



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

## **REPORT**

# **2019 IPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA (ECA)**

## **2019 THEME: PLANT HEALTH AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT**

**Chisinau, Moldova  
2-5 September 2019**



International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) 2019. *REPORT 2019 International Plant Protection Convention Regional Workshop for Africa* Nairobi, Kenya. 37 pages. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

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

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

© FAO, 2019



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

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

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

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

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

## Contents

<b>2019 THEME: PLANT HEALTH AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Meeting arrangements .....	4
1.1 Election of the Chairperson and the Rapporteur .....	4
1.2 Review of the agenda .....	4
2. Updates on governance and strategic issues.....	4
2.1 Update from CPM-14 (2019) .....	4
2.2 Update from Standards Committee .....	5
5.3 Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee .....	5
3 Section 1: Reinforce the capacity of Contracting Parties to formulate productive comments on draft standards sent for consultation.....	6
3.1 Update on the IPPC Online Comment System .....	6
3.2 Review of general and substantive comments on the standards in second consultation.....	6
3.3 Discussion on draft CPM Recommendations sent for consultation (review of general and substantive comments) .....	8
3.4 IPPC call for topics: what it is needed? .....	8
4 Section 2: Moving together from ideas to action (Facilitated sessions).....	9
4.1 National Reporting Obligations: needs from the region .....	9
4.2 Plant Health and Capacity Development (presentation of guides) .....	9
4.3 International Year of Plant Health: moving forward .....	10
5 Section 3: Regional issues organized by RPPOs and/or FAO regional offices: this day to be developed by the regional counterparts for the workshops on the region.....	10
5.1 Operation of an NPPO. Country presentations .....	10
5.2 Demonstration of the Generic ePhyto National System (GeNS) .....	10
5.3 Use of phytosanitary checks of wood packaging material in international trade.....	10
6 Conclusion of the workshop / Date and Venue of the Next Meeting.....	11
Annex 1 – Agenda of the workshop.....	12
Annex 2 List of participants.....	16

## Report

### **Regional Workshop of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC)/Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) for Europe and Central Asia 2019**

#### **1. Meeting arrangements**

- [1] The Workshop presentations in English and Russian (if available) can be found at: <https://www.ippc.int/news/the-presentations-for-the-2019-ippc-regional-workshops-are-available-in-french-and-russian>.

##### **1.1 Election of the Chairperson and the Rapporteur**

- [2] Mr Ringolds Arnitis was elected as Chairperson (by consensus).
- [3] Mr Andrei Orlinski was elected as Rapporteur (by consensus).

##### **1.2 Review of the agenda**

- [4] The agenda drafted in accordance with the conclusions made at the last CPM meeting is considered. New consultations on the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 are ongoing. This IPPC Strategic Framework will be submitted for adoption in 2020. Another agenda item to be discussed is commodity and pathway standards: what should they be like? Another item is electronic certificates and the plan of putting them into practice, as well as e-commerce. The next agenda item deals with emerging pests: extra-budgetary resources are being collected to support this activity. The International Year of Plant Health is another item on the agenda. The issue of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) was raised during the CPM meeting. The Regional Workshop will also provide update from CPM-14: the CPM Recommendation on “High-throughput sequencing (HTS) technologies as a diagnostic tool for phytosanitary purposes”, the scope of ISPMs and a range of other issues discussed during the last CPM meeting including new topics for ISPMs and adopted ISPMs (Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary measure). The budget of the IPPC Secretariat was approved.

#### **2. Updates on governance and strategic issues**

##### **2.1 Update from CPM-14 (2019)**

- [5] Ms Laurence Bouhot-Delduc provided an update on the Standards Committee (SC). Draft ISPMs for first consultations were discussed, in particular, the draft 2019 amendments to ISPM 5 (the term “detection survey”), Guidance on pest risk management with regard to quarantine pests (regulated non-quarantine pests are not included into this discussion). The PRA standards (ISPM 11) may be revised due to the development of the pest risk management standard (this part may be removed from the PRA standards). There is a strategic discussion on pathway standards: elaboration of a concept standard, creation of a new panel, establishment of a permanent steward and work on specific examples. The International Year of Plant Health provides an opportunity to review the core activities of the Standards Committee (SC) and the Implementation Committee (IC). The SC discussed the draft standard on the authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions and the term “emerging pests”. There is a strategic discussion on diagnostic matters. The work plans of the Technical Panel for the Glossary and the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments were reviewed. The activities of 4 IPPC Technical Panels were reviewed and assessed.
- [6] The next call for topics will be announced in 2020-2021.
- [7] Ms Olga Lavrentjeva provided an update on the IC. Workshops are to be held. The IC works on dispute settlement. There are 12 Committee members, plus NAPPO and SC representatives. The mandates of the current members will soon expire and there is a need to start discussing who is to become new representatives from the regions. The Committee has subgroups – offshoots – which enable to invite external experts. There’s a subgroup (initiated by the EU) that identifies issues related to the

implementation and use of ISPMs. A strategic framework for the subgroup is being considered for the future. Another subgroup works to prevent phytosanitary disputes. There is a lack of nominations into this subgroup; legal assistance is required. The subgroup on sea containers is expected to decide soon whether there is a need for phytosanitary regulation of sea containers. The Committee works on capacity development, assessment of resources, and global surveillance in the field of plant protection. The Committee endeavours to develop expertise in phytosanitary capacity evaluation (PCE). There is a need to circulate information on PCE, invite trained facilitators and train new (national) facilitators. The work on surveillance lacked resources. The Committee has received Australia's assistance. The relevant training materials are being collected in Australia. A portal with the surveillance register is being designed.

