**13th APPPC Asia Regional workshop for the review of draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures**

**Gyeong Ju, Republic of Korea**

**3-7 September, 2012**

**Report**



**1. Opening of the session**

Mr. Yongho Park, Commissioner, QIA, Korea warmly welcomed all participants from various countries to participate in the regional workshop on review of draft ISPMs to discuss draft ISPMs. He referred impacts of climate changes to food security and risk of introduction and spread of exotic pests through agro-trades, which places particular emphasis on importance of plant quarantine. He believed that APPPC has been playing a leading role in the contribution to development of international standards to prevent entry and spread of quarantine pests, and Korea like to host the workshop as a part of such regional efforts. He hoped that the outputs of in-depth discussions at the consultation would reflect regional views to the draft ISPMs.

Dr. Yongfan Piao, Senior Plant Protection Officer, RAP/FAO and Executive Secretary of APPPC delivered opening address. He thanked Korea to host this workshop continually with provision of financial support to participants from developing countries. He stressed purpose of the workshop as well as to stress that the results of the discussions not only consolidate country comments and improve the quality of the draft standards but also lea to wider understanding on key issues. He encouraged participants to take full advantage of the opportunity to individually and collectively review and comment on the draft standards.

**2. Meeting participants**

The meeting was attended by twenty-two experts from fourteen countries and was facilitated by Dr Piao Yongfan (FAO), Mr M. Sakamura and Dr A. Dikin. See Appendix 1. Mr Dong-Hyoun Baek, Deputy Director, Export Management Division, Department of Plant quarantine introduced the other QIA staff presented including Mr. Kim, Jong-Chul, Director General of Yeongnam Regional Office, QIA and Mr. Shin, Hyun-Kwan, Director of Export Management Division, Department of Plant Quarantine, QIA also attended the opening session.

**3. Introductory papers**

**Quarantine and Inspection Agency (QIA) activities**

Mr. Lee highlights the activities of QIA, Korea. Evolution of QIA (lunched on 15 June 2011), which is including 5 departments and 29 divisions, 6 regional offices, 30 district offices with total of 1,335 staff was introduced. An International plant-quarantine accreditation board (IPAB) was established in 2011 to carry out AGM (Asian Gypsy moth) inspection of ships departing for North American countries as required by NAPPPO. IPAB various major projects of IPAB was highlighted.

**Introduction by Dr Yim**

Dr Kyu-Ock Yim introduced the city of GyeongJu.

**Update of the IPPC**

Dr Yim provided a short update of IPPC with some specific areas. New members of SC (5 from Asia) and Bureau, some change of standard setting procedures, rules of participation of observers, period of provision of substantial comments on draft ISPMs, information on financial committee of IPPS, etc. It was noted that Asia regional workshop on review of draft ISPMs is most sustainable with substantial outputs and well organized. New members of focus group, some various view on regional rotation of the bureau chair, potential replacements of bureau members, change the name of SPTA into SPG, etc. were introduced.

**4. Adoption of the agenda**

The agenda was discussed and adopted (Appendix 2). Mr Dong-Hyoun Baek, Korea was elected as chair of the meeting with Mr. Gerald Glenn F. Panganiban from Philippines, Mrs. Che Ann Joned from Malaysia, Mr. Lau Siu Ki Clive from China acting as rapporteurs.

**5. Review of documents and discussion on draft ISPMs**

The following three draft standards were reviewed and comments were recorded. The drafts were introduced and the subsequent discussions chaired by the Standards Committee members present, Mr M. Sakamura, Dr A. Dikin and Dr Ha Thanh Huong.

Participants were reminded to follow the *Instructions for the Use of the Template* which is in the on line comment system (OCS) from the IPP.

The following sections include most of the discussion points for each of the draft ISPMs reviewed. Readers should refer to the record of the Online Comment system for all the participating countries agreed comments.

