

RAP PUBLICATION 2009/19

**Report of the
twenty-sixth session of the
Asia and Pacific
Plant Protection Commission**

**31 August to 4 September 2009
New Delhi, India**



**Report of the
twenty-sixth session of the
Asia and Pacific
Plant Protection Commission**

**31 August to 4 September 2009
New Delhi, India**

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.

ISBN 978-92-5-106458-0

All rights reserved. Reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product for educational or other non-commercial purposes are authorized without any prior written permission from the copyright holders provided the source is fully acknowledged. Reproduction of material in this information product for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without written permission of the copyright holders. Applications for such permission should be addressed to:

Chief

Electronic Publishing Policy and Support Branch

Communication Division

FAO

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy

or by e-mail to:

copyright@fao.org

© FAO 2009

For a copy of this publication, please write to:

Piao Yongfan

FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

Maliwan Mansion, 39 Phra Atit Road

Bangkok 10200

THAILAND

Tel: (+66) 2 697 4268

Fax: (+66) 2 697 4445

E-mail: yongfan.piao@fao.org

FOREWORD

The twenty-sixth session of the FAO Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) was convened in New Delhi from 31 August to 4 September 2009 to review the activities of the Commission carried out during the past two years and the overall plant protection situation at national and regional levels. This document presents the final report of the session.

This session was a milestone in the history of the APPPC with three significant outcomes: (1) the revised Agreement of Plant Protection for Asia and the Pacific came into force from 4 September 2009, which enabled the Commission to set up its own financial mechanism after 26 years' effort; (2) the rules of procedure and financial rules were discussed and adopted by the session, which governs the procedural activities and the financial administration of the Commission; and (3) two Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPMs) were adopted, including the RSPM on South American Leaf Blight (SALB) for rubber, after ten years of preparatory work and negotiation in the region. The adoption of the latter represents significant progress made by the Commission in harmonizing phytosanitary measures based on scientific justification and may contribute to promotion of inter-regional trade of plant products. It is hoped that other countries of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and other International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) parties will benefit from the example set by the APPPC.

The Commission unanimously adopted the work programme of the Commission for 2010-2011 and the budget, which for the first time is linked to mandatory contributions by the contracting governments. It marks a new beginning for the APPPC.

It is expected that the work plan for the next two years and the actions taken on the recommendations will further enhance cooperation and the capacity of member countries in plant protection, with firm commitments and concrete actions by all governments of the member countries in the region.



He Changchui
Assistant Director-General and
FAO Regional Representative for
Asia and the Pacific

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Foreword	iii
1. Opening of the session and organizational matters	1
2. Executive Secretariat report on action taken on recommendations of the twenty-fifth session of the Commission	3
3. Country, regional and international organization reports	10
4. Implementation of the revised Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific region and development of APPPC	29
5. Discussion on the approval of three new Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPMs)	32
6. Overview of the global plant protection, update on AGP, IPPC activities and the CPM bureau	33
7. Progress report on plant quarantine in the Asia and Pacific region by the Chairperson of the APPPC Standing Committee on Plant Quarantine	36
8. Progress report on integrated pest management (IPM) in the region	38
9. Progress report on agricultural pesticide management in the region by the Chairperson of the APPPC Standing Committee on Pesticides	41
10. Consideration of the report of the 20 th technical consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs)	42
11. The APPPC work programme for 2010 to 2011	42
12. Date and venue of the twenty-seventh session	45
13. Any other business	45
14. Adoption of the report	45
15. Closing of the Session	45
Annex I – List of participants	46
Annex II – Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission rules of procedure	54
Annex III – Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission financial rules	60
Annex IV – Guidelines for Protection against South American leaf blight of rubber	67
Annex V – Guidance on the operation of land border entry points for local trade	85
Annex VI – APPPC Standing Committees activities for 2010-2011	90
Annex VII – APPPC work programme for the 2010-2011 biennium	93

REPORT OF THE TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION OF THE ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION

31 August to 4 September 2009
New Delhi, India

1. Opening of the session and organizational matters

1.1 Attendance

The twenty-sixth session of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) was held in New Delhi, India from 31 August to 4 September 2009. Sixty delegates from 17 contracting governments, namely, Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam attended the meeting. Delegates from Bhutan and Japan attended as observers. There were 12 additional participants from India. The chair of the IPPC Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Ms Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde attended the Session. The list of participants is attached as Annex I.

1.2 Inaugural address by Mr P.K. Basu, Additional Secretary, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation

Mr P.K. Basu, on behalf of the Secretary (Agriculture and Cooperation), Government of India, warmly welcomed the delegates to the 26th session of the APPPC at New Delhi.

In the context of liberalization of global trade, advances in genetic engineering, climate change, and threats of bio-terrorism and trans-boundary diseases such as avian flu, Ug-99 and swine flu, collaborative initiatives in plant protection were required.

India had prepared a blue print for agricultural bio-security with an integrated approach similar to the one adopted by Australia and New Zealand. New pesticide management legislation is being passed. The National Institute of Plant Health Management at Hyderabad was being upgraded which would create and share knowledge with other countries.

While phytosanitary measures were necessary, they had to be scientifically justified, consistent with the risk, least restrictive, and cause minimum impediment to international trade. A balanced approach was, therefore, required.

He concluded wishing the 26th session of APPPC all success.

1.3 Opening remarks by the Chairperson of the 25th session of APPPC by Mr Xia Jingyuan (China)

The outgoing Chairperson of the 25th session of the APPPC, Mr Xia Jingyuan from China expressed thanks to the Government of India and FAO for their contributions and support for the hosting of this event. He also extended his thanks to the Executive Secretary of the APPPC for the outstanding arrangements made for the meeting.

Special thanks were accorded to the Government of the Republic of Korea for their financial support of the regional workshop for the review of draft international standards for phytosanitary measures. He also thanked the Governments of New Zealand, Malaysia and China for their contributions to the drafting of three regional standards.

Mr Xia noted that the APPPC enters a new era with the implementation of the 1983 amendment to the APPPC Agreement on a financial mechanism. In conclusion, Mr Xia wished the participants a successful conference.

1.4 Opening address by Mr Gavin Wall, FAO Representative in India and Bhutan

The FAO Representative in India and Bhutan, Mr Gavin Wall, on behalf of the Director-General of the FAO of the United Nations, Mr Jacques Diouf and also himself, welcomed the delegates to New Delhi.

Mr Wall noted that of late, the APPPC had apportioned more attention to phytosanitary measures. Three draft regional standards were developed over the last two years, and these will be presented for consideration later on in the Session.

Another important area of work highlighted by Mr Wall was the setting up of a regional information system for the IPPC by the Secretariat of the Commission, and for the development of plant protection profiles of member countries.

There was considerable development work in the region that needed to be done, particularly in the strengthening of organization structures of the plant protection systems of individual countries, and a number of priority recommendations will be made later on in this Session.

In his closing remarks, Mr Wall requested the delegates present to convey to their national authorities the importance of pursuing the deposition of the instrument of acceptance of the amended version of the Agreement as early as possible.

1.5 Welcome address by Dr Peter Kenmore, Deputy Director, Division of Plant Production and Protection, AGP, FAO HQ

Dr Kenmore expressed great pleasure to be with this Session of the APPPC. This was the fifth meeting he had attended. This particular meeting should realize several goals on rules and procedures of ratification, on finance and on some difficult and significant pest problems.

Other countries of WTO and other IPPC parties had benefited from the APPPC, which had set the example to be able to find practical support and in engaging important problems. Dr Kenmore hoped that at the end of the Session, APPPC would have a series of decisions which would serve to inspire other regions.

By 2050, crop production in developing countries must double. For this to happen, there would be need for intensification, smart farming, smart policies, and the more creative use of markets. Dealings with phytosanitary issues would be crucial and risks must be better understood.

Dr Kenmore concluded his message by expressing his wish for participants to support the work in this Session, to provide pragmatic decisions to overcome the challenges over the next few years.

1.6 Address by Dr P.S. Chandukar, Plant Protection Adviser to the Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, India

Dr Chandukar started his address by expressing his gratitude to the Executive Secretary for accepting India's invitation to host this Session. He was also grateful to Mr Basu, who had managed to spare his time to attend the inaugural session amidst the current drought in India.

This was the third time that India had hosted an APPPC Session. Dr Chandukar thanked Mr Pankaj Kumar and Mr Rao for their keen interest in making arrangements and full support and his colleagues for helping out with the organization of the meeting, the Finance Department, the Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage and the Ministry of External Affairs.

1.7 Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons of the 26th session, the Drafting Committee and the adoption of the provisional agenda and timetable

1.7.1 Election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons of the 26th session

India was elected Chairperson of the 26th session of the APPPC.

The elected Vice-Chairpersons were from the following countries:

China, New Zealand and Philippines

1.7.2 Election of the Drafting Committee

New Zealand was elected Chairperson of the Drafting Committee. The other country members were: India, Malaysia, Philippines and Republic of Korea

1.8 Adoption of the provisional agenda and timetable

The draft agenda and timetable were adopted.

2. Executive Secretariat report on action taken on recommendations of the twenty-fifth session of the Commission

Mr Piao Yongfan, Executive Secretary of the APPPC, reported on the activities of the secretariat and working groups since the 25th session of the Commission.

2.1 Status of Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific region

On 13 February 2007, the Director-General received a notification of denunciation by Portugal. In accordance with Article XII.2 of the Agreement, the denunciation became effective on 13 February 2008.

On 4 August 2008, the Director-General received a notification of denunciation by the United Kingdom. In accordance with Article XII.2 of the Agreement, the denunciation became effective on 4 August 2009.

Twenty-four countries are contracting parties of the Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific region at present. These countries are Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), Fiji, France, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Tonga and Viet Nam.

At its Thirteenth session (April 1983), the APPPC proposed certain amendments to Articles II, III, IV and XIV to the Agreement. The purpose of these amendments was to introduce mandatory contributions for the contracting governments in order to finance the programme of activities of the Commission. In accordance with paragraph 2, Article IX of the Agreement, these amendments were submitted to the FAO Council for approval. The Council, at its eighty-fourth session (November 1983), approved the aforesaid amendments. As these amendments entail new obligations, in accordance with paragraph 4, Article IX of the Agreement, they will enter into force as from the thirtieth day after acceptance by two-thirds of the contracting governments but only with respect to the contracting governments which at the time of entry into force or at some later date, have actually accepted the amendments.

The Philippines deposited her instruments of acceptance of the amendments on 27 May 2008. Sixteen countries namely Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, DPRK, Fiji, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka and Viet Nam deposited their instruments of acceptance of the amendments. The Agreement amended in 1983 with introduction of mandatory financial contributions for the contracting governments comes into force on 4 September 2009. This will be a milestone of the history of APPPC.

2.2 Follow-up action of the special group for strategic planning

A special group meeting on strategic planning (SGSP) was established based on the proposal from the 24th session of the APPPC, and the APPPC strategic and business plans were adopted by the 25th session of APPPC. A SGSP meeting, as a follow up action of the 25th session, was convened in Bangkok, Thailand, from 21 to 23 July 2008. The meeting was attended by 8 countries – China, India, Malaysia, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Viet Nam. The specific purpose of the workshop was to prepare administrative arrangements of the Commission for entry into force of the 1983 amendments. The meeting discussed the procedures for budgeting, planning, and accounting for dealing with these funds – in particular the setting of the level of mandatory funding contributions. The estimated budget amount was based on strategic plan and business plan of APPPC for 2008-2009, which was adopted by the 25th session of APPPC in 2007. This information was sent to member countries in 2008. From this proposed budget, the levels of mandatory contributions from members were estimated. Details will be reported at the Agenda 4.2.

2.3 Updating country profiles for the exchange of plant protection information among APPPC members

In order to enhance information exchange among member countries, the Plant Protection Profile was developed. This is a standard format for essential information describing the organization and state of development of the different plant protection functions in the APPPC member countries. This was published in 2007. It is expected that such a format would strengthen APPPC's role for the collection, collation and dissemination of crucial plant protection information, and would allow a more systematic assessment of the state of plant protection in the region. Meanwhile, it is expected that an organized and structured information exchange in form of country profiles would help member countries in formulating policies, recognize new challenges or gaps in the execution of plant protection functions, and promote transparency and harmonization of procedures. In addition the profiles would be the complementary contribution to International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP). All APPPC members were asked to update their profile in early 2009. Countries which did not attend the 25th session of APPPC and which have not completed a Plant Protection Profile were asked to prepare a country profile using the blank format. Most countries provided the updated profile enabling the Secretariat to compile the update version of plant protection profiles and share with all participants to the Session.

2.4 Progress in development and implement of Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPMs) and International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) in Asia and the Pacific region

During the 25th session of APPPC, the topics of South American Leaf Blight (SALB) of Hevea Rubber, land border quarantine and container cleanliness were identified as priorities of development of the regional standards for phytosanitary measures. With the assistance of scientists from China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia and New Zealand, three initial draft specifications were prepared in early 2008 and reviewed by APPPC Standard Committee (SC) members and all member countries subsequently for comments. The drafts of three RSPMs prepared by experts from China, Malaysia and New Zealand and finalized by the APPPC SC members at the workshop which was participated by experts from Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Republic of Korea and Thailand from 14 to 20 July 2008 in Bangkok.

These three drafts (draft 1 – *Guidelines for Protection against South American Leaf Blight of Rubber*; draft 2 – *Guidelines for the Exterior Cleanliness of Containers*; draft 3 – *Guidance on Land Border Plant Quarantine*) were sent to APPPC member countries on August 2008 either by hard copies or emails for country consultations. At the same time the drafts were put on the webpage of APPPC in IPP/IPPC for easy access and comments. After further revision and consolidation based on country feedback, they were submitted to this Session of APPPC for review and consideration for adoption.

During the WTO meeting of 25-26 February 2009, the representative of Brazil raised concerns regarding some provisions of the Constitutive Agreement of the APPPC, which includes a clause in its Article 4 and Appendix B on SALB. The provisions request APPPC contracting parties to prohibit by law the importation

of hevea plants from countries outside the region. Brazil considered that this measure which affected many countries in South and Central America, lacked scientific justification and was not based on risk analysis. In 1999, the 117th Council of FAO recommended that the APPPC revise its constitutive agreement in line with the IPPC and SPS Agreement principles and provisions. Brazil expected a timely revision of the APPPC constitutive agreement. The representative of Japan supported Brazil's concern. Although Japan was located in the area covered by the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Convention, it was not a member of APPPC due to the provisions referred by Brazil against SALB. Japan hoped that APPPC would consider this risk assessment and adopt a regional standard at its Session on September 2009. According to the 117th Council of FAO (1999) the second set of amendments which will remove the Article IV and Appendix B mentioned, will be circulated for acceptance after the development and adoption of a satisfactory regional standard on SALB by the Commission.

Meanwhile APPPC member countries have actively involved in development of ISPMs during past two years. APPPC organized the 9th regional (Asia) workshop on review of draft ISPMs in 2008 with financial assistance of the Republic of Korea. Several draft ISPMs have been reviewed by participants and substantive revisions and suggestions were made to the draft standards that can be used by individual countries in the preparation of their comments for the Standards Committee via the IPPC Secretariat. The 10th APPPC regional (Asia) workshop on review of draft ISPMs will be convened in Busan, Republic of Korea in middle of September 2009. The Republic of Korea will again kindly provide financial support and facilities to this regional review meeting too.

During the 25th session of Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC), it was proposed that the APPPC begin a programme for collaboration on strategic issues. This would be initiated by establishing a programme for the joint consideration of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) issues of concern to the members. The initiative was accepted as part of the work programme by the Commission. As a result, a regional pre-CPM-3 meeting was organized on 6 April prior to the CPM-3 in Rome with participants from Australia, China, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Philippines, Republic of Korea and Thailand. Therefore the delegates had an opportunity to explain the position of their country on various matters and, if appropriate, request support from other delegates for the discussions at CPM-3.

2.5 Technical assistance and capacity building in phytosanitary measures

Three training workshops on pest risk analysis (PRA) and import regulation, followed by several seminars, were organized in 2008 through a regional project (supported by a trust fund provided by Japan), GCP/RAS/226/JPN: *Cooperation for the improvement of phytosanitary capacity in Asian countries through capacity building*, from 9 to 21 June 2008 in Hanoi, Viet Nam, from 3 to 14 November 2008 in Jakarta, Indonesia and from 3 to 14 March 2009 in Bangkok, Thailand. Fifty-three participants from Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Indonesia, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam received training at these three training workshops. In addition, the training materials provided should be useful for their actual work and domestic training on PRA. Meanwhile several seminars and technical meetings on plant quarantine with updates on IPPC activities were conducted in June in Lao PDR, in October in Sri Lanka and in October in Myanmar in 2008 respectively. These activities may provide assistance in development of human resources who are playing key roles in national plant protection organizations and may contribute to improvement of national capacity in phytosanitary measures in these countries.

A “phytosanitary capacity building project” (PCBP) for Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam was commissioned by New Zealand Official Development Assistance in February 2001. Based on the evaluation of the implementation for the period of February 2001 to June 2004, a three-year project (2006-2009) – “Phytosanitary capacity building for the Mekong region”, has been designed to build credible phytosanitary services in each of the four countries to enhance phytosanitary capabilities, in order to promote trade and rural income generation, thereby reducing poverty. The APPPC Executive Secretary attended the senior officials meeting, which was held from 2 to 3 April 2008 in Hanoi, Viet Nam, and presented updated information on the APPPC and discussed the enhancement of capacity building through close collaboration between the project and APPPC with the donor and participants.

