM
 Agricultural Counsellor
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 of the Republic of Turkey to FAO
 Embassy of the Republic of Turkey
 Via F. Denza, 27 - Int. 16
 00197 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-80690562
 Fax: 39-06-80665610
 E-mail: faodt@ats.it

Birol AKBAS
 Plant Protection Central Research Institute
 Bagdat cad. No. 250
 PO Box 49
 06172 Yenimakalle Ankara
 Turkey
 Tel.: 90-3123445993
 Fax: 90-3123151531
 E-mail: birol_akbas@ankara.tagem.gov.tr

**UNITED ARAB EMIRATES/
 ÉMIRATS ARABES UNIS/
 EMIRATOS ÁRABES UNIDOS**

Representative

Mohammed ABDULLA
 Head of Plant Quarantine
 Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
 PO Box 1509
 Dubai
 United Arab Emirates
 Tel.: 97-14-2957650
 Fax: 97-14-2945994
 E-mail: Plant.maf@uae.gov.ae

**UNITED KINGDOM/
 ROYAUME-UNI/
 REINO UNIDO**

Representative

Stephen ASHBY
 Deputy Head
 Plant Quarantine
 Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
 Room 343, Foss House, King's Pool
 1-2 Peasholme Green
 York, YO1 7PX
 England
 Tel.: 44-1904-455048
 Fax: 44-1904-455198
 E-mail: steve.ashby@maff.gsi.gov.uk

Alternate

Alan PEMBERTON
 Head of International Plant Health
 Consultancy
 Room 02FA08
 Central Science Laboratory
 Sand Hutton
 York YO41 1LZ
 England
 Tel.: 44-1904-462222
 Fax: 44-1904-462250
 E-mail: a.pemberton@csl.gov.uk

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/
 ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE/
 ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA**

Representative

Richard DUNKLE
 Deputy Administrator
 Plant Protection and Quarantine
 Animal Plant Health Inspection Service
 U.S. Department of Agriculture
 Whitten Building
 14th Independence Ave. SW
 Washington D.C. 20250
 USA
 Tel.: 1-202-7205401
 Fax: 1-202-4900472
 E-mail: richard.L.dunkle@usda.gov

Alternate

John GREIFER
 Director
 Trade Support Team
 Animal Plant Health Inspection Service
 U.S. Department of Agriculture
 Rm. 1128, South Bldg
 Washington D.C. 20250
 USA
 Tel.: 1-202-7207677
 Fax: 1-202-6902861
 E-mail: john.k.greifer@usda.gov

Cathleen ENRIGHT
 Director Biotechnology
 PPQ/PIM
 Animal Plant Health Inspection Service
 U.S. Department of Agriculture
 Rm. 1128, South Bldg
 Washington D.C. 20250
 USA
 Tel.: 1-301-7345342
 Fax: 1-301-7347639
 E-mail: cathleen.a.enright@aphis.usda.gov

Nick GUTIERREZ
 Assistant Regional Director for Europe
 Animal Plant Health Inspection Service
 U.S. Department of Agriculture
 United States Mission to the
 European Union
 Brussels
 Belgium
 Tel.: 32-2-5082762
 Fax: 32-2-5110918
 E-mail: nicholas.gutierrez@usda.gov

Richard J. HUGHES
 International Relations Advisor
 FAO Liaison
 International Cooperation and
 Development
 Foreign Agriculture Service
 US Department of Agriculture
 Rm. 1128, South Bldg
 Washington D.C. 20250
 USA
 Tel.: 1-202-6900865
 Fax: 1-202-6901841
 E-mail: hughesr@fas.usda.gov

Narcy KLAG
 Program Director
 International Standards NAPPO Issues
 Animal Plant Health Inspection Service
 U.S. Department of Agriculture
 4700 River Road
 Unit 140
 Riverdale MD 20737
 USA
 Tel.: 1-301-7348262
 Fax: 1-301-7347639
 E-mail: narcy.g.klag@aphis.usda.gov