- [8] The Workshop participants formulated the wish for a copy of materials on sea containers in Russian. With regard to the applicability of Australia's surveillance experience in the EPPO region, it was noted that this experience was useful to consider notwithstanding the fact that conditions in Australia and the EPPO region didn't fully coincide. An opinion was expressed that more attention should be given to weeds within the framework of activities on surveillance and pest risk. However, it was noted that weeds were "pests" by definition along with pests and pathogens and they were considered on equal terms by the IPPC.

## 2.2 Update from Standards Committee

- [9] Mr Nico Horn presented on the EPPO Global Phytosanitary Affairs Panel, its position in the EPPO structure and its relation to Regional Workshops. Countries (NPPOs) nominate experts into this Panel. The Panel meets three times a year (once in 3-4 months). The Panel is linked with a number of other EPPO Panels, in particular with the Panel on Phytosanitary Measures and the Panel on Invasive Alien Plants. The Panel circulates information on global phytosanitary issues. It liaises with the CPM and RPPOs (e.g. during technical consultations among RPPOs). One of the objectives is to develop a common regional position in relation to ISPMs and to add comments in the OCS. The Panel is also in charge of nominating regional experts to the IPPC bodies. Regional experts in the IPPC bodies are members of the EPPO Global Phytosanitary Affairs Panel (their names can be found in the presentation). The Panel meeting reports are available to EPPO countries. This year EPPO is setting up a Panel on ePhyto. Regional FAO/IPPC/EPPO Workshops contribute to the work of the Global Phytosanitary Affairs Panel: agreed comments on draft ISPMs are reviewed by the Panel members.

## 5.3 Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee

- [10] Mr Mirko Montuori presented on the key areas of the IPPC activities in 2020 – 2030. The Workshop participants were invited to share their national priorities in relation to the IPPC future activities. The CPM considered initiatives and recommendations in 2019. The IPPC mission is to protect plant resources and facilitate trade. The vision is to minimize the spread of plant pests and their impact on trade. Three core strategic activity areas are identified: (1) to ensure sustainable production of plants and plant products; (2) to protect forests and environment; and (3) to facilitate safe trade in plants and plant products. The CPM made some comments: e.g. capacity development should be more prominent as a core activity. The IPPC Development Agenda is elaborated for the next 10 years. A 5 year investment plan to implement the IPPC Strategic Framework (2.3 million a year) was approved. Countries are expected to share their priorities.
- [11] Ms Olga Lavrentjeva reported that the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee endeavours to align its work with the IPPC Strategic Framework for the next 10 years. The IC is working to elaborate its work plan. There's a need to identify in what areas countries wish to develop. The basic parts of the system (surveillance, inspection, etc.) should be put in order before the system is provided in electronic form. Unfortunately, the IPPC Strategic Framework 2012 – 2017 was rarely resorted to. In future, it is preferable to remedy this situation.
- [12] The participants noted that national documents were adopted in line with international standards. NPPO structures are often set up by countries following the example of the structures in other countries. The participants formulated the wish to have an instruction for decision-makers at the national level. RPPOs

can also play a significant role in implementation of the IPPC Strategic Framework. EPPO has a work program and a strategic plan. EPPO could serve as an example for other regions with regard to the way it organizes its activities. When performing their activities, it is important for RPPOs and the IPPC to follow countries' wishes. However, wishes of various countries may vary and the strategy for responding to them should be flexible. The IPPC should work on issues that many countries demonstrate common interest in. If countries' wishes are of a regional nature, RPPOs take the lead. If they are only of a national nature, they should be considered by NPPOs. It's also important to identify basic NPPO types and basic requirements at the regional level.

- [13] The participants were invited to identify regional priorities out of 8 items. Serbia, Macedonia, Lithuania and Georgia named the priorities of particular interest to them. The following priorities evoked the most interest: 2 (on commodity and pathway specific ISPMs), 3 (on e-commerce), 5 (on a pest outbreak alert system).

### **3 Section 1: Reinforce the capacity of Contracting Parties to formulate productive comments on draft standards sent for consultation**

#### **3.1 Update on the IPPC Online Comment System**

- [14] Mr Mirko Montuori delivered a presentation on the IPPC Online Comment System (OCS). The OCS addresses a number of issues: a standard and homogeneous commenting format, the possibility to insert comments (at the national and regional levels) into the general system, as well as simplified and automatic submission of comments. The presentation on the IPPC OCS provided explanation of basic actions and steps. The participants paid attention to the restrictions on the logo use. They also noted that some OCS parts require particular attention to avoid confusion.