In order to strengthen SPS measures amongst the Greater Mekong sub-region (GMS) members, Asian Development Bank (ADB) initiated a project, Regional Technical Assistance (RETA) 6450: Enhancing transport and trade facilitation-strengthening sanitary and phytosanitary cooperation in the GMS, with the support of and collaboration with various donors and counterparts including FAO. This project was approved prior to the 3rd GMS Summit held in Vientiane on March 2007. It consisted of three main streams of activities: (1) to arrive at an agreed risk-based system of inspections; (2) to strengthen national and regional capacities for diagnostic and testing facilities; and (3) GMS hazard avoidance harmonization in food and agricultural products trade and SE compliance support. The work consists of three phases with consultative workshop at the end of each phase; phase I: information gathering, start-up consultations and the definition of the scope of work; phase II: preparation of a draft report for risk management; and phase III: preparation of a phased regional implementation plan for surveillance and risk management. The action plan for improved SPS handling in GMS cross border trade will be arranged and will be finalized on January 2010, which will include four areas of cooperation. These are (1) to arrive at an agreed risk-based system of cross-border handling that will enhance trade within GMS while promoting plant and animal health, and food safety; (2) to strengthen national and regional capacities for diagnostic and testing facilities; (3) to promote private sector capacities for food safety compliance; and (4) to promote academic training needed for managing SPS. The APPPC Executive Secretary (Senior Regional Plant Protection Officer, RAP, FAO) was involved in several consultation activities and was invited as a resource person at the workshop, while valuable technical advice was provided in depth to the ADB consultant by the Executive Secretary. Such collaboration will continue.

The Republic of Korea organized several training workshops on capacity building in phytosanitary measures for ASEAN member countries during 2007-2009. A number of senior officials and operational staff of the national plant protection organizations from these countries were invited to the trainings. It not only provided training opportunities of improvement of the capacity but also built forums for information exchange among these countries for better mutual understanding of current status and update institutional and infrastructural development regarding phytosanitary measures.

2.6 Progress in integrated pest management (IPM) in the Asia and Pacific region

2.6.1 Regional IPM programme

Two phases of the FAO Vegetable IPM Programme for South and Southeast Asia involving Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, Lao PDR, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam were completed on 31 December 2008, and followed by the implementation of another partial project-IPM component of pesticide risk reduction programme (GCP/RAS/229/SWE, 2007-2009). The final three years of the programme, from 2005 to 2008, were supported by the Norwegian government.

The external review mission took place in October/November 2008 for evaluating the FAO Phase II Asia Regional Vegetable IPM Programme before ending the project. The mission evaluated the work of the programme positively and recommended for a continuation of the programme into a 3rd phase. It was noted that increasing the capacity of national IPM programmes, other agencies, NGOs and farmer trainers required to implement IPM training and to promote sustained IPM practices among smallholder vegetable farmers has been highly successful in all of the countries involved, and has achieved much more than could have been expected. The IPM strategies, and their underlying scientific and technological bases, appeared to be very sound, indicating that the IPM curricula, the Training of Trainers (TOT) and the Farmer Field Schools (FFS) have been very soundly developed. It was clear from the levels of farmer enthusiasm that they felt that IPM worked, and that it was doing them a great deal of good. The final evaluation team considered that the capacity for management and implementation of vegetable IPM had been strengthened significantly in all countries. The first two phases of the FAO Vegetable IPM Programme have shown that IPM can be a very successful and fully sustainable alternative to narrow, chemical-based crop protection, and IPM must remain a core technology of this holistic food production. It was expressed that the project linked in some extent with sustainable intensification of agricultural production, rural development, food safety and trade facilitation.

FAO, with its unique experience in Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and pesticide management capacity building, combined with its convening role for neutral mediation within the context of several international instruments addressing problems related to distribution and use of pesticides, is particularly well-placed to address this within the context of a regional assistance programme on Pesticide Risk Reduction in Southeast Asia, supported by the Swedish Government. FAO has been subcontracted by the Swedish Chemical Agency (KemI) to step up field programmes to help farmers adopt Integrated Pest Management and eliminate the use of highly hazardous pesticides (“IPM component”) as well as strengthening the pesticide regulatory framework and policy reform (“Policy component”) within a 3 year pilot project (2007-2009). The overall development objective of the project GCP/RAS/229/SWE is “Elimination of Use of Hazardous and Persistent Agro-Chemicals through IPM Farmer Training in Conjunction with Better Access/Utilization of Alternative Pest Management Options and Support for National Pest and Pesticide Management Policy Reform”. The immediate objective of the programme is increased capacity of FAO IPM field programmes, particularly in the Greater Mekong sub-region, to educate larger numbers of farmers in areas prone to heavy pesticide abuse, to create or strengthen local groups and networks of smallholder IPM farmers for continued action in support of ecologically-based agriculture and to institutionalize mechanisms for generating sustainable solutions to technical production and protection problems.

The project is focused on community education for pesticide risk reduction. A set of guidelines for curriculum development for pesticide risk reduction has subsequently been drafted and is currently being finalized for publication. Country programmes are now in the process of developing their own locally-adapted curriculum and training materials for use in TOT, FFS and other training activities. Networks of relevant, public and private sector actors at country-level, have been established to assist in project implementation and to provide technical advice and overall directions for project implementation.

2.6.2 *Brown planthopper (BPH) and coconut beetle*

Migratory insect pests such as BPH and viruses carried by the insects are the major common constraints for intensive rice production in Asian countries, since the insect pests can be carried by wind for more than several hundred kilometres. Outbreaks of migratory insect pests and associated virus diseases in rice production areas were frequently observed in Asian countries, affecting stable rice production in the regions. In early 2008, such instability of rice production in Asia finally led to an export ban on rice in countries like India and Viet Nam, and the emergency rice import from Japan to Philippines. Such instability in rice trading instigated social and economic unrest associated with more than 50 percent rise in rice prices in international and domestic markets in some rice-importing developing countries.

An international BPH conference was convened in International Rice Research Institute (IRRI) from 23 to 25 June 2008 in Philippines with the support of FAO. It brought together a number of scientists, agricultural directors and pesticide company representatives from Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, FAO, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Thailand, United States of America (USA) and Viet Nam.

In the 1970s, BPH became a threat to rice intensification programmes in Indonesia, Thailand, India, Solomon Islands and the Philippines. FAO initiated regional rice IPM programme focused on IPM TOT and FFS, and it significantly contributed to remarkable reduction of unnecessary insecticide use and adoption of various ecological approaches at community levels in the past 30 years. However, in the last five years, BPH problems have intensified in several countries. This might be due of factors such increased fertilizer and pesticide intensities, climate, changes in rice varieties (hybrid rice) and cropping patterns. It has been proven by ecological research that BPH is a secondary pest induced by ecological perturbations, particularly insecticides. It was stressed that ecological management techniques, ecosystem management and policy facilitation will be main context of sustainable management of planthoppers and IPM is continuously effective and practical approach.

FAO supported a season-long rice IPM training of trainers course in Viet Nam, with a fortified pest risk reduction (PRR) curriculum, which was implemented in Thai Binh province during July-October 2008. Also, technical advice and assistance were provided to Cambodia for dealing with BPH issue. The Cambodian Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry visited an IPM-FFS Farmers’ Association involved in organic

rice and vegetable production in Thbaung Khmum district, Kampong Cham on 28 December 2008 and announced the ambitious goal that at the end of year 2009, there should be at least one IPM farmers' group producing organic vegetables and rice in each and every Cambodian province.

During the bi-annual regional meeting for the FAO Vegetable IPM Programme (12 to 14 November 2008, Bangkok, Thailand), APPPC IPM Standing Committee Chairperson facilitated discussions on the situation of BPH and coconut beetle in the region and collaboration between APPPC and ASEAN-IPM. The BPH outbreak status was reviewed and experience in the management of BPH shared among participating countries.

Coconut beetle has been and is still a problem for coconut production in Viet Nam, Thailand, Lao PDR, Philippines and Cambodia. FAO has provided assistance for a biological project to introduce rear and release *Asecodes* sp in Viet Nam, Thailand, Lao PDR and Cambodia. The results had been very good in Viet Nam. However, parasitoids needed to be released continuously with an appropriate number to be effective. In Cambodia and Lao PDR, the number of parasitoids released was small and there was a problem with low survival rate in the dry season due to hot temperatures. A predator, an earwig was also effective in controlling this insect and was comparatively easy to produce, but it was not a host specific. There was a problem with bringing them to close to the host in the coconut trees. Each country needs to set up small laboratories near to the place where coconuts are grown and where farmers have access, for example, at district level. Government support is needed both for activities related to collecting from nature and rearing natural enemies in the laboratory. Thailand and Viet Nam were willing to provide initial culture of parasitoids and accept participants from other countries for training.

2.6.3 Weedy rice management

Weedy rice incidence had been reported with increased direct-seeding. With the recent trend in Asian countries from transplanting to direct-seeding, the area affected in the countries was also variable. Thailand has more than 2 million ha seriously affected by this weed, while more than 500 000 ha are also infested in the Mekong Delta River in Viet Nam; Sri Lanka and Philippines have substantial area of rice also affected since direct-seeded areas increased year after year. This clearly indicated that the losses caused by the weed were high and that current agronomic practices would continue to contribute making weedy rice the most troublesome weed in the 21st century.

In order to address this issue, a regional meeting on weedy rice management was convened from 4 to 7 November 2008, in Bangkok, Thailand by FAO. The meeting aimed at full identification of the weedy rice problems in affected countries in terms of total infested areas, methods currently used by farmers for its control, and other alternatives under development. The meeting was attended by specialists from China, India, Malaysia, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Viet Nam, and invited specialists from IRRI, based in Indonesia, and the University of Arkansas, USA. The most important activity of this meeting was to formulate a regional strategy to manage the problem, in particular enhancing farmers' capacity for weedy rice prevention and control through farmers training programmes. The programme will serve as a starting point of collaboration of the countries concerned in finding viable solutions for effective weedy rice management.

2.7 Implementation of the Rotterdam Convention on the prior informed consent (PIC) procedure for certain hazardous chemicals and pesticide in international trade and the international Code of Conduct on distribution and use of pesticides

An international initiative to reduce risks associated with the use of pesticides focusing on highly hazardous pesticides (HTPs) is a direct contribution to various millennium development goals (MDGs). Efforts to protect human health and the environment and to support the growth of healthy crops against the hazards of pesticides will enhance agricultural and environmental sustainability (MDG 7). Over the last few years, a number of countries in Asia and Pacific have made significant efforts to improve their national infrastructure for the management of pesticides. A number of developing countries such as China, Thailand and Viet Nam have recently banned the use of HTPs. For example, China has phased out all pesticides containing persistent organic pollutants (POPs) by 17 May 2009, as required by the Stockholm Convention. Starting 1 October 2009, sales and uses of such fipronil formulations will be banned in the China market, except for those applications in hygiene and seed-coating agents.

The Rotterdam Convention is one of concrete examples of FAO's commitment to helping its members, particularly the developing countries, achieve the sustainable agricultural production and address the challenging problems associated with the pesticide use.

A subregional consultation among designated national authorities (DNAs) to the Rotterdam Convention, which was convened from 18 to 22 February 2008, Phuket, Thailand, fostered cooperation and facilitated a dialogue among DNAs in India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Thailand. Participants discussed the challenges faced in the implementation of the Rotterdam Convention, shared experiences and promoted cooperation in addressing these challenges.

A national workshop on the implementation of trade related provisions of the Rotterdam Convention (PIC), was convened from 29 October to 2 November 2007, Hangzhou, China. Participants reviewed examples from the perspectives of each stakeholder in the country and considered what actions and interactions would be required and by whom, taking into consideration the current practices, identifying gaps or needs for improvement, and exploring a way forward to address the gaps.

The import response average rate among Parties (Asia-PIC region) was 71 percent by the end of January 2009. The information about the import responses issued by both Parties and Non Parties was useful for the countries concerned in their consideration of additional chemicals suitable for issuing import responses. However, notifications of final regulatory actions to ban or severely restrict chemicals issued by contracting parties in the region were quite limited. It may serve as a starting point for other Parties in Asia and the Pacific to consider instances which are suitable for issuance of notifications. Notifications and import response were two key benchmarks measuring the progress achieved in the implementation of the Convention in the region.

In order to present the experiences of various countries in this region in relation to the implementation of the Rotterdam Convention, "The regional approach on the implementation of the Rotterdam Convention (2007-2008)" was published and distributed to all APPPC member countries on October 2008. The report reflected the progress which has been made and the steps which remained to be undertaken to achieve the two key objectives of the Convention. Hopefully, the experiences shared and gained here will help the participating countries in identifying lessons to be learnt, in order to effectively address the challenges to pesticide use and to avoid implementation pitfalls which were time consuming and costly.

There were several countries such as Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR and Myanmar which were still not contracting parties to the Rotterdam Convention. It was suggested that further actions were necessary to ratify the Convention shortly for setting up an early warning system for countries on the potential danger of HTPs by sharing information on bans or severe restrictions, and information on human poisoning and environmental damage. Also, the PIC procedure may help countries make their own informed decisions on the use and import of pesticides and prevent export of unwanted pesticides. The Convention assisted countries to stop problems associated with HTPs before they emerge.

Meanwhile, licensing of pesticide importers and sellers, coupled with an effective inspection system, was an important tool for enforcement of pesticide legislation. Countries in the Greater Mekong sub-region were in the process of establishing or strengthening such systems.

A high-level workshop on licensing and inspection of pesticide retailers was co-organized by FAO and the Department of Plant Protection, Ministry of Agriculture, Viet Nam in Hanoi from 10 to 11 November 2007. Senior officers from Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Viet Nam attended the meeting with the support of GCP/RAS/229/SWE project. The workshop was aimed at department (division) managers with the responsibility for the design and function of licensing and inspection schemes for pesticide sellers. It provided an opportunity to exchange information and experiences, and to discuss common issues/questions related to the establishment and operating of licensing schemes for pesticide importers and sellers, and inspection systems to monitor their compliance with legal obligations.

It was observed that Thailand, China and Viet Nam have developed holistic legislation, registration and inspection systems for pesticide market management, while Cambodia and Lao PDR lack such systems. Periodical inspections, ad-hoc inspections and organized inspections with specific objectives are conducted in these countries. The Ministry of Agriculture plays a leading role in inspections, quality analysis, labeling and regulating advertisement of pesticides. Institutionalization of such actions and infrastructure arrangements has provided sound basis of enforcement. In November 2007, China promulgated six new regulations aiming to improve the level of pesticide management. It included increasing basic requirement in the pesticide registration, strengthening the management of the labels (contents of labels of the products should be put on the official webpage of pesticide management service) and cancellation of all trade names of pesticides, which reduced risk of confusion of understanding and decreased potential confusion while it made significant reduction of the pesticide names from 160 000 to 1 700.

In conclusion, the active collaboration and cooperation among member countries resulted in remarkable achievements during past two years. The government commitments and intensive dedication of NPPOs of APPPC were essential to making such progress.

Special thanks were delivered to Republic of Korea, New Zealand, Malaysia, India and China for their extensive inputs to APPPC. These countries either hosted several training activities and meeting sessions or provided financial support and technical assistance to the development of regional and international standards for phytosanitary measures in the past two years.

2.8 Discussion on the Executive Secretary's report

The Executive Secretary's report was endorsed by the Session.

3. Country, regional and international organization reports

3.1 Australia

Review of Australia's quarantine and biosecurity arrangements

A comprehensive, independent review of Australia's quarantine and biosecurity arrangements was undertaken in 2008. The Australian Government released the panel's report, *One biosecurity: a working partnership*, and its preliminary response to the recommendations in December 2008. In its preliminary response, the government agreed in principle to all of the review panel's 84 recommendations. However, although implementation will take considerable time, interim arrangements are now in place, including the establishment of the biosecurity services group. A new plant division has been established, bringing together plant risk analysis, plant quarantine operations and plant protection, headed by Dr Colin Grant.

Regional capacity building

Activities emphasise sanitary and phytosanitary measures (SPS) awareness, pest risk analysis (PRA), diagnostics of plant pests, management of pest reference collections, information management and economics of SPS barriers to trade. It is delivered by a mixture of in-country training workshops and reciprocal training visits by ASEAN and Australian technical experts.

Australian fumigation accreditation scheme (AFAS)

AFAS is a management system for overseas agencies, a training and accreditation for fumigators, a registration system for fumigation companies and acceptance by Australia of fumigation certificates issued under AFAS. The scheme provides capacity building for overseas quarantine agencies in monitoring and registering fumigators and to enhance the technical expertise of these fumigators and providing training for methyl bromide fumigations. It also assists fumigators in maintaining a high standard of fumigation performance and compliance with AQIS requirements and facilitates export trade. It has been implemented in Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, India, Papua New Guinea and the Philippines leading to reduced fumigation failures. Full implementation of AFAS is scheduled in China in 2009 and discussions have commenced with Viet Nam.

Border quarantine inspections

Approximately 900 000 entries of sea or air cargo are inspected on arrival in Australia. The majority of detections of insects, fungi and contaminant weed seeds in horticultural products, grains and seeds and timber are sent for treatment without detailed taxonomic investigation. In addition, a small number of detections of quarantine pests occur in products that have been released from quarantine. Over 60 percent of post quarantine detections are of insects, mainly associated with detections are furniture and wooden items (including bamboo, cane and wicker), which is thought to reflect the difficulty in detection on arrival due to the cryptic nature of wood boring insects.

Pest incursions and diagnostics

Information exchange has been carried out using the IPP. This has included pest reports, including eradication of citrus canker in January 2009, and the first nationally endorsed diagnostic protocols, for plum pox virus and apple brown rot (*Monilinia fructigena*).

Methyl bromide alternatives information system (MBAIS)

The Australian MBAIS helps identify alternatives to methyl bromide use as a general purpose fumigant and contains information for quarantine and pre-shipment and non-quarantine uses. Users can register to find alternatives, share information and establish links with other users.

Pesticides

Pesticide evaluation, registration and regulation is the responsibility of the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority. It has an established review programme of pesticides.

National plant health status

A concise overview of Australia's plant biosecurity system is provided by the first national plant health status report. It is a consolidated snapshot of the system that protects Australian agricultural and forestry industries, worth more than \$20 billion per year, from exotic pests. It describes Australia's plant health system and provides information on the plant pests of greatest concern to Australia; the organizations and processes involved in keeping Australia's agricultural and forestry industries free from pests; and the innovative plant health research projects currently being undertaken by Australian research organizations and universities. For the year, July 2007 to June 2008, it identifies details of more than 200 high priority exotic pests of significant quarantine concern and also highlights over 120 surveillance programmes targeting plant pests of concern across the country.

Pests and Diseases Image Library (PaDIL)

PaDIL was developed by Museum Victoria with support provided by Department of Agricultural Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) and Plant Health Australia. PaDIL contains high quality images showing primarily exotic targeted organisms of plant health concern to Australia. It provides information on pests and diseases that assist in helping to protect against invasive threats to Australia's plant health by allowing rapid recognition of emergency plant pests to ensure appropriate response strategies are implemented. Guarding against pest and disease invasion is a key component of Australia's national plant health strategy.