* 1. **Draft1**: Draft appendix to ISPM 12: Electronic certification

Mr. Sakamura facilitated discussion following his presentation of draft ISPM. The presentation included background which indicated that a steering committee supported by 3 working groups, the draft appendix of ISPM12 was prepared during 2011-2012 and was revised on April 2012 and was approved for member consultation. General considerations of e-Phyto were noted. It was stressed that the result of discussion of the SC, it will be the appendix rather than annex. Some various draft issues as well as codes and recommendations were highlighted.

During the general discussion on the draft, some comments were made to the codes. With regards to scientific name of plants and regulated pests, it should be coded using EPPO codes. However there’re some codes that are not provided from EPPO codes. In order to solve this problem, there is need for finding the solution like updating EPPO codes or allowing using free-text. Regarding active ingredients, it should be coded using the coding system of Codex Alimentarius. But this coding system is limited and it’s impossible to cover every chemical ingredient for plants and plants products. So there is need to find another coding system to support it too. A further detail discussion in depth was convened by small group members concerned and came up with some specific concerns and suggestions adopted by participants to the workshop:

* **Insufficiency of the Coding**
* Many existing codes are insufficient to cover all the information need; Free-entry of text provision is needed in many fields other than additional declaration.
* **IPPC Commodity Class**
* Although it might be outside the scope of e-cert discussion, numerous countries still pointed out that the IPPC Commodity Classification IPPC were both insufficient and sometime unclear. It was suggested that some explanatory notes should be produced. A country suggest to add fibers, embryo and seed potato to the commodity class list. However it is not clear who, when and how the suggested recommendations could be picked up by the IPPC
* **Treatment Type**
* It was concerned that the meaning of various type of treatment (e.g. cold disinfestations vs cold treatment, and dry heat vs moist heat). Provision of definition or explanatory note to treatment type to propose new treatment type.
* **Updating of Various Codes**
* Many harmonized codes recommended for use in e-Cert currently provided under the IPPC portal are not owned by FAO. For instance the 2-digit country code is owned by ISO and the Plant Protection Thesaurus is owned by EPPO. Thus two major problems arise. These codes were not developed originally for use by IPPC members for e-Cert. In the event that IPPC member find content of these codes insufficient to need their operational need, they were unable to update these codes themselves and the owner of these codes also have no obligation or incentive to fulfill the needs of IPPC members. Secondly some of these codes were not available free of charge to IPPC members.
* Some members suggested that IPPC should try to make all these code made available to all IPPC members free of charge and in either “excel” or “csv” format.

The draft was discussed in a length and a number of substantial comments were made to the paragraph 6, 8, 10, 12, 18, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 30 and 42. For instance with regard to para10, it is suggested to add a footnote with the context of “a free text entry space should be allowed for uncoded/non-standardized contents”, since databases referenced as links by the IPPC IISO, EPPO database) does not comprehensively capture all entries. If NPPOs/RPPOs would like to develop their own databases for the codes, they should have it available free of charge for any country who wishes to access it. In terms of para 16, most participating countries considered that it is necessary to add a description of each code to link7 to enhance the understanding of commodity class code (link7).

* 1. **Draft2:** Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (*Tephritidae*) infestation (2006-031)

Power point display of the draft ISPM was presented by Dr Dikin who also led the discussions.

It was noted that the draft described three host statuses (natural host, non natural host and non-host), and determination is based on surveillance under natural conditions and trails under semi-natural field conditions. It excluded laboratory trials. The existent regional standards were considered for the preparation of the draft, while the APPPC RSPM No.4 has close linkage with this draft.

Extensive discussions were made on whether the draft should exclude lab tests. Overall comments were made followed by 3 recommendations.

Overall comment:

1. The purpose of the draft standard is to produce international guideline for the determination of the host status of fruits and vegetable to Tephritid fruit fly as reflected in the title. Yet the content has turned out to be a guideline for determination of natural host status of fruits and vegetable to Tephritid fruit fly.
2. The emphasis of the draft is focused on testing of host status during cultivation stage in the field. But after the fruits are harvest and before they are properly packed for export, there are still chances that these fruits are subject to fruit fly attacks (e.g. picked fruits in open field or stored fruit in warehouse). These kinds of situation are also “field situations” but they were not addressed in any depth by the current draft.
3. If a fruit is a non-natural host of a pest species of tephritid which can be frequently detected in the imported consignment, there is every reason for the importing country to exercise phytosanitary regulatory measures on the import consignment even the non-natural host status can be established. Thus the draft should be suitably amended.
4. This natural host status test, without saying, is expected to be carried out by the exporting country where the climatic conditions, cultural practice, biological environment and cultivars being grown by farmers could be very much different from the importing country. To such end, even in the non-natural host status can be established in the exporting country, it may not be logical to extend automatically that the same insect-host pair will behave in the same manner in the importing country.
5. The methodology described in this draft paper is extremely costly, time consuming and difficult to carry out.
6. APPPC participating countries of the workshop still consider that laboratory tests are useful tools for the determination of host status of a crop to a given species of Tephritidae and the method should not be completely ruled out.
7. It is a general consent that treatment measures against tephritids in import consignment can be exempted only in non-host situation.

Recommendations:

1. The draft is considered inappropriate to be adopted as an ISPM for IPPC by the majority of the participating countries of the workshop.
2. TPFF and the expert invited to help drafting the current draft ISPM on determination host susceptibility for fruit flies (Tephritidae) are requested to produce a fresh draft taking into considerations of the following:
* Regulatory action would be exempted only under non-host situation.
* In determining host status of fruits and vegetables to tephritid fruit fly both, the utmost important issue is to differentiate host from non-host.
* Laboratory tests are considered useful and possible tools for determining the host-status
* APPPC RSPM No.4 [Guidelines for the confirmation of non-host status of fruit and vegetables to Tephritid fruit flies.] and NAPPO RSPM No.30 [Guidelines for the determination and designation of host status of a fruit or vegetable for fruit flies (Diptera: Tephritidae)] are the two most important references that should be considered.
1. The revised draft to be produced by the TPFF should be reconsidered by the SC before circulation for Member Consultation.

It was suggested that two RSPMs (APPPC RSPM No.4 and NAPPO RSPM No.30) should be listed in the references. Many participants consider the practicality value of the draft appendix was rather low. On one hand, it was very demanding and required a lot of preparatory work. On the other hand, it did not give sufficient details to some of the important topics such as experimental design, statistics, mass-rearing of fruit fly, gender deployment ratio and number in carrying out experiment. Furthermore, it was commented that the appendix is very costly and time consuming to carry out.

With regard to the para 67, the meeting agreed that the paragraph should be further elaborated for the users of the guide. The draft appendix should be further expanded to describe experimental procedures and statistical methods. Disputes over field trial results may stem from the use of different experimental designs and statistical methods. Additional substantial comments were made to the paragraph 10, 27, 29, 32, 33, 38, 43, 44, 48, 51, 59, 67, 73, 79, 82, 93, 100, 101 and 103 in the present draft ISPM.

**5.3 Draft 3**- Draft Annex to ISPM 26: Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak 92009-007)

Mr. Sakamura facilitated the discussion on the draft. The para 12 was suggested to be deleted. The para13 was added with “These phytosanitary measures may be subject to bilateral agreement. They may also be audited by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the importing country.” at the end. A very active debate took place on paragraph 15 regarding the establishment of a quarantine area, at the end the para 15 was rewritten as “The NPPO of the exporting country should declare the outbreak in accordance with this standard and other relevant ISPMs. When a fruit fly outbreak is detected within an FF-PFA, a quarantine area should be established based on the technical evaluation. If the outbreak area is large enough or the phytosanitary measures are not feasible to establish in the quarantine area then the status of the FF-PFA will be lost”.

In consideration of the appropriate area of the buffer zone, it was proposed to revise the para 16 by including “plus the buffer zone to be determined in accordance with section 2.2.1 of this standard” and delete remaining sentence.

Para19 was extended with the sentence of “The NPPO of the exporting country should inform the fruit fly outbreak evidence and quarantine area established to the NPPO of the importing country”.

After a long period of deliberation among members, paragraph 27 was completely redrafted to focus on means to reduce fruit fly population during production period. The original idea of allowing non-infested hosts or production sites within the quarantine areas subject to bilateral agreement between the exporting and importing countries was agreed to be deleted.