#### **3.2 Review of general and substantive comments on the standards in second consultation.**

- [15] Ms Laurence Bouhot-Delduc presented an overview of comments (693) on the revision of ISPM 8 submitted by countries during the first round of consultations in 2018. Many of them were taken into consideration in the preparation of the revised version. Some parts of the draft should be made consistent with other ISPMs, in particular with ISPM 6. The selected comments and the steward's responses were presented for the Workshop discussion.
- [16] The participants reviewed all the selected comments and agreed with the majority of the steward's responses. They discussed the situation when information for determining a pest status was insufficient. The participants agreed that this situation should not be defined as a status, but rather as the absence of a status. The participants agreed that the Appendix should remain in the ISPM because ranking information by its reliability was useful and highly demanded. And, if it's available in the ISPM it is easier to find and refer to than if it's placed into implementation materials.
- [17] Mr Nico Horn presented an overview of the 2018 comments (the first round of consultations) on the draft ISPM on modified atmosphere treatments. The core idea of these treatments is the alteration of the oxygen and carbon dioxide content in the atmosphere where materials are placed in order to eradicate pests. Treatment providers should be authorized by the NPPO to perform such treatments for phytosanitary purposes. The last revision was required to bring this draft into full conformity with other ISPMs on phytosanitary treatments. The selected comments and the steward's responses were presented for the Workshop discussion.
- [18] The workshop participants reviewed the comments. They discussed what gas concentrations should be measured and came to a conclusion that oxygen and carbon dioxide concentrations should be measured. However, that doesn't preclude measurements of other gas concentrations used for displacing oxygen. It was suggested that the ISPM should mainly focus on concentrations (and not on the proportion) of oxygen and carbon dioxide which was more important for the efficacy of such treatments. Relevant suggestions with regard to the draft text were made.



- [19] An issue of Russian translations was raised. The drafts under consideration were translated into Russian by EPPO taking into account terminology used by Russian-speaking experts in this field (in the field of phytosanitary treatments). The participants wished the same technical language and EPPO translations would be used by FAO translators of the adopted versions of these ISPMs.
- [20] Ms Laurence Bouhot-Delduc presented an overview of the 2018 comments (the first round of consultations) on the draft amendments to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (ISPM 5). She explained the peculiarities of the IPPC TPG work (Technical Panel for the Glossary). Reasons for amendments and deletions in the Glossary were given. Such proposals as mentioning rattan products as an exception to the wood definition were discussed. The participants stressed the importance of the proper use of phytosanitary terms in each of the FAO languages and other national languages. It was noted that the IPPC supported translation of international phytosanitary texts (in particular ISPMs) into national languages.
- [21] Ms Laurence Bouhot-Delduc presented an overview of the 2018 comments (the first round of consultations) on the draft ISPM on authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions. Many of them had been reviewed by the Standards Committee and taken into account in the preparation of the revised version. The participants were provided with the summary of the SC's discussion. The selected comments and the steward's responses were presented for the Workshop discussion. For example, the proposal to expand auditing (except details specific for this draft) beyond the scope of the draft (as a theme for a separate draft ISPM) was noted.
- [22] A number of the Workshop participants expressed doubts about the need for this draft ISPM and didn't find reasons supporting its implementation. They consider that this draft standard lowers the relevance of NPPOs and their role; it leads to a conclusion that the existence of NPPOs is not required which contradicts the core provisions of the IPPC, results in undermining the integrity of NPPOs' work systems. The role of NPPOs is already weakened in many countries, in particular through their amalgamation with veterinary and other services. Therefore, it was felt that this draft ISPM will turn NPPOs into auditing organizations. In these participants' view, this draft ISPM doesn't take into account the conflict of interests and helps delegate the government functions to protect plant resources into the hands of commercial entities that are not interested in preserving these resources. Moreover, there is a doubt that practical implementation of this draft ISPM will result in phytosanitary actions being performed by non-qualified persons who are more interested in gaining profit than in protecting plant resources and biodiversity. This draft ISPM gives legislative bodies an opportunity to enact the delegation of authority over NPPOs' head. On the whole, the majority of the participants unanimously agreed that the adoption and implementation of this draft ISPM would be unacceptable for this region (Eastern Europe and Central Asia). It was noted that, unfortunately, participation of this region's representatives in international phytosanitary bodies (CPM, SC, etc.) is very limited. Some participants considered limited implementation of this ISPM standard might be useful. And, the standard should clearly indicate that delegation of the NPPO's authority is only possible if the NPPO cannot fulfill its specific functions. Other participants pointed out that for this purpose there was no need for a special standard. None of the countries present supported the adoption of the draft ISPM.
- [23] It was noted that the decision to adopt an ISPM is made only by the CPM. If an ISPM is not acceptable for some region, it should be stated at the CPM meeting and the ISPM will not be adopted. The IPPC Secretariat clarified the procedures for adoption of and objections to draft ISPMs. The discussion summary in this report is of great importance. The countries' objections to the draft should be submitted beforehand in order to be considered during the CPM session. The CPM adopts ISPMs by consensus. If consensus is not reached, the draft ISPM is submitted for revision. The SC should consider this issue and make a decision. However, objections should be justified. As a rule, in order to reach consensus ways to improve the standard are considered first and foremost. The participants were invited to look into the options for improving the draft ISPM under consideration. It was also noted that the EPPO Panel would discuss this draft as well and elaborate EPPO's position taking on board the Workshop participants' view.