3.2 Bangladesh

Bangladesh is an agrarian country and her climate favours the rapid development of various pests and diseases on crops. One of the main constraints to crop production is the pests. Estimated crop loss by pest and diseases are 10 to 15 percent annually.

The plant protection activities of the country at national level are under the Director of Plant Protection Wing of the Department of Agricultural Extension under the Ministry of Agriculture. Bangladesh has to import a huge quantity of food, seeds and other plants and plant products. Annually on an average 76 lac metric tons of plants and plant products are imported through the Plant Quarantine Stations of Plant Protection Wing.

On an average 900 000 metric tons of agricultural commodities are inspected by the plant quarantine section per annum for the purpose of export. There was also a need to issue huge number of phytosanitary certificates. The recent introduction of some restriction by some of the European Union (EU) countries on sanitary and phytosanitary issues might have created adverse effects on the country's exports.

The existing plant quarantine legislation known as "destructive insects and pests rules, 1966 (plant quarantine)" was framed as per provisions delineated under Sub-section (I) of Section-3, Section-4A and 4D of the Destructive Insect and Pests Act, 1914 (II of 1914). On the basis of the national seed policy, an amended Plant Quarantine Acts, 2007 has been drafted and will get the approval of the Government soon.

Pest surveillance and forecasting system of the country have been recently upgraded. The infestation of brown plant hopper (BPH) and stem borer were very high during last two years. Besides, outbreak of bacterial leaf blight and blast in rice crop during 2007 to 2008 and 2008 to 2009 crop seasons created some threats on the total rice production in the country. Incidences of white mould disease in some oilseeds and vegetables have been reported during 2007 to 2009 as a new disease.

Different pest control approaches were being practiced to manage the pest incidence in the country. Among these, integrated pest management (IPM) approach was given more emphasis for the management of pests in the country. Realizing the importance of IPM, the Government of Bangladesh (GOB) has given due importance, which was reflected in the national agricultural policy where it is emphasized the IPM being the main policy for controlling pests and diseases. In view of the importance of IPM in Bangladesh, a National IPM policy has also been developed. Research institutions have developed several new IPM technologies. Private sectors have also come forward for mass rearing and marketing of parasitoids and predators. Pesticide-free vegetables and some fruits were available on a limited scale but the marketing channel needed to be developed. The Government has started thinking about the GAP, particularly of export vegetables and fruits. Safe food production through IPM approach created a great enthusiasm among the producers and consumers under the guidance of the different Government agencies.

Several hundreds of IPM/ICM facilitators have been developed at Department of Agriculture Extension (DAE). For sustainability of IPM/ICM practices in the community, over 2 000 farmer trainers have been developed. By September 2011, about 950 000 farm families will be trained on IPM/ICM but this is about 6 percent of the 15 million farm families. Over 10 000 IPM/ICM clubs have been formed throughout the country and these clubs started the formation of their association at union and Upazila level.

A total of 123 generic pesticides have been registered for use in agriculture and 60 for use in public health. The total number of trade name of agricultural and public health of these pesticides is 1 674. There is a Pesticide Technical Advisory Committee headed by the Executive Chairman of Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council (BARC), Ministry of Agriculture. Based on formulation, the Government has banned nine pesticide compounds under WHO class 1a and 1b for agricultural purposes.

3.3 Cambodia

General information

Cambodia is an agricultural country with 80 percent of people living in rural areas and relying on the agriculture sector for supporting their livelihood. The share of GDP contributed by the agricultural sector was estimated at 34.4 percent in 2008 compared with 23.8 percent from the industrial sector and 41.8 percent from the services sector. The agriculture sub sectors are composed of crop production (52.7 percent), forestry (6.9 percent), fisheries (25 percent) and livestock (15.5 percent). In recognition of the important role of National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) when Cambodia became a WTO member, the Government restructured and strengthened the Plant Protection and SPS Department (PP-SPSD) of the General Directorate of Agriculture (GDA) on 14 November 2008. The establishment of PP-SPSD demonstrated the commitment of the Royal Government of Cambodia in strengthening the implementation of SPS/WTO measures by empowering this new department to be responsible for all phytosanitary measures and the food safety aspect of plant products at farm level.

Plant quarantine

Plant quarantine became one of the offices under PP-SPSD/GDA that played a key role in inspection and certification of plant products intended for export. After endorsement of Sub-Decree No. 64 in mid 2001 the Cambodian plant quarantine activities were only undertaken at the central office level. Due to lack of staff, no activities were carried out at the international entry/exit points. With the accession of Cambodia to the WTO, the Government has realized the critical role of phytosanitary measures as an integral part of the SPS agreement. The government subsequently reviewed Sub-Decree No. 64 resulting in the endorsement of Sub-Decree No. 06 on 30 March 2004, empowering the plant quarantine service to implement its duties at all international airports (Phnom Penh and Siem Reap) in the Kingdom of Cambodia. Another important development was the finally drafted Sub-Decree on land and seaport border management which has now been agreed by all concerned institutions and had been submitted to the Government for final approval. This new Sub-Decree empowered the plant quarantine service to deploy the officers to work at the land and seaport check points of the country, where the supporting infrastructure needed to be rebuilt from scratch. However, many implementation challenges remain and the PP-SPSD had inadequate qualified personnel and facilities, especially in reference to pest surveillance, management of pest outbreaks, including invasive species. Regarding pest outbreaks, the country still faced problems with golden apple snails (*Pomacea canaliculata*), rice brown plant hoppers (*Nilaparvata lugens*) and coconut beetle (*Brontispa longissima*) infestations in palm trees. Although much effort has been made to manage these pests, the problems persisted.

Due to limited capacity of NPPO and characteristic geographical situation of Cambodia with long porous land borders with Thailand, Lao PDR and Viet Nam, there had not been any pest-free area production sites established yet. The preparation of a list of regulated pests in accordance with ISPM No. 19 is still not drafted due to limited capacity and financial support. The PRA had just started with the formation of a PRA team consisting of three entomologists and three plant pathologists to work with support from FAO to provide on-the-job training. Only some ISPM tasks directly related to trade facilitation had been implemented so far. There were many projects, namely AADCP/AusAID, SPS Capacity Building Programme/AusAID, NZAID I & II, FAO TCP/CMB/3104 and JICA supported project for laboratory capacity building, working to support building capacity of the Cambodia plant quarantine service in the areas of human resource and infrastructure development. The latter included the set up of PRA room and basic equipment for establishment of a plant pest diagnosis laboratory.

Integrated pest management

A wide variety of IPM activities had been implemented with remarkable results in all major agriculture provinces under the effective supervision, management and coordination of the national IPM programme. The overall goal of the national IPM programme is to promote food security and safety and better market access for IPM produce. This was done through the promotion of integrated pest and crop management (IPM) among smallholder farmers as an integral part of government and CSO efforts for sustainable intensification of crop production systems. Through participation in season-long farmers field schools, farmers developed skills to increase productivity and profitability in an environmentally friendly and health safety manner. Integrated pest IPM had been considered by MAFF as one of the country's key crop production strategies with the aim of making IPM the standard approach to crop management in Cambodia. Major training activities implemented were training of trainers courses on rice, vegetable, water melon, rice-fish-vegetable and mung bean; training of farmer trainers; farmer field schools on the above mentioned crops; farmer life schools; refresher courses for district and farmer trainers; living soil training; training on farmer self studies on pesticide health hazards; pesticide risk reduction training; farmer congress; study tour and exchange visits; workshops and meetings; system of rice intensification, field studies and experiments; development of community IPM and establishment of farmer clubs; organic rice; chemical-free vegetable associations; monitoring and impact assessment; and others.

The national IPM programme had recently emphasized the focus on the sustainability by developing FFS approaches that were adopted by provincial government and development agencies, including NGOs. The programme also promoted the integration of IPM-FFSs in the work and budget plans of local commune councils whose work programmes were funded through decentralized donor-supported programmes. This way, IPM training activities had become more demand-driven and could be scaled-up at districts levels. FFS alumni

had formed groups and associations to continue working together with established trainer networks to provide services to local IPM projects and promoting IPM products via food safety projects. IPM alumni farmers organized chemical-free and organic production associations. These associations assisted in facilitating linkages for more effective marketing of IPM produce and better market access. Safe IPM produce was then supplied to supermarkets, restaurants, big hotels and casinos. Introduction and promotion of biological control, e.g., parasitoids (*C. plutellae*, *Asecodes*), pathogens (*Trichoderma*) and predators (earwigs), was included in IPM-FFS to provide farmers with alternatives to chemical pesticides. Application of FFS approaches to training on plant genetic resource management, plant biodiversity and integrated farming systems (rice-fish-vegetable-livestock) had allowed farmers to expand learning about a range of agricultural activities, aimed at developing sustainable agricultural production systems throughout the country.

There were many international and local organizations that provided support for the national IPM programme over the last decade. These included FAO, Danish International Development Assistance (Danida), World Bank, European Union (EU), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and other. In close collaboration with all the organizations involved, the programme had trained more than 700 trainers, more than 2 500 farmer trainers and more than 150 000 farmers through season-long FFSs. Moreover, the programme also worked with school teachers and students and formed more than 900 farmer clubs involving more than 17 000 farmers. From practicing IPM in their fields, farmers had reported reductions of 48 percent in spray events, 51 percent in dosage, 50 percent in costs, 59 percent in WHO Class 1 pesticides and 47 percent in environmental impact quotient field values. Farmers who have graduated from IPM farmer field school training were able to increase rice yield/ha by approximately 25-30 percent. In addition, the investment costs for vegetable production (yard-long bean and tomato) by IPM farmers were reduced with 70-80 percent in comparison with non-IPM farmers. The National IPM Programme led to more sustainable and cost-effective production, reduction of ecological disruption and environmental contamination, reduction of public health and toxic residues in food and improvement of livelihood, biodiversity and marketability of produces. This made a huge contribution to food security and safety promotion, poverty alleviation, and ultimately to the national economic growth which are the priorities of the Cambodian Royal Government's rural development policy and strategy.

Pesticide management

Pesticide management is still a complicated task with cross mandatory responsibility from various departments. In MAFF there are three departments working namely (1) the Department of Agriculture Legislation, in charge of pesticide registration, licensing and regulatory authority, (2) the PP-SPS Department, playing a role as technical adviser in field evaluation of pesticides (chemical, biological), and (3) the National Agricultural Laboratory of the General Directorate of Agriculture, which has a role in analyzing of pesticides. Cambodia had signed and ratified the Stockholm Convention (POP), Montreal Protocol (Ozone Depletion Materials) and Basel conventions with full developed action plans for implementation of the first two conventions with focal points placed in the Ministry of Environment. Cambodia is still an observer and is making effort to be a member of the Rotterdam Convention. With regards to pesticide management, there are many challenges which remain unresolved, such as insufficient enforcement of regulations, uncontrolled importation, and broad availability of undesirable pesticides, misuse and over use, limited data on health and environmental effects and high pesticide residues in food. However, on a positive note, there had been a broad recognition throughout the Government, NGO and private sectors with regards to current pesticide issues and their negative implications for production, health, environment and trade.

In recent years, MAFF had made strong efforts in pesticide management in Cambodia. The Government had issued an order to all relevant units to strengthen pesticide management and quality control including across border trade, distribution, sale and use of agrochemicals in the country. The Government had enforced pesticide labeling regulations, including development of labels in local Khmer language in line with the FAO Code of Conduct on the distribution and the use of pesticides. In addition, MAFF is reviewing and updating the pesticide list including banned, restricted and permitted products. In the context of chemical management, the Ministry of Environment had started to introduce the global harmonization system (GHS) for pesticide labeling. Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) is providing assistance for staff capacity building and facilities for strengthening pesticide analysis laboratory. Through policy component of project GCP/RAS/229/SWE of the Swedish-supported pesticide risk reduction programme, activities were carried out to address

the issue of highly hazardous pesticides through capacity building for chemicals management in general. Cambodia focused on initial steps to develop adequate regulatory framework including legal documents and functional mechanism for the control of pesticides including drafting of the law on pesticide and other agrochemicals and capacity building for staff members in national and provincial levels on pesticide management including training for retailers and inspectors, pesticide quality control and inspection, and registration and data base development. In addition, Cambodia participated in an FAO regional high-level workshop on licensing and inspection of pesticide sellers, which was organized in Hanoi from 10 to 11 November 2008. The workshop facilitated the exchange of information and experiences, and discussed common issues/questions related to the establishment and operation of a functional licensing and inspection schemes for pesticide importers and sellers in compliance with legal obligations.

Food safety

Referring to food safety, high levels of pesticide residues were increasingly recognized as trade barriers and as problematic for domestic consumer health. MAFF was mandated to be responsible for food safety issues from farm level to the final phase of primary processing (Article 1 of Sub-Decree No. 105, dated 22 August 2005 and Sub-Decree No. 188 dated 14 November 2008). The Ministry of Commerce is responsible for food safety issues related to World Trade Organization (WTO)-SPS and food safety at the border and in the market. GAP standards and guidelines were developed in Khmer language based on ASEAN GAP. These were annexed to the draft of the ministerial proclamation (Prakas) on system of good agricultural practice for fresh fruit and vegetable. The PP-SPS Department will play a key role as good agricultural practice (GAP) certification body in cooperation with other specialized departments. The draft had been submitted for approval by the Minister for Agriculture. Whereas organic agriculture was promoted by the Cambodian Government, it still remained underdeveloped and sustainable growth of the organic agricultural sector will depend on consumer preferences and importing country acceptance. A training curriculum on GAP was incorporated into FFS for producers' education and a system of control and certification will be developed. Farmers who completed vegetable FFS had formed associations for chemical-free vegetable, organic rice and made links to the markets at local towns, markets at Phnom Penh capital and oversea markets. IPM products had been recognized as safe food commodity and some Provincial Departments of Agriculture had provided certifications for safe products.

3.4 China

China has made steady progress in most plant protection areas during 2007 and 2008. The National Plant Protection Office was established under the Ministry of Agriculture in 2008 in order to enhance the leadership in plant protection. The list of plant quarantine pests was revised and approved in 2007, based on the results of pest risk analysis and the principle of ISPM No. 19. A number of regulations and technical specifications/standards had been formulated in the fields of plant quarantine pest forecasting and pest management.

Over 2 600 pest species were intercepted in 390 000 lots of import cargoes, including 150 dangerous species in 20 000 cases and the other 2 450 varieties in 370 000 cases. These cases involved 170 countries and regions. The non-compliance notification was sent to relevant countries through bilateral and multilateral channels.

China's crop pests management information system was also established. Pest free areas (PFAs) for codling moth in nine provinces, such as Gansu, Shaanxi and Shandong and PFA for fruit fly in Chongqing were established. The pest information about locust, migratory rice pests, rice borer, rice blast, wheat stripe rust, lawn moth were forecasted and promulgated through television programmes. A large number of farmer training programmes and prevention actions were organized. As a result, large-scale outbreaks of major crop pests were effectively controlled.

In term of pest control, new progress was made on the implementation of green plant protection technologies. Insect pheromones trapping and mating disruption were applied for controlling key agricultural and forestry pests annually covering acreages of over 21 000 ha. *Trichogramma* spp were released in large numbers for controlling corn borers with annual application acreages of over 3 million ha. New mode of pest control actions, such as the unified actions through specialized teams or organized by farmer associations were promoted and supported by the government subsidized programmes, for example, the mode of unified control actions had increased to 18 percent in rice pest control in China in 2008.

In terms of pesticide management, six decrees were issued and implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture to harmonize and standardize pesticide labels in 2008. Amendments for the relevant regulations were made for improving the data requirements for pesticide registrations.

Meanwhile, China hosted the 25th session of APPPC in Beijing in August 2007. The country's experts took part in setting and revising relevant international and regional standards for phytosanitary measures, drafting two APPPC regional phytosanitary standards, as well as setting up bilateral consultation mechanism for phytosanitary issues with many countries.

During the period of 2007-2008, China also provided many countries with pest information for conducting relevant risk analysis, implementing international phytosanitary measures issued by International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and phytosanitary standards in Asian and the Pacific region.

3.5 India

The headquarters of the Directorate of Plant Protection Quarantine and Storage is located at Faridabad, Haryana. This office is headed by the Plant Protection Adviser to the Government of India and is responsible for the implementation of plant protection policies and programmes of Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India.

The major activities were exclusion of exotic pests, surveillance and monitoring and control of desert locust, ensuring availability of quality pesticides and biopesticides, promotion of integrated pest management approach in plant protection, development of the human resources in plant protection and monitoring of pesticide residues in agricultural commodities.

The Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation administered the Destructive Insects and Pests Act, 1914 (2 of 1914) under which Plant Quarantine (Regulation of Import into India) Order 2003 regulated the imports of agricultural commodities and the wood packaging material. Being the National Plant Protection Organization, the Directorate is responsible for implementation of phytosanitary certification programme. More than 150 plant protection specialists from all over the country had been authorized by NPPO to issue phytosanitary certificates, in accordance with the requirements of importing countries as per IPPC. 194 714 phytosanitary certificates were issued during 2008-2009 and more than 239 pest risk analyses were carried out. A number of quarantine pests had been intercepted in the imported consignments and notifications sent to the exporting countries.

IPM programme is based on crop based Farmers Field School approach. Seventy-seven IPM packages on major agricultural/horticultural crops had been developed. The Government of India encouraged the use of biocontrol agents. 318 biocontrol laboratories are in operation. National programme on the monitoring of pesticide residue is in progress. A project on surveillance on fruit flies had been completed during 2008 and the results were pending. Pest free area had been developed and notified for brown rot (*Ralstonia solanacearum*) and ring rot (*Clavibacter michiganensis*) of potato in the State of Punjab, recognition of which is under consideration of EU.

India is a signatory to FAO Code of Conduct on the distribution and use of pesticides and is implementing its provisions. The Insecticides Act, 1968 regulated the import, manufacture, sale, transport, distribution and use of pesticides with a view to prevent risk to the human beings, animals and the environment. The pesticide management bill in the form of "The Pesticide Management Act" is likely to be introduced during the year 2009 replacing Insecticides Act, 1968.