Other substantial comments were made on the para 17, 29, 44, 46, 48, 51, 56 and 60. Some countries expressed concerns on para 35, 57 and 58, it was concluded that individual member countries could reflect their suggestion directly to IPPC via the IPPC OCS.

**5.8 Overall review of comments on 3 drafts ISPMs**

The participants went back through the comments submitted for each draft for verification and fine-turn. Some amendments/addition of comments and explanatory descriptions were made. A set of regional comments on draft ISPMs is listed in appendix3.

**6. Notes on other agendas**

**6.1 APPPC update**

Dr Piao presented information on various APPPC activities including updates on the implementation of the work plan which was adopted by the 27th Session as well as forthcoming events to be taken place before end of 2012 as advance information to participants for potential active involvements and support. Inter-relation between development of draft ISPM and APPPC RSPM on machinery was commented by participants. There was a suggestion that development of position of APPPC on use of alternatives to Methyl Bromide in phytosanitary measures may be needed. Perhaps, this could be discussed at the next Session of APPPC.

**6.2 Overview of IRSS**

Dr. Piao presented introduction of implementation review and support system (IRSS) and update activities, which was prepared by the IPPC Secretariat. It was noted that some APPPC initiatives relating to IRSS, i.e. regional workshop on ISPM No.6 and the symposium on pest surveillance would contribute to the IRSS program by identification of main constraints, issues, challenges to implementation of ISPM No.6 and recommendations on potential revision of ISPM No.6 as well as identification of essential elements for the framework of guidelines/training program for ISPM No.6. Participants were invited to provide feedback with the survey form on ISPM 13 as soon as possible to IPPC Secretariat. It was informed that the survey on ISPM No. 17 and No.19 will be distributed early next year to the NPPOs by IPPC Secretariat. Indonesia expressed their willingness of offering training facilities with some kind support for future workshop, trainings and symposium, etc. The analytical result of survey on ISPM6, collected from 17 countries of APPPC on February, was presented to the participants.

**6.3 Implementation of ISPM15**

Dr. Dikin presented update of ISPM15 provided by IPPC Secretariat. It was noted that 80 countries still not initiating the process of registration. The participating countries were kindly invited to take follow up actions for registration if countries still did not register. Relevant legal assistance could be received by contacting the legal officer of the FAO. Participants noted challenges to implementation of some aspects of the standard such as notification of non-compliance in relation to traceability, especially where the country of phytosanitary treatment is different from the country of use of the treated wood to package material for export. Some technical gaps in the implementation of ISPM15 were also presented. The meeting also noted that the EWG will seek synergies with the APPPC in identifying components of a project which will address different aspects of support to implementation of the standard. Participants are reminded to actively involve in provision of feedback to the APPPC working group led by Korea, which has circulated survey form on ISPM15.

**6.4 Provision of technical resources by the NPPOs for the phytosanitary info page**

Dr. Dikin presented “provision of technical resources by NPPOs for the phytosanitary info page”.

It was noted that phytosanitary technical resources will function as an essential building block for the IRSS help desk, while it might be useful references/materials for capacity development program in developing countries. All participating countries were invited to contribute the resources, and to post the technical resource through the upload link provided or provide with a web link/address to the resource.

**6.5** **Fulfilment of reporting obligations in the IPP**

The importance of using IPP for information exchange was stressed by Mr. Sakamura through presenting and explaining importance of information exchange, main reporting obligations of NPPOs, IPP, relevant Article IV, VII.2(d), VII.2(i), etc. of IPPC. The country pages and official contacts in IPP were demonstrated. It was observed that PRA on pests listed as quarantine pest was conducted with various capacities of countries. Mr. Piao briefed APPPC initiative of quarterly monitoring and distribution of the report for reminding NPPOs to update timely country page in the IPP, which was cross-linked with APPPC web site (quarantine section). Participants were reminded to contact with IPPC official contacts and editors in countries to implement the reporting obligations through the IPP.