- [24] The participants discussed the selected comments on the draft ISPM and added several proposals. It was noted that a number of mistakes had been made in the translation of the IPPC presentation into Russian. For example, the words “if” and “entity” in the title were incorrectly translated. The participants recommended translators to follow the terminology used by EPPO in Russian translations.
- [25] 6.4. (continued) A document substantiating the position of some countries on the need to revoke the draft ISPM on authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions was prepared. This document will be further reviewed by countries supporting it. Authorization is not a phytosanitary measure. Therefore this topic should not be covered by an ISPM. For this reason, this draft (if someone really needs it) may be rearranged into a recommendation. The IPPC (Article 4) states the requirement to set up an NPPO and establishes its functions. And herewith, on an exceptional basis some authority may be delegated to legal entities (though state, not privately-owned). On the contrary, the draft ISPM provides for the delegation of the NPPO’s basic functions to legal entities (including privately-owned ones). This can lead to serious phytosanitary mistakes and considerable damage caused by plant pests. The countries that have elaborated this substantiating document are willing to engage in drafting a guidance/instruction/recommendation based on the draft ISPM.
- [26] The Workshop participants discussed the draft substantiating document. It was proposed to add that if phytosanitary functions were delegated to individuals, trade would be suspended due to the loss of confidence. Some participants reported that customs services had tried to take over their NPPOs’ functions to perform border inspections of consignments while refusing to take the responsibility in case of pest introduction. So far, such delegation of authority has been avoided. However, it may be triggered by the adoption of the draft ISPM. Given that the topic was approved by the CPM in 2017, it’s not possible to revoke it; however, its status may be changed into a guide/instruction/recommendation. This proposal may be submitted to the Standards Committee.

### **3.3 Discussion on draft CPM Recommendations sent for consultation (review of general and substantive comments)**

- [27] Ms Laurence Bouhot-Delduc introduced the draft CPM recommendation on safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the introduction of plant pests during an emergency situation. The need to take action in advance based on the preliminary risk assessment (the use of safe materials, pre-treatment, etc.) was emphasized. Countries with experience in this area are invited to formulate relevant guidance. The draft recommendation provides examples of relief aid that had a negative impact (e.g. the spread of invasive plants). This recommendation is submitted for the first round of country consultations. The Workshop participants discussed the selected country comments and agreed with all proposals. They agreed that the core role of the document was to raise public awareness of the pest risk when providing countries in need of emergency aid with food and other relief aid. Some participants considered that the responsibility lay with donors who should address risks of introducing unwanted organisms into affected countries and take into account these countries’ phytosanitary import requirements. To that effect, it’s also preferable to have pest distribution maps.
- [28] The IPPC Secretariat explained the difference between ISPMs and IPPC recommendations. There are three types of international documents: standards, guidelines and recommendations. They have a different status and relevance. In case of non-compliance with a standard, a country has the right to initiate an international dispute. Recommendations don’t grant this right.

### **3.4 IPPC call for topics: what it is needed?**

- [29] Ms Olga Lavrentjeva explained the system of IPPC calls for topics. It is important to take into account regional proposals which should preferably reflect global interests. Therefore discussions are vital both at the intraregional and interregional levels. As a rule, the call for topics is announced every two years. Topics can be submitted both by individual countries and by RPPOs. In 2018, 36 topics were proposed, of which 26 were adopted by the CPM. Topics should align with the IPPC Strategic Framework. The most effective way is to submit topics through RPPOs. A topic proposal should contain background information, a draft specification and a draft outline. The Framework for Standards and Implementation



is available for reference. This framework enables to avoid topics that are already being developed. Submitted topics are reviewed by the SC and the IC. The Workshop participants performed an exercise on linking various topics to the IPPC Strategic Objectives.

[30] Armenia proposed a topic on quarantine weeds. Moldova proposed a topic on the common ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia*). Azerbaijan proposed a topic on the use of pheromones. The participants discussed the relevance of these topics. Lithuania proposed a topic on electronic trade regulation.

[31] The IPPC Secretariat informed the participants that all materials and forms related to calls for topics were available on the IPP. Some proposals have recently been sent to countries via e-mail.

## 4 Section 2: Moving together from ideas to action (Facilitated sessions)

### 4.1 National Reporting Obligations: needs from the region

[32] Mr Mirko Montuori presented on the National Reporting Obligations. The IPPC Secretariat reminded the participants about these obligations and expressed the view that the functioning of the reporting system should be improved. The system includes an official contact point designation, description of NPPO organizational arrangements, phytosanitary requirements and lists of regulated pests and all changes in them, reporting of entry points, reporting of the occurrence, outbreak or spread of pests, as well as reporting of undertaken emergency actions. Various types of NROs include bilateral reporting between NPPOs, reporting to the IPPC (via the IPP), reporting to the relevant RPPOs. Pest reports are very important. The IPPC Secretariat held an exercise for the Workshop participants and provided them with links to NRO materials on the IPP. The participants were assigned to update information about their NPPOs on the IPP.

[33] Some participants informed that they had difficulties in reporting. One of the impediments was the language barrier and translation from and to national languages. Also, it was noted that some NPPOs tried to conceal information about the detection of regulated pests in order to protect trade which had an adverse effect as these NPPOs lost credibility. The need to publish data on pest distribution in countries was noted. It might be reasonable to raise this issue at the CPM meeting. The EPPO Secretariat reminded that all pest distribution information including that from NPPO reports was added to the EPPO Global Database. Also, it was noted that a great deal of information was published and could be found on the Eurasian Economic Union website. It was highlighted that information about contact points should be updated in a timely manner.

[34] The participants asked the Secretariat to give an example of how to complete a notification of noncompliance. They discussed a noncompliance example related to pest detection.