3.6 Indonesia

Plant quarantine

Agricultural industry is the back bone of the Indonesian economic. Indonesia has more than 17 000 islands that needed specific risk management in the agricultural quarantine operation with limited available resources. In the new organization structure, the centre for plant quarantine is a part of Indonesian agricultural quarantine

agency, and has 51 stations and offices which spread over the whole of Indonesian territory. In the year of 2008, the operational organization in the stations and offices were restructured by the modification of 43 plant quarantine stations and 43 animal quarantine stations to become 51 stations and offices to increase efficiency of the available resources particularly human resources and infrastructure. However, the quarantine operations were still at the same places to cover the whole of entry points such as air ports, seaports, mail offices, land borders and dry ports. Plant quarantine operations in the entry points were based on the law and regulations. During 2007-2008, we regulated the importation of fresh plant products in the form of fresh bulb vegetables into the territory of the Republic of Indonesia with the objective to protect the entry of quarantine pests associated with the consignments. The quarantine action was taken to mitigate risk by mechanically removing the roots. To strengthen capacity building, professional quarantine officers will be trained in the new infrastructure which had been constructed in 2008. These new infrastructures in the quarantine training complex included quarantine research and development. The members of APPPC may use this facility for regional activities such as workshops, seminars, training and other scientific activities.

The plant quarantine operations cover import, export and intra islands of Indonesia were significantly increased compared to 2006. The issuance of import permits for plant propagation material reached 56 044 and import inspection a total of 58 832. The issuance of phytosanitary certificates for exporting consignment reached 63 900. The centre for plant quarantine received notification of non-compliance 24 times. The main import commodities were wheat, soybean and fresh fruits, while Indonesia exported rubber, palm oil and live plants as ornamentals. Quarantine inspection intercepted quarantine pests such as *Acidovorax avenae* subsp. *avenae*, *Xylella fastidiosa* and Turnip Mosaic Virus. Those consignments were destroyed as there were no effective treatment at the border. South American leaf blight (SALB) including plant products of rubber, as potential risk, were prohibited for entry into Indonesian. In the harmonization of trade, most ISPMs were applied at the operational level from partial until full implementation and some ISPM were still in the process of feasibility study for their implementation. Pest Risk Analysis referred to ISPM No. 2 and No. 11, as basic principles when conducted by PRA team for deciding the status of new commodity to be imported in Indonesia. The team conducted risk analysis for 57 documents. The centre for plant quarantine had strong coordination with directorates of plant protection from Directorate General of food crops, horticulture, estate crops including universities and research institutes. International cooperation, namely bilateral, regional and multilateral may affect the optimal quarantine operation and procedure to manage the risk. Bilateral cooperation between two countries was effective to eliminate dispute in the trade as well as to strengthen plant protection both countries such as Indonesia-Australia, Indonesia-China, Indonesia-Papua New Guinea (PNG) and others. Other project cooperation was conducted to strengthen the quarantine pest status with ACIAR, namely fruit fly management.

Integrated pest management

Integrated pest management called IPM programme had been launched in 1990. The IPM programme was funded either by the government, donor countries or international banks, and complied with the Law No. 12 of 1992 and government regulation No. 6 of 1995. The project had successfully changed the attitude of many farmers in uncontrolled application of pesticide. Organization of plant protection function consisted of policy development, pest management research, control recommendation, pest management extension, IPM training and Good Agricultural Practice training. The success implementation of IPM programme was supported by a number of technical officers for pest management, village level field officers, field extension agents for pest management advice and farmer field schools.

Pesticide usage

The use of pesticide in Indonesia is registered through the Centre for Investment and Permit, Ministry of Agriculture. There are three kinds of permit of pesticide use, namely trial permit, temporary permit and permanent permit. Technical requirements for the permit status of pesticide use was through the evaluation such as quality issuance, safe for human and environment, and effective control for specific pest. Permits for pesticide in Indonesia were for 1 702 pesticides of different trademarks, 341 pesticide formulators. Thirty eight (38) active ingredients of pesticides were prohibited for distribution.

3.7 Korea, Republic of

The Ministry for Agriculture and Forestry (MAF) of the Republic of Korea has widened its scope to food and fisheries and changed into Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MIFAFF) in 2009. The ministry actively encouraged farmers to use the integrated pest management (IPM) and integrated nutrient management (INM) according to the Environment-friendly Agriculture Promotion Act, to promote sustainable environment-friendly agriculture at the government level, and provided trust on safety of agricultural products. Control techniques using natural enemies for greenhouse pests were developed and increasingly used for various crops.

The Rural Development Administration (RDA) has experienced structural changes but their function for plant protection remained the same. RDA monitored the occurrence of significant pests all over the country by operating approximately 150 monitoring stations of rice and approximately 1 500 observatory posts of rice and major vegetables etc., and provided the data for pest control. The Review Standard for the Registration Test Method of Bio-Pesticide and the Registration Application Document Act established in April 2005, encouraged the development and registration of low-toxic, non-residual, environment-friendly biopesticides such as natural extracts and pheromone, etc. The National Plant Quarantine Service (NPQS) of Republic of Korea continuously improves the regulation and practice to develop international standard-harmonized and transparent plant quarantine system.

NPQS of Korea implemented LMO border control since 2008. NPQS also established the QIPS (quarantine inspection processing system) which enabled importers to request for the inspection of imported plant and plant products, and to confirm the progress status of inspection information (by using internet), which noticeably saved personnel and time, and established prompt plant quarantine procedures.

Responding to import request from various countries, NPQS conducted PRA on commodity related pest and implemented new import requirements for various commodities. Eight new quarantine pests in 2007, 68 pests in 2008 and 39 pest in 2009 were posted. These legal activities were notified to WTO/SPS. The NPQS of Korea hosted international cooperation programmes such as “ASEAN plant quarantine expert training programme” since 2006 and “IPPC regional workshop on ISPM drafts” in APPPC region since 2006. The ISPM workshop in 2009 will be in Busan, Republic of Korea in September.

3.8 Lao People’s Democratic Republic

General information

To protect plant health status and facilitate a safe trade in plants and plant products, the NPPO of Lao PDR dealt its mandates with the Prime Minister Decree on Plant Quarantine promulgated on 1993. To comply with the WTO-SPS Agreement, the National Assembly approved a new Plant Quarantine Law on December 2008 which determined the mandate of the NPPO to become highly effective, efficient and professional, with the capacities and competencies to protect the nation’s plant health status and biodiversity and promote market access for plants and plant product in compliance with international agreements and standards.

Plant quarantine

Lao PDR is a party member of international treaty such as International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), which provides standards for phytosanitary measures on how to prevent the spreads and introduction of pest of plants and plant products.

Legal framework

- “Prime Minister Decree on Plant Quarantine” No. 66/PM, dated 21 March 1993.
- “Ministerial Agreement on Plant Quarantine Regulation” No. 0369/MAF, dated 2 July 1993
- “Ministerial Notice on Role and Function and Standard for Entry/exit Plant Quarantine Stations for implementing the Prime Minister Decree No. 66/PM” No. 0754/MAF.DoA.06, dated 14 July 2006
- Plant Quarantine Law, dated 9 December 2008 by National Assembly.

Surveillance, pest outbreaks and invasive species management

The national warning system for possible pest outbreak had not been setup. However, the Plant Protection Center PPC was fully in charge to monitor and develop database of pest status and reports to NPPO at DOA for identifying the proper control measures. Besides that, under New Zealand's International Aid and Development Agency (NZAID) support on phytosanitary capacity building, the activities on surveillance are ongoing in specimen-based pest lists on some key crops such as mango and maize.

Pest management

Pest management is nationwide recognized in Lao PDR through integrated pest management project (IPM) which has been implemented since 1995 under technical cooperation programme between FAO and LAO PDR the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry as well as Department of Agriculture had been promoting integrated pest management (IPM/FAO) as the basis for implementation of clean agricultural production which comprised three steps, such as good agricultural practice, pesticide-free production and organic agriculture.

Pesticide management

Pesticide management has been nationally recognized since the declaration of Pesticide regulation No. 0886/MAF, dated on 10/30/2000 with the aim to manage and prohibit non-quality pesticides which are harmful to human, plants, animals and environment. To comply with the WTO-SPS Agreement, the new Decree on pesticide management is in the process of public consultation with the national authorities concerned. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry has submitted a recommendation for ratification of the Rotterdam Convention to the Prime Minister's office. In April 2006, this recommendation was under consideration by national focal point, which falls under the Prime Minister's office.

3.9 Malaysia

Since the last session of the APPPC 2007, Malaysia is now in the final stage of drafting the plant quarantine legislation to replace the current Plant Quarantine Act 1976.

An agency called Malaysia Quarantine Inspection Services (MAQIS) has been established in August 2008 under the Ministry of Agriculture and Agro-Based Industry (MOA) to coordinate the inspection of food and agriculture products including plants, animal and fish at the entry check points in Peninsular Malaysia. In order to facilitate trade and tourism there is a policy among ASEAN countries to harmonize operations at the entry points under Customs, Immigration and Quarantine Station (CIQS) system as one stop centre.

Treatment facilities have been improved with the purchase of three units of vapour heat treatment and establishment of two export centres to facilitate phytosanitary treatment, processing and packaging of fruits and vegetables for export.

The Repository and Culture Collection Centre was established in 2007 to serve as biological and reference centre for pest and beneficial organism specimen.

In order to facilitate trade and market access of agriculture produce/products, Malaysia had also carried out the following plant quarantine services:

- Implemented electronic permits for import and export of plants and regulated articles starting from September 2007.
- Carried out pest risk analysis for papaya, jackfruit, rambutan, pineapple, starfruit and oil palm.
- Implemented three accreditation schemes namely, Malaysian fumigation accreditation scheme (MAFAS), Malaysian heat treatment accreditation scheme (MAHTAS), and Malaysian phytosanitary certification assurance scheme (MPCA) to expedite export.
- ISPM 15 for import will be implemented in January 2010.
- Impose revised import requirement for mango seed weevil (*Sternochetus mangiferae*) and guava fruit fly (*Bactrocera correcta*)

- Gazette papaya die-back as a quarantine pest for control and eradication in August 2009
- In the final stage of developing national pest list for rubber and forest trees.

Since 2007, significant events in the area of crop protection includes:

- the newly established biotechnology unit, enhanced cooperation with the Chemistry Department to enhance officer capability in diagnosis of plant pests and diseases, and GMO using the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) technique;
- formation of National Committee on Invasive Alien Species (IAS). Among the activities include awareness seminar and a workshop on identifying ten priority species for Malaysia.
- Integrated pest management (IPM) – to control of the golden apple snails (*Pomacea canaliculata*) in rice fields using ducks and catfish, baiting with papaya leaves, succulent plant *Furcraea selloa* as biopesticides, bamboo trapping, netting, and handpicking; improved technique of rice pest surveillance focusing on increasing the frequency of survey and area of coverage for early detection of pest; using of protein baits to control fruit flies.
- a biological hymenoptera parasite, *Asecodes hispanarium* was brought in from Thailand for mass rearing to control *Brontispa* on coconut palm.

Pesticides Licensing Regulation of the Pesticides Act was amended in 2008 to increase the license fee for the sale and registration of highly toxic class, and to ensure a wider scope of authority to control the manufacture as well the manufacturer of pesticides.

A laboratory was established to facilitate export of fresh agriculture produce to meet the minimum residual level (MRL) requirements of importing countries.

Registration of tributyltin compound has been in line with the inclusion of tributyltin compound in Annex III of the Rotterdam Convention in 2008. Under the Montreal Protocol, Malaysia has set the requirements of the phase-out schedule and set limits on the quantity of methyl bromide (MB) to be used by the industry. The use of MB for quarantine purposes is exempted from the phase-out schedule.

3.10 Myanmar

Myanmar's economy is based on agriculture and has to rely on natural resources for many years. This contributed around 23 percent of export earning and employed about 63 percent of the working population. For further development of the agriculture economic sector, it is vital that the products are produced and traded in accordance with SPS requirements. At present, 90 percent of major export crops such as pulses and maize are sold to countries with less rigorous SPS regulation. The authorities are trying their best to carry out the task of SPS measures, to be upgraded and in-line with ISPMs. The Plant Protection Division of Myanmar Agriculture Service is taking the role of National Plant Protection Organization and actively takes parts in plant quarantine measures of the country in cooperation with other national and regional standards for phytosanitary measures are developed by ISPMs. Whenever the drafts for the new standard are received for the comments, NPPO made every possible efforts to cooperate in this particular task. The implementation status of existing international and regional standard of phytosanitary measures still need to be further developed.

There were no pest outbreaks. However, rodent outbreaks occurred in northern parts of Myanmar in forestry area (bamboo), but were not of agriculture importance. Biological control research works as a part of integrated pest management programme being carried out for cotton, groundnut and vegetables. Farmer's field school (FFS) were established since the year 2000. At the initial stages, emphasis was only to the rice farmers.

Work on pesticide management was steadily in progress, and consisted of registration schemes, licensing programmes, controlling persistent organic pollutants, disposal of toxic wastes, and also managing transboundary movement of illegal products. Various ministries were involved in food safety programme of the country, namely the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Livestock breeding and Fisheries.

In the agriculture sector, extension education programme for good agriculture practice are encouraged. Under this programme, FFS, IPM techniques were implemented in the main producing areas. This programme helped farmers to reduce the use of agrochemicals while improving food safety and quality.

Training of trainers on managing the food safety and post harvest quality of fruits and vegetables was initiated. In various districts, training of GAP knowledge was given to farmers, collectors, transporters, wholesalers and retailers who were involved in the supply chain. The survey regarding quality and safety in the fresh produce marketing chain of Myanmar had been carried out since 2004. The authorities also disseminate the GAP practice to the private sectors in line with WTO and SPS requirements.

The Plant Protection Division, Myanmar Agriculture Service of Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation is legally responsible to issue phytosanitary certificates and import certificates according to the Plant Pest Quarantine Laws enacted. The certificates for import and export are issued in the headquarters and also at the eight border entry points and two inspection stations. Regarding the consigned transits, the post entry quarantine studies had been carried out with limitations. Regarding the ISPMs, Myanmar, as a developing country had some technical barriers to be implemented, as provided by ISPMs. Myanmar has very limited experts in the field of entomology, plant pathology, weed science and post harvest quarantine. That is a major obstacle for the implementation of ISPMs. Training human resource is absolutely critical in Myanmar.

Survey of pests and diseases occurring in Myanmar had been carried out and entry of data are in progress. However, due to lack of expert verification for collected specimens, it was not feasible yet to publish the updated list of pests in Myanmar. There were no insect pest outbreaks in the agricultural areas. There were no invasive species management in Myanmar.

By the cooperation projects of Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), NZAID and ASEAN dialogue partners, insect pest collection technology, curation, preservation and diagnostic were widely known. SPS awareness, pest risk analysis (PRA) and pests list database methods had been improved.

Myanmar has national IPM policies and is one of the main pillars to the development of Plant Protection Division established by the steering committee since 1999. It supported the need for integrated pest management as a national crop protection policy. It also makes decision on crop information exchange regarding integrated pest management between Myanmar and other ASEAN countries and international association. Currently, IPM practices were being adopted to lessen pest damage. Other botanical insecticides like neem has been tested against the pests of vegetable under field conditions.

3.11 Nepal

Plant Protection Directorate (PPD) executes and coordinates various plant protection functions such as plant quarantine implementation, surveillance, pest outbreaks and invasive species management, pest and pesticide management through a national plant quarantine programme, national integrated pest management programme, Pesticide Registration and Management Division and regional plant protection laboratories. In addition, each district (Nepal has 75 districts) has one plant protection officer for all plant protection services to be carried out within the district.

In accordance with a provision made by the IPPC, the government in 2004 designated PPD as the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) of Nepal. It acts as the focal agency in the implementation of the standards set by IPPC, WTO-SPS rules and international pesticide conventions. A separate WTO unit has been established within the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MoAC). The Department of Food Technology and Quality Control is designated as the SPS enquiry point of Nepal.

The new Plant Protection Act 2006 had been approved to be in harmonization with WTO-SPS and IPPC provisions. The new Plant Protection Regulations 2009 is in the process of approval. List of 268 regulated pests had been prepared for commodities like potato, lentil, ginger, apple and garlic. The agriculture perspective plan (1995-2015) of Nepal identifies integrated pest management (IPM) as the specific strategy of plant protection. By 2007, the programme expanded to 70 districts out of 75. Currently, 72 957 farmers had been trained, 1 010 farmer field schools (FFS) were implemented and 1 149 IPM trainers had been prepared.

The Pesticide Registration and Management Division implemented the Pesticide Regulations 1993 (to enact Pesticide Act 1971). A plant protection officer from each district is also designated as the pesticide inspector to carry out the functions of pesticide management in the district. About 75 metric tons of obsolete pesticides stored in different parts of the country were in the process of disposal. To date, 289 commercial formulations and 76 generic products had been registered. In 2008, Nepal imported about 757 metric tons of different pesticides. The total cost incurred was about US\$35 million.

Currently, national IPM programme is funded by Royal Norwegian Government. FAO is backstopping this programme with technical support. WTO fund is made available through FAO to standards and trade development facility (STDF-170) project for enhancing capacity of human resource development for implementation WTO-SPS rules. Nepal appreciated technical support from APPPC and other regional/international agencies for strengthening its capacity in plant protection services.

3.12 New Zealand

Since the last session of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Organization, New Zealand has continued to develop and refine its biosecurity system. In July 2007, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry's (MAF) two biosecurity divisions Biosecurity New Zealand (BNZ), and MAF Quarantine Service (MQS) were structurally integrated. The new integrated organization is known as MAF Biosecurity New Zealand (MAFBNZ).

MAFBNZ is charged with leadership of the New Zealand biosecurity system. The biosecurity system aims to protect New Zealand's productive base, the health and wellbeing of New Zealanders, and our unique environment, while facilitating safe trade and movement of people.

New Zealand's biosecurity system aims to:

- Prevent harmful organisms from crossing our borders and establishing in New Zealand while, at the same time, ensuring trade and tourism are maintained,
- Reduce the harm caused by organisms already established in New Zealand, and
- Support New Zealander's being informed and involved participants in the biosecurity system.