**6.6 IPPC national phytosanitary capacity development strategy**

Dr. Ha presented the “IPPC national phytosanitary capacity development strategy” and highlighted the project proposals for capacity development. It was noted that two project proposals (training of trainers of phytosanitary capacity development and training of PCE facilitators) were submitted to STDF. The reference website of STDF was provided for further detail information of project application guidelines, etc. <http://www.standardsfacility.org/en/FDPPGs.htm>. One comment made on differences of capacity reguirements between Island countries and mainland countries.

7. The field visit to the International Plant-quarantine Accreditation Board (IPAB) for Asian Gypsy Moth (AGM) and a pear packing house in Ulsan, Korea provided participants with the first hand impression on the inspection process and other main working areas.

**8. Tentative date and venue for the 2013 consultation on draft ISPMs**

The participants were informed that QIA plans to hold the workshop around September 2013 and is working on securing the relevant budget. All participants have expressed their gratitude to the Korean hospitality and hoped that Korea will continually provide the financial support for the upcoming regional workshops.

**9. Any other business**

On-line participant survey was conducted and survey forms were filled out by the participants. IPP was accessed through: [https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=workshops\_on\_draft\_ispm\_eval&no\_cache=1&L=0&tx\_simplesurvey\_pi1[showUid]=53&cHash=d90cc765cce546fda63821b9104b2915](https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=workshops_on_draft_ispm_eval&no_cache=1&L=0&tx_simplesurvey_pi1%5bshowUid%5d=53&cHash=d90cc765cce546fda63821b9104b2915)

**10. Comments on the IPPC diagnostic protocols**

Dr. Piao briefly introduced on-going survey of IPPC Secretariat on value of the diagnostic protocols followed by some discussions on usefulness, protocols with frequently use as well as to be preferably developed with priority in general. The comments included different views on the useful or not useful as well as some suggestions on potential improvements of efficiency and effectiveness. Main points of the discussions are noted below:

* Useful or not useful?

Useful as it is might be practical resource. Some quarantine pests are alien species. In case of interception or introduction, there is a need of standardized protocols for the main resource by labs as well as to trainings of diagnostic experts. However, it differs country by country depending on the importance of the pest. Some concerns on expensive inputs and very difficult to be discussed as it is too specialized area. In case of addressing some important quarantine pest, there is need of detail discussions among taxonomists in global level based on standardized protocols (especially microorganism such as bacteria, fungus and virus). Language barrier is a challenge.

It is useful but should focus on specific pest and few specific cases of diagnostics. It seems to take a long time to develop the relevant protocols for requirements of countries. Current procedures and process of development of the protocols should be improved for efficient use of resources.

Although it might be useful but upon past experience the development of protocols require a large resource and take a long time to finalize. Therefore there is need for exploring more effective and efficient approaches of development; It was also noted that few experienced participants are actively involved discussion during the course of the development. It was doubt the speed of the development to meet the demand. The development of manuals or/and references could be considered rather than the protocol (standard). Sometimes sampling, inspection, etc. might be more important than the diagnostic protocol itself.

A comment was made that training on how to carry out the diagnostic methods in the protocols may be more important than developing new diagnostic protocols.

There was a suggestion to have more time to discuss with stakeholders in countries to get feedback of comments.

* Which protocols are used frequently?

It was noted that diagnostic protocols are not frequently used.

* Who uses it?

It will be used for basic training for trainers. It was used by reference lab of diagnostics.

* What protocols are to be developed with priority?

It is difficult to prioritize the development of diagnostic protocols as no prioritization criteria exists. It might be useful to collect which pest problems exist or dispute on diagnostics then it might be useful reference to decide the priority. As main interest/concerned pests might be different by various regions/countries (i.e. Thrips palmi may not be interest of this region) there may need of identifying main focus list of pest linked with development of protocols.

Export commodities and requirements of importing countries related to the importance levels but might be difficult to be decided specifically at a global level as it varies from country to country. It was commented that how to develop the protocols would be more important than which protocols to be developed. One comment suggested that nematode should be on the list of priorities.

In addition, it was called on provision of examples of equivalence agreements (ref: ISPM24) if possible within a week.