### 4.2 Plant Health and Capacity Development (presentation of guides)

[35] Ms Olga Lavrentjeva explained the basic principles for phytosanitary capacity development of countries and technical assistance to countries. Phytosanitary capacity development is a core activity in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020 – 2030. The IPPC Secretariat plays a major role in phytosanitary capacity development. Ms Olga Lavrentjeva clarified the nature of the PCE tool and listed training materials for phytosanitary experts available on the IPP in Russian as well. The participants were informed about the IPPC International Symposium to be held in Japan at the end of October. The information about the CPM capacity development side session was presented. The meeting of the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) will be held in October. Calendar of events is available on the IPPC website.

[36] The Workshop participants told what capacity development tools and materials they used. They noted that explanatory documents for ISPMs were very helpful. They stressed that governments and all stakeholders should become aware of the importance of plant protection activities. It would be useful to hold a workshop for a wide range of phytosanitary inspectors. It is important to develop and maintain trust between NPPOs and between countries. The participants highlighted the great role of national workshops attended by high-level representatives of all agencies involved in production, storage, transportation of and trade in plants and plant products.

### **4.3 International Year of Plant Health: moving forward**

- [37] Mr Mirko Montuori presented on the International Year of Plant Health. The IYPH should demonstrate the great relevance of plant health at the international and national levels. The idea to establish the IYPH was proposed by Finland in 2015. This initiative was approved by the CPM and later on adopted by the FAO Conference. The Workshop participants were informed about IYPH programme events for 2020. A special IYPH website was launched. The Workshop participants were provided with the ideas of how to support and promote the IYPH.
- [38] Several participants told about ongoing or planned national IYPH events. They stressed the need to make the public aware of the relevance of plant health starting from schools (introducing plant health lessons). It is also important to enhance the image of plant health services.
- [39] Mr Ralf Lopian stressed the importance of developing a communications strategy both within a country and among countries. It is also important to demonstrate and highlight the daily work performed by phytosanitary inspectors. We should shed light on agricultural damage caused by plant pests.
- [40] Mr Nico Horn noted that EPPO planned a range of activities for the IYPH. EPPO posters will now feature the IYPH logo. EPPO will greatly appreciate proposals from its members.
- [41] Mr Piotr Wlodarczyk noted that the FAO Regional Office in Budapest kept in touch with its member-countries and planned a number of activities for IYPH. FAO European Regional Conference is to be held in Uzbekistan.

## **5 Section 3: Regional issues organized by RPPOs and/or FAO regional offices: this day to be developed by the regional counterparts for the workshops on the region**

### **5.1 Operation of an NPPO. Country presentations**

- [42] North Macedonia presented on the structure of the NPPO, its budget, the system of international cooperation, import control, surveillance, export certification, regulation of wood packaging material, and challenges faced. For example, some problems occur in relation to insufficiently clear sections of the Council Directive 2000/29/EC.
- [43] Georgia presented on its situation: geography, relevance of plants and their protection, climate and soils, agriculture (grapes, wheat, hazelnuts, citrus crops, fruit crops, potatoes, blueberries, vegetables and greens, cucurbits), trade (ancient Greece, the Silk Road, modern times, free trade agreements), export and import, growing number of tourists, pest risks, and the NPPO structure. Import control is the responsibility of the Revenue Service. Major challenges are as follows: fireblight, brown marmorated stink bug, box tree moth and buxus blight, locust. The IPPC was asked to update the web-page with the description of possible NPPO structures. An alarming trend to reduce the NPPO's powers was stressed.

### **5.2 Demonstration of the Generic ePhyto National System (GeNS)**

- [44] The IPPC Secretariat demonstrated the Generic ePhyto System. It is developed to facilitate phytosanitary regulation of trade. ePhytos are not mandatory, they are offered to countries to simplify their work. There's generic software that enables countries to create and send ePhytos. Each country can retrieve information about all ePhytos it issued but can't do that with regard to ePhytos issued by other countries. The ePhyto System is to be launched by July 15. The steps to use the system were described and contact details were provided.

### **5.3 Use of phytosanitary checks of wood packaging material in international trade**

- [45] Belarus shared challenges its NPPO encountered in relation to wood packaging material. Phytosanitary activities related to wood packaging material are governed by the country's legislative acts. Requirements to legal entities willing to perform treatments and mark wood packaging material were described. Examples of cases when legal entities had their authorization withdrawn were given. The challenges are as follows: customs officers don't inspect wood packaging in non-plant consignments

and don't even have information about the presence of wood packaging in these consignments. Many countries encounter this problem. Belarus prepared brochures and other advocacy materials related to regulation of wood packaging material and conducted workshops for stakeholders. The Workshop participants discussed this issue and some countries shared their experience and concerns. Some participants voiced a desire to send their questions and suggestions to EPPO for consideration at this RPPPO's level and to seek assistance in solving problems related to wood packaging material.

## **6 Conclusion of the workshop / Date and Venue of the Next Meeting**

- [46] The EPPO Panel decided to continue discussing the draft ISPM on authorization and organize a one-day meeting during some other EPPO event.
- [47] Mr Mirko Montuori announced the venue of the next Workshop. The IPPC Secretariat received proposals from the following countries in chronological order: Azerbaijan, Montenegro, Armenia and Uzbekistan. In accordance with the IPPC rules (if several proposals are presented), proposals are to be considered in the order of their submission. The IPPC Secretariat recommended holding the next Workshop in Azerbaijan. The participants supported the proposal to hold the next Workshop in Baku.