Around \$NZ500 million is spent annually on biosecurity in New Zealand, with activities undertaken by central government, regional councils, industry and private landowners. MAFBNZ has approximately 1 100 full time and part-time staff, based across New Zealand and overseas responsible for developing and implement the biosecurity system.

The Biosecurity Act 1993 provides the legislative framework for the biosecurity system. It provides a menu of regulatory powers that can deal flexibly with various situations, including managing risk goods, unwanted organisms and pests, and allowing central government, regional government and industry to access regulatory powers.

New Zealand's biosecurity system is a continuum of interventions aimed at reducing and managing biosecurity risks:

Pre-border the system includes:

- International agreements
- Considering emerging risks
- Pest and import risk analysis
- Import health standards
- Off-shore assurance programmes

At the border:

- Pathway analysis
- Risk screening and profiling
- Checks of passengers, cargo and mail
- Monitoring performance and gathering information

Post-border surveillance:

- 0800 Hot-line
- Modelling
- Sampling and surveys
- Trapping
- Diagnostics

And response to incursions:

- Initial response
- Delimiting surveys
- Response plans
- Eradication or control measures

The biosecurity system also underpins New Zealand's export assurance programmes by reducing risks associated with new pests and providing information supporting New Zealand's freedom from pests of concern to other countries. New Zealand continues to develop and review import health standards based on pest risk assessment in accordance with the international standards for phytosanitary measures. Since the 25th session of the APPPC, import health standards have been developed for a range of plants and plant products. New Zealand has recently completed a re-prioritization of requests for development of new import health standards. Results of this re-prioritization are currently being communicated to the requesting countries, and will subsequently be published on the MAFBNZ website.

Seventy-five new organisms associated with plants and plant products were recorded as new to New Zealand by MAFBNZ in 2007/2008. MAFBNZ has officially responded to the presence of a number of these organisms, including *Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*, and *Porotermes adamsoni* (Dampwood termite).

New Zealand operates an approvals framework for pesticides under the Hazardous Substance and New Organisms Act 1996, has developed a substance reassessment programme, and has implemented a compliance structure to support the approvals framework.

Integrated pest management continues to be an integral component of orchard management programmes in New Zealand.

New Zealand continues to be active in the development, implementation and promotion of international and regional phytosanitary standards.

3.13 Pakistan

Pakistan is an agricultural country. Total geographical area is about 80 000 sq. km. and agriculture land is about 22 million ha. Total GDP is US\$143.6 billion per capita income defined as GNP at market price in dollar terms is US\$870. Population is 162.4 million. Agriculture sector is still the largest sector of the economy with deep impact on socio-economic set up. It is the source of the livelihood of almost 44.7 percent of the total employed labour force in the country. With the present contribution to GDP at 21.8 percent, agriculture sector is the mainstay of the rural economy around which socio-economic privileges and deprivations revolve.

Plant quarantine work is done by Plant Quarantine Division in the Department of Plant Protection, which has the legal authority and management responsibility. The organization arrangements are as per Article IV of the International Plant Protection Convention, 1997. The head office is at Karachi and the quarantine stations

are located at the seaport, airports, dry ports and land border points for the convenience of traders. The working of the Plant Quarantine Division, actions and decisions are according to Pakistan Plant Quarantine Act, 1976 and Pakistan Plant Quarantine Rules, 1967.

The Provincial and Federal Agriculture Department staff does general surveillance and specific survey of field crops, forests, plantations and orchards. The provincial governments make pest survey reporting on weekly and fortnight basis during the crop seasons and farmers are advised for rational use of pesticides for controlling pests.

Agricultural pesticides ordinance (APO) was promulgated in 1971 to regulate import, manufacture, formulation, sale, distribution, use and advertisement of pesticides. Agricultural Pesticides Rules were made thereunder in 1973 and the whole business was put under regular standardization and registration with the help of provincial agriculture departments. Pesticides are registered under the trade name (Form-1) after efficacy evaluation trails of two crop seasons by at least two research agencies including provincial and federal ones. The products to be approved under this scheme are first standardization by the provincial government with final approval granted by the federal government on advice of Agricultural Pesticides Technical Advisory Committee (APTAC). It normally takes three years to get a product approved under Form-1 scheme.

Plant protection measures currently comprise, largely, of the use of pesticides, which has grown from about 915 tons in 1981 to 39 186 tons in 2008. With regard to use, the most heavily covered crop is cotton followed by paddy, sugarcane, fruits and vegetables. Cotton alone accounts for about 60 percent of the total consumption of active ingredient of pesticides and this has resulted in the phenomenal rise in cotton production in the country.

The Government has strengthened a project for good agricultural practices (GAP) for certification of orchards from where exports will be made to different countries. Federal government with the coordination of provincial agriculture departments has devised different strategies for pest management of cotton, wheat and rice crop.

3.14 The Philippines

The Philippine Plant Quarantine Service (PQS) is persistent to achieve its goal heading towards the three-point programme focus of improving PQS image, efficiency and technical excellence to further strengthen the PQS's capacity to ensure efficient service and perform the NPPO's mandate.

In line with the obligation of Philippine Plant Quarantine to SPS agreement to comply with the requirements of importing country and be consistent with international standards, six (6) various PQ rules and regulatory policies were formulated and modified. To enhance export of Philippine products export protocols were developed and amended which includes *revised protocol for the export of Okra and revised protocol for the export of fresh cavendish banana to Japan, creating regional accreditation screening committee (ASC) members for Cavendish Banana Exporter Accreditation*. To provide alternative treatment for fresh fruits and vegetables, *regulations for the importation, exportation and domestic movement of irradiated plants and plant products and the use of irradiation as phytosanitary treatment* was formulated. The PQS also made a *Guidelines for the implementation of the Australian fumigation accreditation scheme (AFAS) in the Philippines and administrative arrangements and creation of various teams for the implementation of AFAS in the Philippines* which implies the readiness of the PQS to implement high standard fumigation. With the PQS' thrust of improving image and technical excellence and equip its personnel with knowledge and learning experience, a series of technical trainings were organized and conducted by the NPPO which were participated by 187 plant quarantine personnel nationwide. This includes *identification of pest and diseases of fresh fruits and vegetable, stored products, wood and non-wood products, identification of ornamental plants and its pest and diseases, identification of fruit fly, training on inspection protocol on Musa Plantlets*.

On establishment of pest free area aside from Guimaras island, other areas were surveyed and recognized by the Philippines as mango pulp and seed weevil (*Sternochetus frigidus* and *Sternochetus mangiferae*) free area. This includes the province of Davao del Sur, Sarangani province and City of General Santos all from Mindanao area. Another component of PQS focus to ensure efficient service to clients, new PQS buildings at the port

of Iloilo, Batangas and Bacolod and new treatment area in central office were constructed, south port's diagnostic laboratory was renovated and provided more laboratory equipments.

The PQS in collaboration with the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), conducted national survey since 2006 and about to finish this year for the purpose of establishing the Philippines except Palawan as MPW and MSW free area and institute irradiation dose for MPW in Philippine super mango. In compliance to the requirements of importing countries the PQS continuously conducts research to develop quarantine treatment protocol to enhance Philippine export.

3.15 Sri Lanka

Sri Lanka as a signatory to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement of World Trade Organization (SPS/WTO), and hence SCPPC is obliged to ensure the successful implementation of the terms of these agreements. In this context, Seed Certification and Plant Protection Center (SCPPC) serves as the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) of Sri Lanka to comply with the conditions in these agreements. SCPPC plays regulatory role under the Plant Protection Act No. 35 of 1999, Control of Pesticides Act No. 33 of 1980 and the Seed Act No. 22 of 2003.

During the period under review discussions were held to revise the regulations made under the Plant Protection Act No. 35 of 1999. The national committee was appointed to revise the Plant Protection Act No. 35 of 1999 to make necessary changes to reflect the current requirements ensuring that the regulations were consistent with IPPC recommendations. A number of quarantine pests were intercepted during the import of planting materials and questionable consignments were destroyed.

Pest risk analysis (PRA) on powdery scab on potato was completed while PRAs on import of dragon fruit and mangosteen from Thailand and in vitro cultures of banana from the Philippines were started.

A new exotic invasive species namely Papaya Mealy Bug-*Paracoccus marginatus* was first observed in the country's western region in August 2008. A package of control practices was recommended. The damage is currently under control.

The country embarked on several pest management programmes for control of specific pests. Control programmes for weed species *Parthenium hysterophorus*, *Alternanthera philoxeroides*, *Salvinia molusta*, and *Ichchornia craspis* were undertaken. An outbreak of coconut leaf rot and coconut wilt disease in southern part of the country was reported and at present it is under control.

Rice IPM has received high priority of the country during the period under review. Rice IPM programme has successfully implemented. Now it had expanded to vegetables and other crops using farmer field school training approach. A new programme namely integrated pest and vector management (IPVM) programme was initiated. Due to its multidisciplinary nature, the programme involved several stakeholders.

Regarding pesticide control, the highest priority had been given by the Government. The mandate of the control of pesticide regulations is to execute statutory provisions of the control of pesticide act No. 33 of 1980 as amended by the control of pesticides (amendment) No. 6 of 1994 and regulations made there under. It makes provisions to regulate the import, formulation, packing, labeling, storage, transport, sales and use of pesticides. Legal provisions are also provided in the act for licensing of traders, appointment of authorized officers, specifying functions and powers to seize pesticides in outlets conducting activities contrary to regulations. Draft regulations to control commercial pest control service organizations were recently finalized.

3.16 Thailand

The Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MoAC) has three major agencies carrying out activities of the plant protection responsibilities. These are the Department of Agriculture (DOA), the Department of Agricultural Extension (DOAE) and the National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS). The national legislations involved are the Plant Quarantine Act B.E. 2507 (1952) amended by the

Plant Quarantine Act No. 2 B.E. 2542 (1999) and Plant Quarantine Act No. 3 B.E. 2551 (2008), The Hazardous Substances Act B.E. 2535 (1992) amended by the Hazardous Substances Act B.E. 2551 (2008) and the Agricultural Commodity Standards Act B.E. 2551 (2008).

In early 2008, an outbreak of mealybug was detected on major cassava production areas, covering 117 067 acres in 17 provinces. There was serious threat 36 514 acres where estimated crop loss were USD17.31 million. Emerging outbreak of mealybug may have been caused by climate change in vast cassava growing area. Pests were collected for taxonomic identification.

In early 2009, DOA conducted the detection survey of mango seed weevil, *Sternochetus mangiferae* to provide information supporting that Thailand is free from this weevil to expand the export market for Thai mango. Mango weevils collected from different mango production areas were all identified to species and found to be *Sternochetus olivieri* (Faust).

During 2007-2008, IPM programme had been emphasized on the economic crops: rice, okra, asparagus, fruit crops, vegetable, field crops, and orchid. However, due to budget limitations, some implementation on IPM, has decreased, especially in the training or conducting of farmer field school (FFS). Nevertheless, the DOAE still encouraged the education and development of farmers' knowledge by promoting attitude change of farmers who have been using high toxicity pesticides to understand the principle and the framework of good agricultural practices (GAPs).

The main component of IPM implementation encouraged farmers to use biological control, and a number of bio-agents were introduced to replace and/or as an alternate to chemical pesticide. From the end of 2007 until today, DOAE had set the project of "using integrated pest management for decreasing risk of plant pest infestation" within the project "community plant pest management center" to be the main activity. The objectives of the project are to develop farmers to be "pests management professional in IPM" to reduce damage to farmers crops, encourage less input and to enhance community participation in the project. Technology transfer in the projects mainly relied on the adaptation process of FFS.

Products are tested for the chemical residue to ensure the safety for consumers before harvest. Area wide IPM of fruit fly control programme using the sterile insect technology (SIT) had operated over large areas, and involved major facility and equipments. The financial support that came from the Government, however, was sometimes unreliable or not delivered in a timely manner.

Currently, the Plant Quarantine Act B.E. 2507 (1952) amended by the Plant Quarantine Act (No. 2) B.E. 2542 (1999) and Plant Quarantine Act (No. 3) B.E. 2551 (2008) are being enforced. The Plant Quarantine Act (NO. 3) B.E. 2551 (2008) was published in the royal gazette in May 2008 contained 26 Sections which provided specification and criteria for notification of plants; plant pest and carrier as prohibited articles, adding power to control the exportation of specific controlled plants, enhancing power of plant quarantine officer toward an effective prevention of exotic plant pests and diseases. Three of Plant Quarantine Acts are administered by the DOA, MoAC.

In 2009, the DOA had announced five of Notification of Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives and eight of Notifications of Department of Agriculture to strengthen the quarantine practices for both export plants and plant products and import prohibited articles.

The DOA had conducted pest risk analysis for the importation of potatoes, including seed potatoes, potatoes for processing, and potatoes for consumption in accordance with ministerial notification on specification of plants and carriers from certain sources as prohibited articles, of exceptions and conditions under the Plant Quarantine Act B.E. 2507 (No. 5) B.E. 2550. Currently, pest risk analysis (PRA) for potatoes from following countries had been completed; seed potatoes from Australia, Canada, Israel, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Scotland and USA; potatoes for processing from Australia, Cambodia, Canada, Germany, Lao PDR, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Scotland, USA and Viet Nam; and potatoes for consumption from the Netherlands, New Zealand and USA. The new import protocols for importation of potatoes from these countries were established based on the results of PRA.

Thailand had exported fresh pomelo fruits to the Netherlands under the condition regulated by European Commission Council Directive 2000/29 item 16.2 (C) due to presence of bacterium; *Xanthomonas campestris* pv. *citri* (Hasse) citrus canker in Thailand. This disease commonly occurred in citrus growing area. The DOA had certified canker free production site in northern part at Weing Kaen district of Cheing Rai province for the Netherlands market in accordance with EC Council Directive 2000/29. A single cultivar “Thong Dee” was selected and produced from GAP orchard where the DOA had take responsibility for inspection, registration and conduct routine monitoring by visual survey and laboratory test in semi-selective media, pathogenicity tests, serology and PCR method. The project was audited by plant health officers from EU before export was started. Currently, there are 517 registered orchards under this project. Two hundred and ninety five are qualified. Six exporters joined the project.

The Hazardous Substances Act B.E. 2535 (1992) amended by the Hazardous Substances Act B.E. 2551 (2008) is being enforced. The pesticide or laboratories companies adopted good laboratory practices (GLP). Under this Act, the DOA announced nine notifications of Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, five notifications of Department of Agriculture and one rule of Department of Agriculture. Registration, licensing and extending of the hazardous substances certificate are under the DOA’s responsibilities.

Thailand is committed to complying with the methyl bromide reduction obligations, and has proposed a national methyl bromide phase-out plan (NMBPP) that aims at reducing all non-quarantine and pre-shipment (QPS) consumption of MB before the target date of 2015. The DOA, MoAC puts in place an import schedule for MB for non-QPS applications for the period 2004 to 2013. Import quotas will be distributed among existing importers, as no import licenses will be given to new importer. The NMBPP proposed to utilize a combination of policies, regulations, and financial incentives to subsidize the phase-out cost of alternatives to MB (chemicals, non-chemicals, and/or management), especially for those enterprises that were willing to participate in earlier phase-out initiatives. Technical assistance, capacity building, and implementation support to the DOA and other key stakeholders will be an integral part of the phase out strategy, in order to promote safety, to ensure effective implementation, monitoring and overall long-term sustainability of the strategy which largely depend on close monitoring of insect phosphine resistance in Thailand. Two codes of good practice, namely the code of good practice for phosphine fumigation and the code of good practice for methyl bromide fumigation were published and distributed to government officials, fumigation service providers and agricultural produce warehouse keepers in VCD and print. DOA notification was issued on the accreditation scheme to the producers of frozen fruits and vegetables and manufacturers of processed agricultural produces for phytosanitary certification to reduce the use of methyl bromide for the producers/manufacturers of processed products that have low risk of pests such as dehydrated fruits, starch, processes food products and industrial articles for imports that required phytosanitary certificates. Training and public outreach for the stakeholders were conducted and that included the DOA officers.

In November 2007, the mission team of the project “cooperation for the improvement of phytosanitary capacity in Asian countries through capacity building (GCP/RAS/226/JPN)” made ten recommendations for developing the phytosanitary capacity in Thailand. One of them was to develop a strategic plan to strengthen the collaborative mechanism between the responsible agencies in the country, including the universities. The ACFS, responsible for IPPC contact point has set up the sub-committee of Phytosanitary Standards to consider the mechanism. In 2008, the committee approved two Thai standards of phytosanitary measures, “diagnostic protocols for regulated pests” and “diagnostic protocols for *Pantoea stewartii* subsp. *stewartii*”. In March and July 2009, there were two FAO regional workshops in Bangkok, “training workshop on pest risk analysis” and “training workshop on phytosanitary inspection and phytosanitary certification” organized under the GCP/RAS/226/JPN with the management assistance of the ACFS.

3.17 Viet Nam

Viet Nam continues to be the second largest exporter of rice in the world. Sustainable production is still an important direction to assure food security.

The mission statement of the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) for the new period 2010-2020 “*To become a highly effective, efficient and professional NPPO with the capacities and competencies to protect*

the nation's plant health status and biodiversity and promote market access for plant and plant products in compliance with international agreements and standards".

From 2008-2009, brown plant hopper (*Nilaparvata lugens*) and rice ragged stunt virus (RSV)/rice grassy stunt virus (GSV), coconut beetle weevil (*Brontispa sp.*) were successfully controlled using IPM community approach and introduction of natural enemies for coconut beetle control.

New incidence of pests recorded in 2008-2009 included: small brown plant hopper (*Laodelphax striatellus*), rice spider mite: *Oligonychus oryzae* in rice in north of Viet Nam, sugarcane grassy shoot: *Phytoplasma* transmitted by *Deltocephalus vulgaris* and cassava diseases. 104 cases of plant quarantine pests were detected.

The national IPM and other projects/programme related to IPM assisted by number of donor countries were still ongoing, and emphasized on IPM related to GAP, BUCARP, SRI programme. Farmer's participatory – FFS was the main approach for "capacity building" – farmer's empowering approach.

National campaign on "food safety" emphasized on "safe vegetable production" with GAP practices under implementing.

From 2008-2009, 104 cases of quarantine pests were detected. The plant quarantine system was further strengthened. The first market access of dragon fruit was done with the US market; other kinds of fruits are under PRA process for US, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand. As of March 2009, 886 types of a.i. with 2 537 trade names had been registered for use, 16 a.i. including 29 trade names of pesticides were restricted in use and 29 a.i. were banned. Pesticide registration regulation continues to be revised/amended.