**11. Participant survey**

The survey form was filled in by participants and submitted to QIA, Korea.

 **12. Close of the meeting**

Closing remarks were given by Dr Piao, FAO. Participants were thanked for their valuable contributions and encouraged to coordinate the submission of national country comments to the Secretariat. Dr Piao noted that participants were well prepared for this meeting. He noted that 5 countries have shared country draft comments with the regional workshop through the OCS. He stressed that NPPOs of participating countries should send country comments to the Secretariat before 20 Oct. and the country that wish to fully agree regional comments as the country comment should send official email to the Secretariat to inform it. A number of countries made remarks on the meeting thanking the organisers for their efforts.

Mr Hyun-Kwan Shin, Mr Dong-Hyoun Baek, Ms. Kyu-Ock Yim and Mr. Jae-Seung Lee from QIA Korea, Mr Sakamur (Japan), Dr Dikin (Indonesia), and Mr. Gerald Glenn F. Panganiban (Philippines) were also thanked for their special contributions. The Governments of Korea was thanked by participants for the financial support for the workshop and for the hospitality.
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**Provisional Agenda**

# Monday

**8:30-8:55 am**   **Registration**

**9.00 – 9.20 am Agenda 1: Opening Session**:

 - Welcome address by Republic of Korea

 - Opening address by FAO

- Local and logistical information (QIA, Korea)

**9.20 – 10.00 am**  **Agenda 2:** **Presentation of update**

 - Update IPPC business

 **- QIA activity**

**9:50-10:00 - Group photo**

# 10.00 – 10:30 am Coffee break

 **Agenda 3: Adoption of agenda**

10:30 – 10:40 am

 - Election of chair

 - Election of rapporteur

 -Adoption of agenda

10:40 – 12:30 pm **Agenda 4: Review and discussion on draft ISPMs**

Review on Draft 1- Draft annex to ISPM 12: Electronic certification (2006-003)

# 12:30 – 2:00 pm Lunch break

2:00 – 3:30 pm Continuation on the draft 1

# 3:30 – 4:00 pm Coffee break

4:00 – 5:30 pm Review on Draft 2- Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (*Tephritidae*) infestation (2006-031)

# Tuesday

**8.30 – 10.30 am** Continuation on the draft 2

# 10.30 – 11:00 am Coffee break

**11:00 – 12:30 pm** Continuation of the review on the draft2

# 12:30 – 2:00 pm Lunch break

**2:00 – 3:30pm** Review on Draft 3- Draft Annex to ISPM 26: Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak 92009-007)

# 3:30 – 4:00 pm Coffee break

**4:00 – 5:30 pm** Continuation of the review on the draft 3

# Wednesday

**8.30 – 9.30 am Agenda 5: APPPC update**

**9:30-10:30 am Agenda 6**: **Overview of IRSS**

# 10.30 – 11:00 am Coffee break

11:00 – 12:30 pm **Agenda 7: Implementation of ISPM15**

# 12:30 – 2:00 pm Lunch break

2:00 – 3:30 pm **Agenda 8:** **Provision of technical resources by the NPPOs for the phytosanitary info page**

# 3:30 – 4:00 pm Coffee break

**4:00 – 5:30 pm**  **Agenda 9**: **Fulfillment of reporting obligations in the IPP**

# Thursday

 Field visit (Packing house, pest inspection on ships for Asia Gypsy moth)

# Friday

**8.30 – 9.30 am** **Agenda 10:** **IPPC national phytosanitary capacity development strategy**

**9:30-10:30am Agenda 11: Review of regional comments on draft ISPMs**

# 10.30 – 11:00 am Coffee break

**11:00-11:30am Agenda 12: Tentative date and venue for the 2012 consultation on draft**

**ISPMs**

**11:30-12:30pm Agenda 13: Any other business**

Discussion on value of diagnostic protocols

Good examples of equivalence (ref: ISPM23)

On-line participant survey (access IPP by using country’s NPPO

#  12:30 – 2:00 pm Lunch break

**2:00pm-3:30pm**  Report preparation

Closure of the meeting

**Appendix 3**

**(See separated zip files)**