## Annex 1 – Agenda of the workshop

### 2019 IPPC REGIONAL WORKSHOP FOR EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA (ECA) 2019 THEME: PLANT HEALTH AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

2-5 September 2019

Jolly Alon Hotel, 37 Maria Cebotari str.

Chisinau, Moldova

PROVISIONAL Agenda

Updated 2019-09-05

Agenda Item			Document N.	Presenter / facilitator
<b>First Day – General Information and Meeting Logistics</b>				
<b>1</b>	8:00-9:00	<b>Participants registration</b>		NPPO of Moldova
<b>2</b>	9:00-9:40	<b>Opening of the Meeting</b>		
2.1		Welcome remarks by host country Ms Ela MALAI – Deputy Director-General of the National Food Safety Agency of the Republic of Moldova	-	NPPO of Moldova
2.2		Opening statement by ADG of Regional Office / FAOR Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK – Agricultural Officer, FAO REU	-	FAO-ADG welcome letter presented by FAOR representative
2.4		Opening statement by EPPO Mr Nico HORN – Director General of EPPO	-	EPPO Director-General
2.5		Objectives of the workshop Mr Mirko MONTUORI – IPPC Secretariat	PPT	IPPC Secretariat
2.6		Video message highlighting the 2019 Annual Theme from the IPPC Secretary	<a href="#">Link</a>	IPPC Secretariat
<b>3</b>	9:40-9:50	<b>Meeting Arrangements</b>		
3.1		Election of the Chairperson	-	
3.2		Election of the Rapporteur	-	
3.3		Review of the Agenda	01	Chairperson
<b>4</b>	9:50-10:00	<b>Administrative Matters</b>		
4.1		Participants lists	02	NPPO of Moldova
4.2		Local information	-	NPPO of Moldova
<b>5</b>	10:00-10:30	<b>Updates on governance and strategic issues</b>		
5.1		Update from CPM-14 (2019)	PPT	IPPC Secretariat
5.2		Update from Standards Committee	PPT	SC Member
5.3		Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee	PPT	IC Chairperson
5.4		Regional Workshops and EPPO panel	-	EPPO

		Agenda Item	Document N.	Presenter / facilitator
	10:30-10:50	<b>Coffee break</b>		
5.3	10:50-11:20	IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030: what are your regional priorities?	PPT	IPPC Secretariat
<b>6</b>	<b>Section 1: Reinforce the capacity of Contracting Parties to formulate productive comments on draft standards sent for consultation</b> <i>This session includes time for discussion, questions and answers on draft standards sent for consultation</i>			
6.1	11:20-11:40	The IPPC Online Comment System (OCS): update	PPT	IPPC Secretariat
6.2	11:40-13:00	Review of general and substantive comments on the standards in second consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)</li> <li>- Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)</li> <li>- Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)</li> </ul>	PPT	SC member of the region OCS input: IPPC Secretariat
	13:00-14:00	<b>Lunch break</b>		
6.2	14:00-15:30	Continued: Review of general and substantive comments on the standards in second consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)</li> <li>- Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)</li> <li>- Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)</li> </ul>	PPT	SC member of the region OCS input: IPPC Secretariat
	15:30-15:45	<b>Coffee break</b>		Last Name
6.2	15:45-17:00	Continued: Review of general and substantive comments on the standards in second consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revision of ISPM 8: Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)</li> <li>- Requirements for the use of modified atmosphere treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-006)</li> <li>- Draft 2018 Amendments to ISPM 5 (1994-001)</li> </ul>	PPT	SC member of the region OCS input: IPPC Secretariat
<b>Second Day – Continuation of Section 1</b>				
6.3	9:00-11:00	Continued: Review of general and substantive comments on the standards in second consultation, including facilitated discussion on the draft ISPM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)</li> </ul>	PPT	SC member of the region OCS input: IPPC Secretariat
	11:00-11:20	<b>Coffee break</b>		
6.4	11:20-13:00	Continued: Review of general and substantive comments on the standards in second consultation, including facilitated discussion on the draft ISPM: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requirements for NPPOs if authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions (2014-002)</li> </ul>	PPT	SC member of the region OCS input: IPPC Secretariat



		Agenda Item	Document N.	Presenter / facilitator
	13:00-14:00	<b>Lunch break</b>		
6.5	14:00-15:40	Discussion on draft CPM Recommendations sent for consultation (review of general and substantive comments): - "Safe provision of food and other aid to prevent the international spread of plant pests" (2018-026)	PPT	SC member of the region OCS input: IPPC Secretariat
	15:40-15:55	<b>Coffee break</b>		
6.6	15:55-17:00	IPPC call for topics: what it is needed?	PPT	SC Member / IC Chairperson
<b>Third Day – Section 2</b>				
<b>7</b>	<b>Section 2: Moving together from ideas to action (Facilitated sessions)</b> <i>This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the workshop participants</i>			
7.1	9:00-10:00	International Year of Plant Health: moving forward	PPT	IPPC Secretariat
7.2	10:00-10:30	Plant Health and Capacity Development (presentation of guides)	PPT	IC Chairperson
	10:30- 10:50	<b>Coffee break</b>		
7.3	10.50-12:00	National Reporting Obligations: needs from the region	PPT	IC Chairperson / IPPC Secretariat
	12:00-13:00	<b>Lunch break</b>		
	13:00-17:00	Field trip		NPPO of Moldova
<b>Fourth Day – Section 3</b>				
<b>8</b>	<b>Section 3: Regional issues organized by RPPOs and/or FAO regional offices: this day to be developed by the regional counterparts for the workshops on the region</b>			
8.1	9:00-10:30	Operation of an NPPO	PPTs	Presentations from 4 participants and facilitated discussion
	10:30- 10:50	<b>Coffee break</b>		
8.2	10:50-11:30	Operation of an NPPO (continued)	PPTs	Presentations from 4 participants and facilitated discussion
8.3	11:30-12:30	Demonstration of the Generic ePhyto National System (GeNS)	PPT	IPPC Secretariat
	13:00-14:00	<b>Lunch break</b>		
8.4	14:00-15:40	Use of phytosanitary checks of wood packaging material in international trade	PPT	EPPO, Participants
	15:40-15:55	<b>Coffee break</b>		
9	15:45-16:00	Conclusion of the workshop / Date and Venue of the Next Meeting	-	Chairperson
10	16:00-17:00	Review and Adoption of the Report (if applicable)	Draft report	