On-going projects/programmes related to plant protection and quarantine:

- Phytosanitary capacity building project for CLMV countries second phase assisted by NZAID 2007-2009 to finish in this year.
- Improvement of plant quarantine treatment against fruit flies on fresh fruits 2005-2007 assisted by JICA. Terminated in 2008. Technical clearance report for access market of dragon fruit export to Japan finished. VHT facility was being set-up.
- Viet Nam national CFC and Halon phase-out project 2007-2014 assisted by WB has started implementation.

Key issue for future workplan (2009-2011) are:

- Law of plant protection and quarantine will be enacted in the end of 2010 or early 2011
- Pesticide registration and management scheme continue to be revised and amended
- Promote farmer's training on IPMs linkage to GAP and pesticide risk reduction
- Implementation of ISPMs, RSPMs, national standards
- Conducting PRAs and access market for facilitation of trade
- Promote international cooperation.

3.18 Regional and international organization reports: Japan (observer)

Structure of the NPPO

The plant protection system of Japan is principally administered by Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. The Plant Protection Division and Plant Protection Station are responsible for import and export quarantine and pest management in Japan. Plant Protection Station composed of 5 head offices and 72 sub-stations and branches and has 865 plant quarantine officers.

Plant quarantine system in Japan

Plant quarantine services in Japan include international plant quarantine (prevent international movement of pests) and domestic quarantine (monitoring survey for invading pests from overseas and enforcing restriction on the movement of plants to prevent internal spread of important pests).

Categories of import plants and plant products

Importing plants and plant products are classified into four categories namely “plants subject to quarantine inspection”, “plants subject to post entry quarantine”, “import-prohibited plants” and “plants not subjected to quarantine inspection”.

Cooperation for the improvement of phytosanitary capacity in Asian countries

Japan made donation of 1 256 781 US dollars to the FAO for strengthening phytosanitary capacity in Asia for the last three years. Mr Sai has been dispatched from Japan as a plant quarantine expert to coordinate with the project. Four seminars and four workshops have been organized for quarantine officials in the project for several Asian countries since 2007.

Issues related to APPPC

Although Japan has been considering joining the APPPC over the years, it has not yet joined because the Agreement obliges contracting governments to prohibit the importation of plant or plants of the genus hevea by law (Article IV and Appendix B of the current Agreement). These provisions had no scientific justification and were inconsistent with SPS Agreement. Therefore, Japan was not able to take any measures. Only these provisions were blocking the way to the APPPC membership of Japan. Japan recognized that the provisions are inconsistent with WTO’s SPS Agreement and should be deleted.

Development of compliance with SPS Agreement

Japan appreciated that the APPPC had decided to delete these provisions in 1999, and that efforts to comply with SPS Agreement had been progressing steadily. Japan is eagerly awaiting for the APPPC Constitutive Agreement to be revised to be consistent with SPS Agreement at the earliest stage. That will enable Japan to join APPPC and contribute for Asia and Pacific region as the official member of APPPC.

4. Implementation of the revised Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific region and development of APPPC

4.1 Developments with the amendments of the Plant Protection Agreements (1983 and 1999) and legal announcement

Mr Jean Pierre Chiaradia-Bousquet, Senior Legal Advisor, FAO provided the following report:

4.1.1 Entry into force of amendments introducing mandatory contributions

Pursuant to Article IX.2 of the Plant Protection Agreement for Asia and the Pacific (hereafter the Agreement), amendments to Articles II, III, IV and XIV introducing mandatory contributions for the contracting governments (approved by the FAO Council at its 84th session in November 1983) entered into force on 4 September 2009, the 30th day after acceptance by two-thirds of the contracting governments.

However, as these amendments entail new obligations, in accordance with Article IX.4 of the Agreement, they enter into force only with respect to the contracting governments which on 4 September 2009 to the revised Agreement, or at some later date, have deposited the required instrument of acceptance to the Director-General of FAO who, in his capacity as the Depositary, circulate for information and/or acceptance a certified true copy of the revised text of the Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific region which includes the above amendments. Further details available at <http://www.fao.org/Legal/treaties/006s-e.htm>

In addition, this revised version of the Agreement will be forwarded to the Secretariat of the United Nations for registration in conformity with the Regulations adopted by the General Assembly to give effect to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

4.1.2 Adoption of the rules of procedure and financial rules

Pursuant to Article II.1(a) and 5 of the Plant Protection Agreement for Asia and the Pacific, the Commission adopted its rules of procedure and financial rules which should govern the procedural activities and the financial administration of the Commission. For all matters not specifically dealt with these rules, the provisions of the general rules of FAO shall apply *mutatis mutandis*. A copy of these rules is attached to this report in Annexes II and III.

4.1.3 Adoption of a regional standard on South American leaf blight of hevea

At 26th session (New Delhi, August-September 2009), the Commission adopted a regional standard on guidelines for protection against South American leaf blight of hevea. The Secretary will accordingly notify the Director-General of FAO.

4.1.4 Amendments yet to come into force

At its 117th session in November 1999, the FAO Council approved (i) a set of amendments providing for the deletion from the Agreement of the detailed measures to exclude South American leaf blight of hevea from the region, and (ii) another set of amendments “*designed to bring the Plant Protection Agreement for Asia and the Pacific into line with the new revised text of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) as well as with the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) and other modern requirements for plant protection and to strengthen the Commission.*”

4.1.4.1 Amendments referring to South American leaf blight of hevea

While it approved them, the Council decided at the request of the rubber-producing countries that such amendments would not be transmitted for acceptance until such time as a satisfactory regional standard on South American leaf blight of hevea had been adopted by the Commission. As the Commission has adopted the required standard (see 4.1.3 above), in accordance with the decision of the Council, the Director-General will now issue a Circulate State Letter to transmit to contracting governments for acceptance a certified true copy of the revised text of the Agreement which includes the amendments providing for the deletion of detailed measures to exclude South American leaf blight of hevea.

As these amendments do not entail new obligations for the contracting governments, they shall come into force with respect to all Contracting Governments as from the 30th day after acceptance by two-third of such contracting governments.

4.1.4.2 Amendments referring to IPPC and SPS

The amendments designed to bring the APPPC into line with IPPC and SPS (see 4.1.4 above) were transmitted for acceptance by the Director-General of FAO to the contracting governments by Circular State Letter issued in June 2000.

This set of amendments remains open for acceptance and, as they *do not entail new obligations*, they shall come into force with respect to all contracting governments as from the 30th day after acceptance by two-third of such contracting governments. However, as of today, only three countries have accepted these amendments. Further details available at <http://www.fao.org/Legal/treaties/006s-e.htm>

4.2 Report of the working group meeting on the procedures for finance, administration and planning for APPPC

Dr John Hedley presented the report of the working group meeting on the procedures for finance, administration and planning for APPPC.

The working group decided to recommend a UN based system. This recommendation was based on the following elements:

- FAO implements the UN systems, and APPPC is an “Article XIV body” of FAO,
- the UN system of contribution is well understood, agreed to by FAO members and reviewed and regularly amended by the General Assembly.
- the contributions of the larger contributors is limited to 22 percent as is done with FAO. This reduces the contributions of the larger countries to a more reasonable proportion of the budget.

The contribution calculations will be aligned with the UN rate and they will consequently be regularly updated.

The working group also discussed the establishment of a trust fund, the need for some Secretariat staffing, and the development of procedural and financial rules (by FAO legal office). The working group drafted a possible work programme for the biennium with estimated costs, and a list of proposed member contributions to meet the proposed budget.

4.3 Adoption of APPPC rules of procedure

Mr Jean-Pierre Chiaradia-Bousquet, Senior Legal Advisor, FAO presented a total of 18 APPPC Rules of Procedure to the Session (Annex II). The following amendments were made to read as:

“Rule VI. Secretariat

(g) promote, facilitate and monitor the development of databases for plant protection;”

“Rule VII. Chairmanship

3. In the absence of the Chairperson, or at the request of the Chairperson, the functions of the Chairperson shall be exercised by one of the Vice-Chairpersons”

“Rule VIII. Decision-making, voting arrangements and procedures

1. Each Contracting Government shall be represented on the Commission and shall have one vote. A majority of the Contracting Governments shall constitute a quorum. Except as otherwise provided in the Agreement or in this rule, all decisions of the Commission shall be taken by a majority of votes cast unless, by consensus, another method of arriving at a decision is reached.”

“Rule X. Budget and finance

2. Any estimates of expenditures to be covered by the mandatory contributions provided for by contributing contracting governments under Article III of the Agreement, shall be submitted by the Secretary to the session of the Commission for approval by consensus. Once approved, they are forwarded to the Director-General, provided that any budgetary or financial matters relative to the budget of the Commission shall be dealt with in accordance with the financial rules of the Commission and the financial regulations and procedures of the Organization.”

These procedural rules were adopted.

4.4 Adoption of APPPC financial rules

Mr Jean-Pierre Chiaradia-Bousquet, Senior Legal Advisor, FAO presented a total of 11 APPPC financial rules to the session (Annex III). One amendment was made, to read as follows:

“Rule VI. Provision of funds

3. Mandatory contributions shall be due and payable in full preferably within 30 days of the receipt of the communication of the Secretary referred to in Rule VI.2 above, or as of the first day of the calendar year to which they relate, whichever is later. As of 1 January of the following calendar year, the unpaid balance of such contributions shall be considered to be one year in arrears.”

These financial rules were adopted.

5. Discussion on the approval of three new Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPMs)

Dr John Hedley, Chairperson of the APPPC Standard Committee, presented three RSPMs to the Session for approval. They were:

- *Guidelines for protection against South American leaf blight of rubber;*
- *Guidance on the operation of land border entry points;*
- *Guidelines for the exterior cleanliness of containers.*

5.1 Guidelines for protection against South American leaf blight of rubber;

Changes made to the guidelines were as follows:

“1.1.1 Host material (Hevea spp.)

As identified in the SALB PRA, ...”

“...For budded stumps and bud wood*:... ”

- ...restricting the length of each budwood stick to less than 1 metre...
- ...restriction of imports to government research institutes only and using post entry quarantine stations...”

* footnote: budded stumps includes seedling stumps

“1.1.2 Non-host material (SALB endemic countries)

Non host material includes travellers, ...”

“...Non-host organic material

Other items, such as planting material and foliage, of non-SALB hosts may need to be assessed for possible SALB contamination and phytosanitary procedures and appropriate treatment applied.”

“1.4 SALB surveillance systems

NPPOs in rubber growing countries should establish and maintain...”

This standard was adopted (Annex IV). With the adoption of this regional standard on SALB, the Secretary will accordingly notify the Director-General of FAO.

5.2 Guidance on the operation of land border entry points

Changes made to the guidelines were as follows:

Title to read as: **“Guidance on the operation of land border entry points for local trade”**

Deletion of “pre-clearance systems” from **outline of requirements**

“2.5 Pre-clearance of local trade” will be deleted as a title. Para to read:

“When necessary, an importing country may carry out the inspection of plants, plant products and other regulated articles in the exporting country before export if appropriate bilateral arrangements can be agreed.”

This standard was adopted (Annex V).

5.3 Guidelines for the exterior cleanliness of containers

This standard was not adopted. Several participants felt that a number of issues needed to be further addressed, such as the practicality of the physical process of inspection, mechanics of the cleaning process, and possibility of re-contamination after inspection, and logistics before the standard could be considered for adoption. After extensive deliberation on the matter, the Session proposed that a working group be set up to further study this guideline.

6. Overview of the global plant protection, update on AGP, IPPC activities and the CPM bureau

6.1 Overview of the global plant protection and update on AGP, FAO

Dr Peter Kenmore, Deputy Director, AGP, FAO presented the overview of the global plant protection and update on AGP, FAO. Three parameters need to be addressed in global plant protection. Dr Kenmore stated that we should double crop production by the year 2050, use less land and water, and that we must sustain and improve ecosystem services that support plant production (e.g. natural pest population regulation, pollination, soil nutrient cycles, and water conservation). Dr Kenmore noted that a major new FAO strategic objective is sustainable intensification of crop production. The list of all the new strategic objectives follows:

- Sustainable intensification of crop production.
- Increased sustainable livestock production.
- Sustainable management and use of fisheries and aquaculture resources.
- Improved quality and safety of foods at all stages of the food chain.
- Sustainable management of forests and trees.
- Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to global environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture.
- Enabling environment for markets to improve livelihoods.
- Improved food security and better nutrition.
- Improved preparedness for, and effective response to, food and agricultural threats and emergencies.
- Gender equity in access to resources, goods, services and decision-making in the rural areas.
- Increased and more effective public and private investment in agriculture and rural development.

The impact focus areas for donors are:

- Support to smallholder farmer food production and global information and monitoring systems (IFA-CFA)

- Transboundary threats to production, health and environment (IFA-EMPRES)
- Strengthening the base for sustainable forest management (IFA-SFM)
- Capacity building in support of implementation of the Code of Conduct for responsible fisheries (IFA-CCRF)
- Coping with scarcity of water and land resources (IFA-WALS)
- Capacity building to strengthen information and statistics for decision making (IFA-CBIS)
- Global standard setting and implementation into national policies and legislation (IFA-SNL)
- Transboundary threats to production, health and environment (IFA-EMPRES) supports the building of national, subregional, regional and global systems for surveillance, identification of sources of potential and imminent threats, detection of outbreaks, early warning, rapid response, supportive research, and rehabilitation emphasizing “building back better” after outbreaks of transboundary plant pests. The IFA will focus on strengthening national systems, especially in developing countries, to recognize and respond to transboundary threats earlier; reduce the risk of those threats spreading within countries, to neighbouring countries and to trading partners; protect national production; reduce environmental and health risks.
- Global standard setting and implementation into national policies and legislation (IFA-SNL) The effective development and implementation of internationally recognized standards, agreements and action plans adopted by FAO statutory bodies and commissions, in particular to satisfy requirements under WTO Agreements, relies on national capacity and secretariat support. The IFA will focus on strengthening national and global capacities for the development and implementation of regulations and standards with particular attention to the capacities and participation of developing countries (plant protection, food safety, genetic resources).

Sustainable Intensification of crop production

This effort is led by AGP, consisting 16 regional and subregional office and over 12 divisions. The assessed budget for 2010-2011 is about US\$47 million, where about US\$28 million from AGP, an extra budgetary envelope over US\$180 million, and about US\$110 million from emergencies funding. Each organizational result (4 year) has two AGP teams who deliver unit results (2 year) or teams report to director’s team. The organizational results are as follows:

- A1 – Policies and strategies on sustainable crop production intensification and diversification at national and regional levels
- A2 – Risks from outbreaks of transboundary plant pests and diseases are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels
- A3 – Risks from pesticides are sustainably reduced at national, regional and global levels
- A4 – Effective policies and enabled capacities for a better management of plant genetic resources for food and agriculture (PGRFA) including seed systems at the national and regional levels

Three kinds of risks are associated with plant protection problems. They are:

- Agricultural intensification brings risks from plant pests and from the pesticides often used to control them.
- Human modification of the environment can create favourable conditions for pests (Fourth Intl. Locust Conf. Cairo, 1936 to Fourth IPCC Rept. Paris, 2007).
- Rapidly growing human traffic and plant trade (for food security and global markets) increases risks of transboundary movement of pests.

Three kinds of pests have been identified, which are intensification pests, semi-natural pests, and pests emerging from human transboundary movements (trade, traffic, refugees, humanitarian aid). Intensification pests include rice plant hoppers which resulted from overused of cheap insecticides, wheat rust diseases from boom and bust breeding, and maize and cotton pests such as leafhoppers, viruses, whiteflies, bollworms.

Semi-natural pests include locusts such as desert locust, red locust, migratory locust; rodents associated with bamboo flowering, and sunn pest associated with host alternation with local migration.

Pests emerging from human transboundary movements are:

- Fruit flies: classic trade, but complex ecosystem invasion (*Bactrocera invadens*)
- Cassava mosaic disease: conflict traffic
- Cassava brown streak: humanitarian
- Banana bacterial wilt: conflict traffic
- Pomacea snail: investment, hobby
- Corn rootworm: military traffic

Evolutionary perspectives include genetic hybridization for cassava mosaic disease, selection on existing variation for banana bacterial wilt, convergent evolution for moko, blood disease, BXW and “concentric” expanding spread like rain splash, tools, planting material and insect vectors.

Three kinds of responses were necessary. These are:

- Better local management IPM FFS, better breeding strategies for intensification pests,
- Better warning for action (DLIS, regional) for semi-natural pests, and
- Monitoring and networks (surveillance, cell phones) for pests from human transboundary movements.

Climate change and plant protection

Climate changes results in an expansion of pest ranges and changes in phenology (earlier start). There is also an increased impact of pest presence due to stressed plants. Extreme weather events have been known to cause sudden invasions.

Dr Kenmore stated that in conclusion, plant protection is about people, now and for our future.

6.2 Overview of IPPC and update on CPM bureau

Ms Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde, Chair of the CPM presented an overview of IPPC and update on CPM Bureau.

At its fourth meeting in April 2009, the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) adopted: one new international standard for phytosanitary measures (ISPM), *categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*; revisions to ISPM No. 5, *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* and ISPM No. 15, *Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*; a new appendix to ISPM No. 5; and 8 irradiation treatments as annexes to ISPM No. 28, *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*. These were the first treatments to be adopted by CPM.

CPM-4 also provisionally adopted a strategy for building national phytosanitary capacity. This strategy consisted of a concept paper, a situation analysis followed by six strategic areas for action, and a draft operational plan. The CPM recognized that this operational plan required further development.

CPM-4 spent quite some time discussing how to better utilize the available resources, how to work within the available human and financial resources. Many members noted the importance of standards development. The financial guidelines for the trust fund for the IPPC were amended to make it clear that the trust fund could be used for hiring persons to work in the Secretariat to carry out the activities which fall under the objectives of the trust fund.

Since CPM-4, and as planned under the operational plan for 2009, there has been one expert working group on the development of a draft standard on pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests. Several technical panels have met, as well as the Standards Committee and the CPM Bureau. The Director-General of FAO

has finally identified a full time Secretary for the IPPC, although very few other staffing actions have been completed in the Secretariat. Additional staff has left the Secretariat since CPM-4 and vacancies continue to exist. The capacity building strategy has been modified slightly based on the comments provided during and after CPM-4.