David P. LAMBERT
 Agricultural Counselor
 Alternate Permanent Representative
 of the United States of America to FAO
 Via Sardegna, 49
 00187 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-46743507
 Fax: 39-06-47887047
 E-mail: lambertd@fas.usda.gov

Ms Lucy TAMLYN
 Alternate Permanent Representative of
 the United States of America to FAO
 Via Vittorio Veneto, 119/a
 00187 Rome
 Italy
 Tel.: 39-06-46743506
 Fax: 39-06-47887048
 E-mail: ltamlyn@usaid.gov

URUGUAY

Representante
 Felipe CANALE
 Director Adjunto Asuntos Fitosanitarios
 Convención Internacional de
 Protección Vegetal
 Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura
 y Pesca
 Meliton Gonzalez, 1169 - p.5
 Montevideo
 Uruguay
 Tel.: 598-2-6289471
 Fax: 598-2-6289473
 E-mail: f_canale@hotmail.com

Suplente

Sra Laura GALARZA
 Representante Permanente Alterno
 del Uruguay ante la FAO
 Via Antonio Gramsci, 9 - Int. 14
 00197 Roma
 Italia

VIET NAM

Alternate

*Ms Xuan Huong NGUYEN THI
Alternate Permanent Representative
of the Socialist Republic of
Viet Nam to FAO
Embassy of the Socialist Republic
of Viet Nam
Via Clitunno, 34/36
00198 Rome
Italy
Tel.: 39-06-8543223
Fax: 39-06-8548501

YUGOSLAVIA/YOUGOSLAVIE

Representative

Nenad GLISIC
Counsellor
Yugoslav Embassy
Via dei Monti Parioli, 20
00197 Rome
Italy
Tel.: 39-06-3200796
Fax: 39-06-3200868

OBSERVERS

ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION

Chongyao SHEN
 Executive Secretary of APPPC
 Regional Plant Protection Officer
 FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
 Phra Atit Road, 39
 Bangkok 10200
 Thailand
 Tel.: 66-2-2817844
 Fax: 66-2-2800445
 E-mail: chongyao.shen@fao.org

CARIBBEAN PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION (CPPC)

Gene V. POLLARD
 Regional Plant Protection Officer
 Technical Secretary – Caribbean Plant
 Protection Commission (CPPC)
 Sub-Regional Office for the Caribbean -SLAC
 P.O.Box 631-C
 Bridgetown
 Barbados
 Tel.: 246-4267110
 Fax: 246-4276075
 E-mail: Gene.Pollard@fao.org

COMUNIDAD ANDINA

César A. WANDEMBERG
 Representante
 Secretaría General
 Experto en Sanidad Vegetal
 Comunidad Andina
 Paseo de la República, 3738
 Lima 27
 Perú
 Tel.: 51-1-2212222
 Fax: 51-1-2213389
 E-mail: cwandemberg@comunidad andina.org

CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

David COOPER
 Programme Officer Agricultural Biodiversity
 Secretariat Convention on Biological
 Diversity
 World Trade Center
 393 St. Jacques, Suite 360
 Montreal, Quebec
 Canada
 Tel.: 1-5142877045
 E-mail: david.cooper@biodiv.org

**EUROPEAN AND MEDITERRANEAN
 PLANT PROTECTION
 ORGANIZATION/
 ORGANISATION EUROPÉENNE POUR
 LA PROTECTION DES PLANTES/
 ORGANIZACIÓN EUROPEA Y
 MEDITERRANEA DE PROTECCIÓN DE
 LAS PLANTAS**

Ian SMITH
 Director-General OEPP
 Rue Le Nôtre, 1
 75016 Paris
 France
 Tel.: 33-1-45207794
 Fax: 33-1-42248943

FAO REGIONAL OFFICES/

Sebastião BARBOSA
 Regional Plant Protection Officer
 FAO/RLC
 P.O.Box 10095
 Santiago de Chile
 Chile
 Tel.: 562-3372225
 Fax: 562-3372101
 E-mail: Sebastiao.Barbosa@fao.org