Agenda Item			Document N.	Presenter / facilitator
11	17:00-17:15	Online survey of the workshop	<a href="#">Link</a>	All participants
12	17:15-17:20	Close of the Meeting	-	Chairperson

## Annex 2 List of participants

### List of Participants 2019 IPPC Regional Workshop for Europe and Central Asia (ECA)

#### Theme: Plant Health and Capacity Development

Country	Name	E-mail address
Armenia	Mr Artur NIKOYAN	<a href="mailto:a.nikoyan@ssfs.am">a.nikoyan@ssfs.am</a>
Armenia	Mr Georgi AVETISYAN	<a href="mailto:g.avetisyan@ssfs.am">g.avetisyan@ssfs.am</a>
Armenia	Mr Marushan TARZIAN	<a href="mailto:m.tarzian@ssfs.am">m.tarzian@ssfs.am</a>
Belarus	Mr Aliaksandr PAULOVICH	<a href="mailto:rasten@tut.by">rasten@tut.by</a>
Belarus	Mr Aliaksandr PISKUN	<a href="mailto:rasten@tut.by">rasten@tut.by</a>
Azerbaijan	Ms Khayala DADASHOVA	<a href="mailto:Khayala.dadashova@mail.ru">Khayala.dadashova@mail.ru</a>
Azerbaijan	Ms Anela ISMAILOVA	<a href="mailto:Anela.ismailova@afsa.gov.az">Anela.ismailova@afsa.gov.az</a>
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr Nenad ČOLAKOVIC	<a href="mailto:Nenad.Colakovic@uzzb.gov.ba">Nenad.Colakovic@uzzb.gov.ba</a>
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Mr Seid UZUNOVIĆ	<a href="mailto:seid.uzunovic@uzzb.gov.ba">seid.uzunovic@uzzb.gov.ba</a>
Croatia	Ms Ksenija BISTROVIĆ	<a href="mailto:ksenija.bistrovic@mps.hr">ksenija.bistrovic@mps.hr</a>
Estonia	Ms Olga LAVRENTJEVA	<a href="mailto:olga.lavrentjeva@agri.ee">olga.lavrentjeva@agri.ee</a>
France	Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC	<a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a>
Georgia	Mr Bejan REKHVIASHVILI	<a href="mailto:bezhan.rekhviashvili@nfa.gov.ge">bezhan.rekhviashvili@nfa.gov.ge</a>
Georgia	Mr Lasha NUTSUBIDZE	<a href="mailto:Lasha.nutsubidze@nfa.gov.ge">Lasha.nutsubidze@nfa.gov.ge</a>
Italy	Ms Mariangela CIAMPITTI	<a href="mailto:Mariangela.ciampitti@ersaf.lombardia.it">Mariangela.ciampitti@ersaf.lombardia.it</a>
Montenegro	Ms Maja PETROVIĆ	<a href="mailto:maja.petrovic@ubh.gov.me">maja.petrovic@ubh.gov.me</a>
Montenegro	Ms Tamara POPOVIĆ	<a href="mailto:tamara.popovic@ubh.gov.me">tamara.popovic@ubh.gov.me</a>
North Macedonia	Mr Ivica ANGELOVSKI	<a href="mailto:angelovski_ku@yahoo.com">angelovski_ku@yahoo.com</a>
North Macedonia	Mr Mentor ZEKJIRI	<a href="mailto:mentor.zekiri@mzsv.gov.mk">mentor.zekiri@mzsv.gov.mk</a>
North Macedonia	Ms Nadica DJERKOVSKA	<a href="mailto:nadica.dzerkovska@mzsv.gov.mk">nadica.dzerkovska@mzsv.gov.mk</a>
Serbia	Ms Jelena JANKOVIC	<a href="mailto:Jelena.jankovic@minpolj.gov.rs">Jelena.jankovic@minpolj.gov.rs</a>
Serbia	Ms Sladjana LUKIC	<a href="mailto:sladjana.lukic@minpolj.gov.rs">sladjana.lukic@minpolj.gov.rs</a>
Turkey	Mr Murat SAHIN	<a href="mailto:Msahin46@gmail.com">Msahin46@gmail.com</a>
Ukraine	Mr Andrii CHELOMBITKO	<a href="mailto:a.chelombitko@dpss.gov.ua">a.chelombitko@dpss.gov.ua</a>