At its meeting in June 2009, the Bureau reviewed how the implementation of the operational plan for 2009 was progressing. Based on the fear that funding could be lapsing in 2009 due to the lack of completed staffing actions, the Bureau allocated several amounts of money for persons to be hired quickly to carry out specific tasks. These included one person to make sure that an additional expert working group meets before CPM-5 to work on another new standard; one person to initiate progress on the implementation review and support system for the IPPC; and one person to provide administrative support for standard setting. Funding for the expert working group itself, for the finalization of the phytosanitary evaluation tool and funding for the on-line comment system, as well as for three workshops for capacity building networks was allocated.

7. Progress report on plant quarantine in the Asia and Pacific region by the Chairperson of the APPPC Standing Committee on Plant Quarantine

7.1 Ninth regional workshop on draft ISPMs – Anyang, Republic of Korea 28 July to 1 August 2008

The Ninth regional workshop was held in Anyang, Republic of Korea supported by the Republic of Korea Government. Twenty-five experts from nineteen countries participated in the meeting: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Viet Nam. The meeting was also attended by the Chairperson of the CPM.

The following drafts were discussed:

- Amendments to the glossary ISPM No. 5
- Terminology of the CBD in relation to the glossary of phytosanitary terms (proposed supplement to ISPM No. 5)
- Regulating wood packaging material in international trade (revision of ISPM No. 15)
- Pest free potato micropropagative material and minitubers for international trade
- Fruit fly trapping (proposed Annex 1 to ISPM No. 26)
- Structure and operation of post-entry quarantine facilities
- Categorization of commodities according to their phytosanitary risk

The minutes of the meeting were sent to the various participants for the preparation of country comments to be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat.

7.2 The Pre-CPM-3 coordination meeting for APPPC countries plus Japan

This meeting was intended to give CPM delegates from APPPC member countries the opportunity to discuss CPM-3 issues of particular importance to delegates. Delegates had the opportunity to explain the position of their country on various matters and, where appropriate, request support from other delegates for the discussions at CPM-3.

The agenda included the following:

- Discussion on evaluation report – CPM agenda item 8.
- Draft standards – CPM agenda items 9.2 and 9.3
- Changes to standard-setting system – CPM agenda items 9.4, 9.5, 9.6, 9.7, 9.8, 9.11,
- Information exchange – CPM agenda item 10

- OEWG on compliance – CPM agenda item 11.3
- Improved phytosanitary capacity – CPM agenda item 12
- Implementation of the IPPC – CPM agenda item 13
- International promotion of the IPPC – CPM agenda item 14
- Discussion on nominations for CPM positions CPM agenda items 16 and 17
- The development of further regional standards on phytosanitary measures

Nine countries (Australia, New Zealand, China, Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Japan and Malaysia) attended the pre-CPM-3 meeting on 14:30 hours at headquarters building on 6 April 2008.

This was the first time the APPPC had a pre-CPM meeting. Participants were able to share areas of concern and this was particularly useful when countries held different views. The members felt it was a fruitful exercise and agreed to a similar arrangement the following year.

7.3 Working group meeting on the procedures for finance, administration and planning for APPPC

This meeting was held in Bangkok, Thailand 21 to 23 July 2008. The main problem faced by the participants was the selection of a suitable mechanism for the mandatory contributions of APPPC contracting governments to the APPPC trust fund. After considering a number of options, the meeting agreed that a UN based system would be the least subject to disagreement as all countries were already involved in using this funding regime. This system has three countries, China, Republic of Korea and Australia, each paying 22 percent of the required funds with other APPPC members contributing the remainder. The working group felt that this produced a fair and equitable system. The regular review of the UN system also ensured that any changes in the status of member will be taken into account.

The working group decided that the APPPC financial system should operate to procedural and financial rules. These would be prepared by FAO legal office and submitted to the 26th session of the APPPC in 2009.

The meeting reviewed the work programme prepared by the strategic planning group in 2006 and made substantial modifications. This was done to show APPPC members the financial commitments necessary from each country to fund the work programme using the foresaid contribution system.

7.4 The development of further regional phytosanitary standards for phytosanitary measures

Three initial draft RSPMs were arranged by end June 2008 and the APPPC SC meeting was conducted from 14 to 20 June in Bangkok, Thailand.

The drafts prepared were:

- Guidelines for protection against South American leaf blight of rubber by Malaysia
- Guidance on the operation of land border entry points by China
- Guidelines for the exterior cleanliness of containers by New Zealand.

These three drafts were reviewed and approved by the APPPC Standards Committee, and sent to APPPC members as part of the consultation process.

The committee which reviewed the draft on container cleanliness decided that it should refer to the exterior of containers only. The guidelines would be optional and involve certification of cleanliness by NPPOs or where necessary, by approved parties. If phytosanitary certificates are not used, a special purpose certificate could suffice.

The draft standard on guidelines for protection against SALB was reduced. The context was amended to follow that provided by the APPPC SALB PRA. Some of the appendices were removed as the contents within the standard covered those issues.

The draft on guidance in land border quarantine was substantially changed so that it referred more to the differences between an entry point at a sea or air port and an entry point at a land border. The draft particularly referred to phytosanitary measures for local trade including the listing of specific products for such trade, the size of consignments, the delineation of a specific border region for local trade, designated sites for marketing and restrictions on traders.

7.5 Development projects

7.5.1 NZL project-phytosanitary capacity building project for CLMV

Based on the evaluation of the implementation for the period of February 2001 to June 2004, a three year project (2006 to 2009) – “Phytosanitary capacity building for the Mekong region” – was designed. This is intended to build credible phytosanitary services in each of the four countries with the goal of enhancing their phytosanitary capabilities, for the promotion of trade and the generation of rural income and thus reducing poverty.

7.5.2 Japanese funding project (GCP/RAS/226/JPN)

This project is entitled “Cooperation for the improvement of phytosanitary capacity in Asian countries through capacity building”. It involved:

- a training workshop on pest risk analysis for quarantine staff from Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar and Viet Nam in Hanoi, Viet Nam, 8 to 14 June 2008,
- a regional workshop on pest risk analysis (PRA) (3 to 13 November 2008, Indonesia). Participants from Indonesia, Malaysia and Philippines attended the workshop. The workshop provided an opportunity for practical exercises in step by step PRA
- a regional workshop on PRA, in Bangkok, Thailand, from 8 to 20 March 2009. Twenty-one participants from the plant quarantine agency of Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Thailand attended the training

7.5.3 TCP/CMB/3101(D) for Cambodia

This project is to identify urgently institutional development and infrastructure needs, provide training to staff in critical operational areas, develop documented procedures for major activities, and assist with the formulation of a five-year development plan.

7.6 Membership of the APPPC

The Standing Committee had pursued the matter of the withdrawal of the United Kingdom from the Commission. This was effective 4th September 2009.

8. Progress report on integrated pest management (IPM) in the region

The 25th session of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission was held in Beijing, China from 27 to 31 August 2007. The IPM Standing Committee met, discussed and formulated a resolution, which addressed three key issues pertaining to IPM development in the Asia and Pacific region. The resolution stressed:

- (1) the need for more restraint responses to outbreaks of rice brown plant hoppers,
- (2) the need for policy reforms to capture benefits of IPM in pesticide risk reduction efforts, and
- (3) the need to enhance collaboration between APPPC and ASEAN-IPM.

Progress report

8.1 Need for more restraint responses to outbreaks of rice brown planthoppers

- The meeting expressed concern about tendencies that current BPH outbreak responses do not fall in line with IPM research and empirical field experiences built up over the years and that these responses actually could be counter-productive. The importance of reliable field data that reflect the real field situation was emphasized. There is a particular risk that pesticide (and other input) suppliers exploit the situation to promote pesticide use regimes that otherwise would not be acceptable.
- The meeting recommended that the dynamics of current BPH outbreaks are fully documented and shared with special attention to consequences for IPM, health and environment. The examples of the most recent FAO locust campaigns and the 1994 decision by the Thai Government to cancel its outbreak budgets for pesticide and channeling funds instead into IPM farmer training could provide key guidance.
- The meeting expressed the need for consultation and involvement of technically competent experts (including national IPM programme staff) in the decision-making process with regards to government responses to BPH outbreak situations. National IPM programmes should be formally tasked to facilitate the process of collection of scientific data that can be used to guide government decision making with regards to how best to manage the outbreak situations. In addition, possible complementary roles that a regional body, such as the APPPC, can play in facilitating such a documentation process should be explored.

8.1.1 Action taken and results

At the request of the Government of Cambodia's MAFF and Viet Nam's MARD, FAO provided assistance in developing strategies and activities to demonstrate ecologically sound BPH management with minimal or no use of pesticides. FAO assisted in the development and promotion of community level management of BPH and associated viruses in the Mekong Delta. FAO also supported policy development at MAFF and MARD ministerial levels which are intended to guide strategy development for prevention and management of future hopper outbreaks in the Mekong Delta.

8.2 Need for policy reforms to capture benefits of IPM in pesticide risk reduction efforts

- The meeting expressed the position that IPM will not succeed without reform of pesticide policies consistent with IPM principles. The importance of employing the push-pull strategy of educating farmers about unnecessary use of pesticides and providing farmer access to effective and affordable alternatives need to be supported by policy enforcements to stop the supply of cheap and broad spectrum pesticides.
- The meeting recognized that better demonstration of the contribution of IPM farmer education achievements to policy objectives related to food safety and promotion of good agricultural practice programmes for better market access would be useful to the promotion of IPM and that specific efforts into this direction should be encouraged.

8.2.1 Action taken and results

With support from SIDA and the Swedish Chemical Agency (KemI) as part of a three-year (2007-2009) pilot project, FAO assisted countries in the Greater Mekong sub-region to step up field programmes to help farmers adopt integrated pest management and eliminate the use of highly hazardous pesticides ("IPM component" of project GCP/RAS/229/SWE). FAO also provided assistance for the strengthening of the pesticide regulatory frame work and policy reform ("policy component" of project GCP/RAS/229/SWE), with focus on Cambodia and Lao PDR. The implementing partners were KemI, FAO and regional civil society organizations, PAN-AP and the field alliance. Activities were carried out to lead to the elimination of use of hazardous and persistent agro-chemicals through IPM farmer training in conjunction with better access/utilization of alternative pest management options and support for national pest and pesticide management policy reform.

Although activities in the different countries varied, the IPM component had resulted in the identification and prioritization of information, research and training development needs. The project also fostered the development of functional partnerships among government, NGOs, research and public sector organizations for the development and further strengthening of IPM field training programmes to address pesticide risk reduction at farm level in the Greater Mekong sub-region. The project also supported longer-term impact assessment of pesticide risk reduction training, publicizes successful pilot models for community education for pesticide risk reduction for up-scaling and promotes better pest and pesticide management policy reform by local governments, public sector and partner organizations in the Greater Mekong sub-region.

Through the policy component of the Swedish-supported pesticide risk reduction programme activities were carried out to address the issue of highly hazardous pesticides through capacity building for chemicals management in general. While activities varied in Lao PDR and Cambodia, they focused on initial steps to develop adequate regulatory framework including legal documents and functional mechanism for the control of pesticides and capacity building for staff members in national and provincial levels on pesticide management including, i.e., providing training and conducting inspection. At the regional level, a high-level workshop on licensing and inspection of pesticide sellers was organized on 10 to 11 November 2008 to provide an opportunity to exchange information and experiences, and to discuss common issues/questions related to the establishment and operating of licensing schemes for pesticide importers and sellers, and inspection systems to monitor their compliance with legal obligations.

8.3 Need to enhance collaboration between APPPC and ASEAN-IPM

- The meeting expressed concern over the designation of crop protection staff with limited IPM background who participate in ASEAN meetings where critical issues related to APPPC are discussed and where the participation of staff associated with national IPM programmes is necessary to ensure that due attention is given to IPM and quality farmer education. The meeting recommended the participation of at least one participant from each existing national IPM programmes in ASEAN IPM meetings.
- The meeting recommends an APPPC link up with ASEAN to push its IPM and farmer education agenda and for national IPM programmes to lobby for its inclusion in relevant ASEAN working groups.
- The meeting recommended the idea of using existing websites and regional meetings as forum for sharing information on pest outbreaks and solutions. The meeting further recommended that an interim meeting of the IPM Standing Committee be called next year to assess the status and progress of work related to the current BPH outbreaks in the AP region.
- The meeting recommended the publication of an FAO book documenting IPM history, evolution and best practices to address the need for better scientific documentation of IPM and empirical field results for policy reforms in support of IPM.

8.4 Information sharing

Issues relative to enhancing collaboration between APPPC and ASEAN-IPM were raised again in the FAO regional IPM programme bi-annual meeting in November 2008. The meeting was used as a forum for sharing information on pest outbreaks and solutions including best practices to address the need for better scientific documentation of IPM and empirical field results for policy reforms in support of IPM, e.g. the BPH problem.

The concern was raised about representatives from national IPM programmes (supported by FAO) not being considered as official delegates in APPPC meetings. Through dialogue with the governments and through the APPPC Secretariat, national IPM focal persons have been invited to the coming APPPC meeting as official country representatives so that they can be officially recognized as part of the official country delegations and as such participate in discussions and policy formulation.

8.4.1 Action taken and results:

In terms of the development of e-networks for information sharing, FAO developed a new website: www.vegetableipmasia.org. This website provides a rich source of information on IPM and farmer education. Whereas the publication of the proposed FAO IPM history book is as relevant as ever, no progress has been made with the publication of the book.

8.5 Continuous efforts of national IPM programmes

In addition to the above mentioned regional activities and achievements, during the last two years many activities have been implemented by national IPM programmes of the APPPC member countries and achieved remarkable results mainly in the areas of:

- Government commitments in term of policy and financial support to IPM programmes
- Human capacity development for trainers, extension workers and farmers for ecologically sound pest management
- Development of novel options for non-chemical pest management
- IPM products marketed through GAP and food safety programmes
- Technical documents and training materials development and sharing
- Farmer organizations development and empowerment and so forth.

9. Progress report on agricultural pesticide management in the region by the Chairperson of the APPPC Standing Committee on Pesticides

Sound management of pesticides in the region has been mainly focusing on reduction of risk associated with pesticide and these include banning and restriction of use of highly hazardous pesticides and improvements of national regulatory controls in some countries in the region.

China made a significant progress towards reducing the uses of highly hazardous pesticides which has great implication on the trade of those pesticides in the region. China has phased out all pesticides containing persistent organic pollutants. The production, sale, use, import and export of chlordane, mirex and DDT, have been completely banned in China from May 2009. These initiatives can be seen as a standards setting activity for the other countries in the region and beneficial to other developing countries in the region since China is one of the major exporters of pesticides. Sri Lanka has initiated regulatory actions to phase out of Dimethoate, Fenthion and Paraquat due to their relatively very high rate of deaths due to ingestion, supported by properly conducted scientific studies according to the internationally accepted norms. Malaysia has introduced a new fee structure in registration of pesticides that discriminate Class Ia and Ib products of WHO hazard classification as against lesser toxic pesticides. Malaysia has also started a pesticide container recycling project in efforts to reduce risk to humans and the environment resulted from the improper disposal of pesticide containers. Strengthening of regulatory controls over distribution, sale and use of unregistered, banned and illegal pesticides has also been carried out in many of member countries.

In addition to above activities, three sub-regional meetings/workshops involving key regional personnel were also held under the activities and programmes of the Rotterdam Convention and the FAO. The Secretariat for the Rotterdam Convention in collaboration with hosting countries organized two workshops:

- National workshop on the implementation of trade related provisions of the Rotterdam Convention which was held from 29 October to 2 November 2007 in Hangzhou, China, and
- Subregional consultation among Designated National Authorities (DNAs) to the Rotterdam Convention which was held from 18 to 22 February 2008 in Phuket, Thailand.

FAO organized a subregional workshop on licensing and inspection of pesticide retailers which was held from 10 to 11 November 2008 in Hanoi, Viet Nam. The workshop was part of the activities under the FAO's risk reduction project for countries in the Greater Mekong subregion.

At the international level, the region was well represented in the international initiatives on pesticide management. The international Code of Conduct on distribution and use of pesticides, implemented jointly by FAO and World Health Organization (WHO) is setting the international standards in activities related to pesticides in its entire life cycle. The FAO/WHO joint panel of experts on pesticides which recommends implementation options of the Code was represented by China, Malaysia, India and Sri Lanka.

9.1 “Rotterdam Convention and responsible trade”: Report on implementation of Rotterdam Convention by PIC Secretariat and DNAs from two countries

The overall report on implementation of Rotterdam Convention was presented by Dr Peter Kenmore outlining the various activities that had occurred over the past two years.

The DNA country reports were presented by China and Malaysia.

10. Consideration of the report of the 20th technical consultation among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs)

Mr Yongfan Piao, Executive Secretary of APPPC presented the report of the 20th technical consultation (TC) among Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs), which was held in Rome, 25 to 28 August 2008.

It was stressed that the TC noted that there is a trend of increased trading partner participation, from outside the RPPO region, in the comment period for draft RSPMs. Examples were provided where this has taken place in the past and the TC encouraged this increased transparency and participation when appropriate. The TC agreed that there is an urgent need for an update, from a global perspective, on electronic certification in terms of current technologies and practical implementation issues. The TC agreed that in order to begin accumulating information on IPPC and ISPM implementation issues with respect to the implementation, review and support system (IRSS), the RPPOs will prepare an annual report for the TC concerning implementation issues in their regions.

The report was noted.

11. The APPPC work programme for 2010 to 2011

11.1 Group discussions by APPPC Standing Committee meetings on IPM, plant quarantine and pesticide management respectively, and report on the work plan presentations by Chairperson of the Standing Committees of IPM, Plant Quarantine and Pesticide

11.1.1 Report of the APPPC Standing Committee on Plant Quarantine

This committee was chaired by New Zealand with the participation of Australia, China, India, Indonesia, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam. The activities of the Standing Committee are as in Annex VI.

11.1.2 Report of the APPPC Standing Committee on IPM

This committee was chaired by the Philippines with the participation of Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Republic of Korea and Viet Nam. The activities of the Standing Committee are as in Annex VI.