**GLOBAL INVASIVE SPECIES
PROGRAMME/**

Ms Mary Megan QUINLAN
Regulatory Specialist
Suite 17, 24-28 St. Leonards Rd.
Windsor, Berkshire SL4 3BB
England
Tel.: 44-1753-856799
E-mail: quinlanmm@aol.com

Jeffrey WAAGE
Chair GISP
40 Clarence Road
Windsor, Berks
England

GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL

Leslie SIUBHAN
Political Unit
Keizersgracht, 176
1076 DW Amsterdam
Netherlands
Tel.: 31-20-5236228
Fax: 31-20-5236200
siubhan.leslie@ams.greenpeace.org

Doreen STABINSKY
Science Advisor
Genetic Engineering Campaign
Keizersgracht, 176
1076 DW Amsterdam
Netherlands
Tel.: 31-207-2449836
doreen.stabinsky@dialb.greenpeace.org

**INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY
AGENCY/****AGENCE INTERNATIONALE DE
L'ÉNERGIE ATOMIQUE/
ORGANISMO INTERNACIONAL DE
ENERGÍA ATÓMICA**

Ms Tatiana RUBIO
Division of Nuclear Techniques
Wagramer Strasse, 5
PO Box 100
A1400 Vienna
Austria
Tel.: 43-1-2600
Fax: 43-1-26007
E-mail: T.RUBIO-CABELLO@iaea.org

**INTERNATIONAL REGIONAL
ORGANISATION FOR PLANT
PROTECTION AND ANIMAL HEALTH/
ORGANISMO INTERNACIONAL
REGIONAL DE SANIDAD
AGROPECUARIA**

Juan José MAY MONTERO
Plant Protection Technical Director
OIRSA Sede
Av. Las Camelias, 14
Col. San Francisco San Salvador
El Salvador
Tel.: 503-2790174
Fax: 503-27901889
E-mail: oirsa@ns1.oirsa.org.sv

**INTERNATIONAL SEED TESTING
ASSOCIATION/
ASSOCIATION INTERNATIONALE
D'ESSAIS DE SEMENCES**

Jim SHEPPARD
Agriculture Canada Laboratory
Service Division
Bldg. 22, CEF
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6
Canada
Tel.: 1-613-7591224
Fax: 1-613-7591260
E-mail: sheppardj@em.agr.ca

**INTERNATIONAL SEED TRADE
FEDERATION/
FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE DU
COMMERCE DE SEMENCES**

Patrick HEFFER
Coordinator
Scientific & Technical Matters
FIS
Chemin du Reposoir, 7
1260 Nyon
Switzerland
Tel.: 41-223654420
Fax: 41-223654421
E-mail: p.heffer@worldseed.org

**NORTH AMERICAN PLANT
PROTECTION ORGANIZATION/
ORGANIZACIÓN NORTEAMERICANA
DE PROTECCIÓN DE LAS PLANTAS**

Ian McDONELL
Executive Director
Bldg. 3
Ottawa ON KIA 0C6
Canada
Tel.: 1-613-7596132
Fax: 1-613-7596141
E-mail: imcdonell@em.agr.ca

**PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION
ORGANISATION/**

Jaqui WRIGHT
PPPO
Plant Protection Service
Secretariat Pacific Community (SPC)
Private Mail Bag
Suva
Fiji Islands
Tel.: 679-370733
Fax: 679-386326
E-mail: jacquiw@spc.int

**WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION/
ORGANISATION MONDIALE DU
COMMERCE/
ORGANIZACIÓN MUNDIAL DEL
COMERCIO**

João MAGALHÃES
Counsellor
Agriculture and Commodities Division
Rue de Lausanne, 154
Case postale CH – 1211
Genève 21
Switzerland
Tel.: 41-22-7395152
Fax: 41-22-739-5777
E-mail: joao.magalhaes@wto.org