Country	Name	E-mail address
Ukraine	Ms Olga BASHYNSKA	<a href="mailto:o.bashynska@dpss.gov.ua">o.bashynska@dpss.gov.ua</a>
Uzbekistan	Mr Lutfidin ABDULAEV	<a href="mailto:Abdullaev.I@gov.uz">Abdullaev.I@gov.uz</a>
Uzbekistan	Mr Sultan-Makhmud SULTANOV	<a href="mailto:info@karantin.uz">info@karantin.uz</a>
Latvia (resource person)	Mr Ringolds ARNITIS	<a href="mailto:ringolds.arnitis@hotmail.com">ringolds.arnitis@hotmail.com</a>
APHIS (observer)	Ms Diana CHAPMAN	<a href="mailto:diana.l.chapman@usda.gov">diana.l.chapman@usda.gov</a>
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Mirko MONTUORI	<a href="mailto:mirko.montuori@fao.org">mirko.montuori@fao.org</a>
FAO REU	Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK	<a href="mailto:Piotr.wlodarczyk@fao.org">Piotr.wlodarczyk@fao.org</a>
Moldova	Ms Svetlana LUNGU	<a href="mailto:Svetlana.lungu@ansa.gov.md">Svetlana.lungu@ansa.gov.md</a>
Moldova	Ms Veronika TERTEA	<a href="mailto:Veronica.tertea@madrm.gov.md">Veronica.tertea@madrm.gov.md</a>
Moldova	Mr Vladimir TODIRAS	<a href="mailto:vladimir.todiras@gmail.com">vladimir.todiras@gmail.com</a>
Moldova	Mr L. VOLOSCIUC	
Moldova	Ms Tatiana ROTARU	<a href="mailto:centrudecarantina@gmail.com">centrudecarantina@gmail.com</a>
Moldova	Ms Iulia HAIDARLI	<a href="mailto:iulia.haidarli@ansa.gov.md">iulia.haidarli@ansa.gov.md</a>
Moldova	Ms Victoria STRUNA	<a href="mailto:victoria.struna@ansa.gov.md">victoria.struna@ansa.gov.md</a>
Moldova	Ms Lidia BIVOL	<a href="mailto:lidia.bivol@ansa.gov.md">lidia.bivol@ansa.gov.md</a>
Moldova	Ms Diana GHERMAN	<a href="mailto:diana.gherman@ansa.gov.md">diana.gherman@ansa.gov.md</a>
Moldova	Ms Olga SAVENCOV	<a href="mailto:olga.savencov@madrm.gov.md">olga.savencov@madrm.gov.md</a>
Moldova	Ms Andrei CUMPANICI	<a href="mailto:acumpanici@moldovaagro.com">acumpanici@moldovaagro.com</a>

EPPO Panel participants		
EPPO	Mr Nico HORN	<a href="mailto:nh@eppo.int">nh@eppo.int</a>
EPPO	Mr Andrei ORLINSKI	<a href="mailto:orlinski@eppo.int">orlinski@eppo.int</a>
EPPO	Mr Valerio LUCCHESI	<a href="mailto:lucchesi@eppo.int">lucchesi@eppo.int</a>
United Kingdom	Mr Samuel BISHOP	<a href="mailto:Sam.bishop@defra.gov.uk">Sam.bishop@defra.gov.uk</a>
Russian Federation	Ms Alexandra FEDOTOVA	<a href="mailto:intervniikr@gmail.com">intervniikr@gmail.com</a>
Latvia	Ms Astra GARKAJE	<a href="mailto:astra.garkaje@vaad.gov.lv">astra.garkaje@vaad.gov.lv</a>
Malta	Ms Marica GATT	<a href="mailto:Marica.gatt@gov.mt">Marica.gatt@gov.mt</a>
Spain	Mr Jose Maria GUITAIN CASTRI	<a href="mailto:jmgc@tragsa.es">jmgc@tragsa.es</a>

Greece	Ms Stavroula IOANNIDOU	<a href="mailto:stioannidou@minagric.gr">stioannidou@minagric.gr</a>
Finland	Mr Ralf LOPIAN	<a href="mailto:Ralf.lopian@mmm.fi">Ralf.lopian@mmm.fi</a>
Israel	Mr David OPATOWSKI	<a href="mailto:davido@moag.gov.il">davido@moag.gov.il</a>
Belgium	Mr Roman VAGNER	<a href="mailto:Roman.vagner@ec.europa.eu">Roman.vagner@ec.europa.eu</a>
Lithuania	Ms Rasa ZITKUVIENE	<a href="mailto:Rasa.zitkuviene@vatzum.lt">Rasa.zitkuviene@vatzum.lt</a>
Lithuania	Ms Rasa RIMKUTE	<a href="mailto:rasa.rimkute@vatzum.lt">rasa.rimkute@vatzum.lt</a>
Germany	Ms Christine HERMENING	<a href="mailto:Christine.Hermening@bmel.bund.de">Christine.Hermening@bmel.bund.de</a>
Invited expert	Mr David MCKELLAR	<a href="mailto:david.s.mckellar@gmail.com">david.s.mckellar@gmail.com</a>
Invited expert	Mr Robert FAVRIN	<a href="mailto:favrinr@gmail.com">favrinr@gmail.com</a>
	Mr Ilich Marsbek UULU	