11.1.3 Report of the APPPC Standing Committee on Pesticide

This committee was chaired by Malaysia with the participation of China, India, Japan, Myanmar and Pakistan. The activities of the Standing Committee are as in Annex VI.

11.2 Discussion on the approval of the APPPC work plan for biennium (2010-2011) and on the approval of budget for next biennium (2010-2011), which will be the basis for assessment of country mandatory contributions (CPM)

The work plan was presented by the Secretary, as follows:

11.2.1 Plant protection measures

11.2.1.1 Pre-CPM consultation for APPPC members

A pre-CPM consultation will provide APPPC member with an opportunity for discussion of CPM agenda items including more specifically the draft ISPMs which will be presented for adoption by the CPM. This meeting facilitates a better understanding of the specific concerns of participants and allows the development regional views on some issues. This meeting would not involve any financial input from the APPPC.

11.2.1.2 SALB working group

It is suggested that the Commission set up a working group on SALB to develop detailed guidelines to support the APPPC SALB standard. The working group would arrange a workshop to develop and consider harmonized plant import requirements for rubber planting material and other pathways as noted in the PRA, and a workshop concerning inspection, diagnostics and disinfection in SALB endemic countries. The budget for the second workshop would be supplemented by individual participating countries to cover additional expenses (e.g. expenses for travel to workshops in SALB endemic countries). The SALB working group will be led by Malaysia with participation of China, India, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam.

11.2.1.3 Pest incursion management

The Commission recognizes this area as extremely important. It was proposed that the subject be considered by means of a workshop. Experts on pest incursion management and pest eradication would be invited. Training material could be developed. It is suggested that a working group be established. This group would be led by Australia with the participation of China, India, Indonesia, New Zealand and Republic of Korea.

Note: A workshop on this subject is proposed in the business plan.

11.2.2. Information management programme

If possible, the Commission should consider the development of a system for the collection and dissemination of plant protection information within the region including the development of the website of APPPC.

The information management programme could continue with the development and maintenance of plant protection profiles. This could be linked to the questionnaire system proposed for the IPPC implementation review and support system. It could be revised and published every two years.

There is need for enhancement of coordination of funding for plant protection activities in the region as well as promotion of acceptance of revised APPPC Agreement.

The Commission should consider compilation, documentation and presentation of 'Best Practices' of IPM and pesticide risk reduction for member countries. Support, including financial support, could be sought from the regional IPM programme or any other related projects.

This programme requires the appointment of a full/part time project staff or a National Programme officer (NPO). The officer would not only promote information exchange among APPPC members but also provide assistance to the Executive Secretary. Such an appointment has been discussed before and is noted in:

- the report of the 13th session which suggests the funds may be used for additional staff
- the strategic plan adopted at the 25th session

- the report of the working group meeting on the procedures for finance, administration and planning for the APPPC (2008) where agreement was noted that some trust funds could be used for a project staff person

11.2.3 Capacity development

11.2.3.1 Implementation of ISPMs

The need for support for the implementation of ISPMs was noted in the discussions of Commission members. It is proposed to establish a working group to investigate how the Commission members can assist in the implementation of standards. The working group would select an ISPM or ISPMs and, if it is thought appropriate, look at the development of training material. The group would be led by Republic of Korea with participation of Australia, India, the Philippines and New Zealand.

11.2.3.2 Cooperation with counterparts

The Commission closely cooperates with potential supporters and counterparts for their assistance and financial support for providing technical assistance in improvements of country capacity in implementation of RSPMs, ISPMs, pesticide risk reduction through IPM, Rotterdam Convention and Code of Conduct etc.

11.2.3.3 A regional workshop on sustainable intensification of production and IPM

11.2.4 International agreements

11.2.4.1 Regional workshops

It is hoped that sponsor(s) will be found to facilitate the holding of the regional workshop on draft ISPMs.

11.2.5. Estimated budget for specific activities (2010-2011) in US\$

11.2.5.1 Estimated costs for specific activities (2010-2011) supported by the trust fund from mandatory contribution

Activities (2010-2011) and budget supported by the mandatory contribution

	Activity	Cost (US\$)
1	SALB working group activities	60 000
2	Implementation of ISPMs	20 000
3	A workshop on pest incursion management	50 000
4	Information management (including staffing cost) biennium	150 000
5	Support of sustainable development of IPM	20 000
6	Administration 13 percent	39 000
	Total:	339 000 (169 500 per year)

Note: The annual mandatory contribution level by countries during 2010-2011 will be based on the above estimated costs.

11.2.5.2 Estimated costs for specific activities (2010-2011) supported by the trust fund from voluntary contributions or other sources

Activities (2010-2011) and budget supported by voluntary contributions

	Activity	Cost (US\$)
1	Regional workshops on draft ISPMs (one per year)	50 000
2	Promote acceptance of revised APPPC	20 000
3	Training workshop on capacity development in implementation of ISPMs/RSPMs and other international treaties	40 000
4	Promotion of IPM and GAP, etc.	35 000
5	Commission study and review of the implementation of the Code of Conduct on the distribution of use of pesticides	20 000
	Total:	165 000

Note: This figure is only indicative costs for potential activities listed in the section 11.2.5.2, the activities will be depending on availability of voluntary contributions from member countries and other sources.

11.2.6 Discussions

The Session discussed the business plan and solicited views from the member countries, especially the main contributors, Australia, Republic of Korea and China. The Session unanimously agreed that the activities proposed were acceptable and in line with the objectives of the APPPC. The work plan and the budget were adopted (Annex VII).

12. Date and venue of the twenty-seventh session

The twenty-seventh session will be hosted by the Philippines and the twenty-eighth session will be hosted by the Republic of Korea.

13. Any other business

13.1 Cooperation of APPPC with other regional groups

The Session agreed to look into the possibility of having cooperation with other regional groups at the next meeting.

13.2 Reorganizing the Standing Committees of APPPC

The Session agreed that the organization of the Standing Committees will be reviewed at the next meeting

13.3 APPPC member participation in APPPC management

The role of an “Executive Committee” to assist the Secretary in the management of the affairs of the Commission was discussed. Members felt that some form of support and guidance was necessary. This should be discussed at the next session of the Commission. It was suggested that a meeting of the Standards Committee be arranged for this coming biennium, possibly associated with one of the planned workshops.

14. Adoption of the report

The report was adopted.

15. Closing of the Session

The Chairperson thanked all the delegates and the organizing committee for making the meeting a success and closed the Session.

**THE TWENTY-SIXTY SESSION OF THE
ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION**

**31 August to 4 September 2009
New Delhi, India**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

AUSTRALIA

1. **Mr Robert Bertrand Schwartz**
Senior Manager
Plant Biosecurity
Biosecurity Services Group
7, Civic London Circuit
G.P.O. Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Tel: 61 2 6272 4865
Fax: 61 2 6272 3307
E-mail: Rob.Schwartz@biosecurity.gov.au
2. **Dr Colin Grant**
Executive Manager Plant Division
Biosecurity Services Group
Australian Government
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Australia
Tel: 612 6272 3937
E-mail: colin.grant@biosecurity.gov.au

BANGLADESH

3. **Dr MD. Delowar Hossain**
Chief Scientific Officer
Plant Pathology Division
Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute
Gazipur, Bangladesh
Tel: 0088 02 9256405 (Office)
Mobile: 01914959589
E-mail: csopath@bari.gov.bd
4. **Md. Hasanul Haque**
Project Director
Agricultural Extension Component (AEC)
Department of Agriculture Extension
Khamarbari, Farmgate, Dhaka
Bangladesh
Tel.: 0088-02-9139596
Mobile: 0088-01711434450
E-mail: panna_hasan@yahoo.com

CAMBODIA

5. **Dr Hean Vanhan**
Deputy Director General
Organization/affiliation General Directorate of
Agriculture (GDA)
Ministry of Agriculture, Forest and Fisheries
(MAFF)
House 56B, Street 365, Sangkat Teuk Laak III
Khan Toul Kork, Phnom Penh
Cambodia
Tel: (+855) 12818216
Fax: (+855) 23216655
E-mail: heanvanhan@gmail.com
6. **Mr Ngin Chhay**
Cambodia National IPM Coordinator & Chair
APPPC-IPM Committee, Phnom Penh
Department of Rice Crop, MAFF
House 56B, Street 365, Sangkat Teuk Laak III
Khan Toul Kork, Phnom Penh
Cambodia
Tel/Fax: (855-23) 880 465
Mobile: (855-17) 984 898
E-mail: chhay.ipm@online.com.kh

CHINA

7. **Dr Xia Jingyuan**
Director General
National Agro-Technical Extension and
Service Center
Ministry of Agriculture
No. 20 Mai Zi Dian Street, Beijing, China
Tel: 86 10 59194505
Fax: 86 10 59194517
E-mail: Xiajyuan@agri.gov.cn
8. **Mr Fuxiang Wang**
Director
Plant Quarantine Division
National Agro-Technical Extension and
Service Centre
Ministry of Agriculture
Beijing, China
Tel: 86-10-59194524
E-mail: wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn

- 9. Mr Yang Puyun**
Deputy Director
Pest Control Division
National Agro-Technical Extension and
Service Centre
Ministry of Agriculture
Beijing, China
Tel: 86-10-59194542
E-mail: yangpy@agri.gov.cn
- 10. Mr He Pengfei**
Programme Official
General Administration of Quality Supervision
Inspection and Quarantine of the
People's Republic of China (AQSIQ)
No. 9 Madian East Road
Haidian District, Beijing
China, 10088
Tel: 8610-82261664
Fax: 8610-82260157
E-mail: hepf@aqsiq.gov.cn
- 11. Mr Lau Siu Ki Clive**
Senior Agricultural Officer (Regulatory)
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Department
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
China
Tel: (852)-21507039
E-mail: clive_sk_lau@afcd.gov.hk

INDIA

- 12. Shri Pankaj Kumar**
Joint Secretary (Plant Protection)
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi – 110 001
India
Tel: +91-11-23070306
Fax: +91-11-23070916
E-mail: pankajkumar@nic.in
- 13. Dr P.S. Chandurkar**
Plant Protection Adviser to the Government
of India
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and
Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2413985/2410056
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: ppa@nic.in
- 14. Dr S.K. Khurana**
Secretary
Central Insecticides Board and Registration
Committee
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and
Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2413002
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: cibsecy@nic.in
- 15. Shri V.K. Yadava**
Director (IPM)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and
Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2413023
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: dipm@nic.in
- 16. Dr Ravi Prakash**
Joint Director (PQ)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and
Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 12100, Haryana
India
Tel: +91-129-2418506
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: jdpq@nic.in

Observers (India)

- 17. Dr B.S. Phogat**
Director, Central Insecticides Laboratory
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and
Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel/Fax: +91-129-2413014
E-mail: cilfbd@nic.in
- 18. Dr (Mrs) Sarita Bhalla**
Joint Director (MT)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and
Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2412049
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: toxcil@nic.in

- 19. Shri A.K. Bandhopadhyaya**
Deputy Director (E)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2412149
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: locust@nic.in
- 20. Dr R.M. Shukla**
Deputy Director (E)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2419067
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: rmshukla1977@yahoo.co.in
- 21. Shri Vipin Bhatnagar**
Deputy Director (Chem.)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2434496
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: vipinb55@rediffmail.com
- 22. Dr K.C. Gupta**
Deputy Director (PP)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2418508
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: ddstat@nic.in
- 23. Dr J.N. Thakur**
Deputy Director (PP)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2418117
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: jn.thakur@nic.in
- 24. Dr P.S. Nain**
Deputy Director (PP)
National Plant Quarantine Station
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
Rangpuri, New Delhi – 110 037, India
Tel: +91-11-26899297
E-mail: panjab_nain@yahoo.co.in
- 25. Dr J.P. Singh**
Deputy Director (E)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2418508
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: j.p.singh@nic.in
- 26. Dr V.K. Srivatsava**
Deputy Director (PP)
Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine and Storage
Department of Agriculture and Cooperation
Ministry of Agriculture
NH-IV, Faridabad – 121001, Haryana, India
Tel: +91-129-2412149
Fax: +91-129-2412125
E-mail: ddpnc@nic.in
- 27. Dr B.G. Naik**
Director General
National Institute of Plant Health Management (NIPM)
Rajendra Nagar
Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh, India
Tel: 040-24015346
E-mail: drbgnaik@yahoo.co.in
- 28. Dr A.M.K. Mohan Rao**
Rodent Specialist
National Institute of Plant Health Management (NIPM)
Rajendra Nagar, Hyderabad
Andhra Pradesh, India
Tel: +91-9440 654 555
E-mail: mohanrao.arasada@live.com

INDONESIA

29. Mr Hari Priyono

Director General
Indonesian Agricultural Quarantine Agency
Ministry of Agriculture
Jl. Harsono Rm No. 3 Building E (1st floor)
Pasar Minggu, Jakarta Selatan 12550
Indonesia
Tel: 62-217816481
Fax: 62-217816481
E-mail: hari@deptan.go.id;
hariPriyono55@yahoo.com

30. Mr Suwanda

Director of Centre for Plant Quarantine
Indonesian Agency for Agricultural Quarantine
Ministry of Agriculture
Jl. Harsono Rm No. 3, Building E (5th Floor)
Pasar Minggu, Ragunan,
Jakarta Selatan 12550
Indonesia
Tel: 62 21 7816482
Fax: 62 21 7816482
E-mail: suwanda@deptan.go.id;
suwanda.suwanda@gmail.com

31. Mr Soekirno

Director of Horticulture Crop Protection
Ministry of Agriculture
Jl. Aup, Pasarmingu, Jakarta Selatan
Indonesia
E-mail: ditlinhor@yahoo.com

32. Dr N. Herdradjat

Director of Estate Crops Protection
Ministry of Agriculture
Jl. Harsono Rm No. 3 Building E (5th floor)
Pasar Minggu, Jakarta Selatan 12550
Indonesia
Tel: 62-21-7815684
Fax: 62-21-7815684
E-mail: herdradjat@deptan.go.id

33. Mr Heru Wahyupraja

Head for Quarantine of Import Plant
Centre for Plant Quarantine
Agency for Agricultural Quarantine
Ministry of Agriculture
Building E, Fl. 5, Jl. Harsono Rm No. 3
Jakarta Pusat, Indonesia
Tel/Fax: +62 21 7816482
E-mail: pusatkt@indo.net.id

34. Dr Antarjo Dikin

Head of Division for Cooperation and
Public Relation
Indonesian Agricultural Quarantine Agency
Indonesia
Tel: 6281399155774
E-mail: antario_dikin@yahoo.com

LAO PDR

35. Mr Siriphonh Phithaksoun

Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine Division
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Lane Xang Avenue
Patuxay Square, P.O. Box 811
Vientiane, Lao PDR
Tel: +856 21 412350
Mobile: +856 20 2410440
Fax: +856 21 412349
E-mail: syriphonh@gmail.com

MALAYSIA

36. Ms Wan Normah Wan Ismail

Director, Crop Protection and
Plant Quarantine Division
Department of Agriculture
3rd Floor, Wisma Tani Kuala Lumpur
Sultan Salahuddin Road
50632 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Tel: 60-3-2030-1401
Fax: 60-3-2691-3530
E-mail: wanis@doa.gov.my

37. Mr Yip Kin San

Principal Assistant Director
Enforcement and Plant Protection Section
Department of Agriculture
Aras 1, Wisma Pertanian Sabah
88632 Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia
Tel: 088-283264
Fax: 088-239046
E-mail: KinSan.Yip@sabah.gov.my

38. Ms Fatimah binti MdAnwar

Principal Assistant Director
Pesticides Control Division
4-6 Floor, Wisma Tani
Jalan Sultan Salahuddin
50632 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Tel: 603-20301491 (direct line)
Tel: 603-20301400 (general line)
Fax: 603-26917551
E-mail: fatimahmdanwar@yahoo.com;
fatimahmdanwar@doa.gov.my

39. Mr Michael Ranges Nyangob
Assistant Director of Agriculture
Plant Quarantine Division
Agric. Annex Complex
Jln, Kumpang, Off Jalan Ong Tiang Swee
93200, Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia
Tel: 6 082 414712
Fax: 6 082 413163
E-mail: michaelr@sarawaknet.gov.my

40. Mr Ho Haw Leng
Principal Assistant Director
Import and Export Control Section
Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Division
Department of Agriculture
3rd Floor, Wisma Tani
Sultan Salahuddin Road
50632 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Tel: 60-3-2030-1417
Fax: 60-3-2691-3350
E-mail: hawlengho@doa.gov.my
hawlengho@yahoo.com

41. Mr Chan Yeng Wai
Deputy Director, Legislation and
International Affairs, MAQIS
7th Floor, Lot 4G2, Wisma Tani, Precint 4
62624 Putrajaya, Malaysia
Tel: 6-03-88704198
Fax: 6-03-8890-2910
E-mail: yengwai@yahoo.com;
yengwai@moa.gov.my

42. Mr Halimi Mahmud
Pesticides Control Division
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Agro-Based Industry
Jalan Sultan Sallahuddin
50480 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
Tel: +603-2030 1480
Fax: +603-2691 7551
E-mail: halimi@doa.gov.my;
halimi_mahmud@yahoo.com

MYANMAR

43. Mrs Phyu Phyu Lwin
Manager (Senior Entomologist)
Plant Protection Division
Myanma Agriculture Service
Bayint Naung Road, West Gyogone
Insein P.O., Yangon, Myanmar
Tel: 01- 644214 (Office)
Mobile: 09502-7926
E-mail: pppmas.moai@mptmail.net.mm;
phyuppd@gmail.com

NEPAL

44. Mr Badri Bishal Karmacharya
Programme Director
Directorate of Plant Protection
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Government of Nepal
Harihar Bhawan, Pulchowk, Lalitpur
Nepal
Tel: 00977-1-6226684 (Res.)
00977-1-5521597 (Office)
Mobile: 00977-9841624222
E-mail: karmabishal@yahoo.com

NEW ZEALAND

45. Mr Tim Knox
Director Border Standards
MAF Biosecurity New Zealand
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Pastoral House, 25 The Terrace
P.O. Box 2526, Wellington 6140
New Zealand
Tel: 04 894 0165
Cell: 029 894 0165
E-mail: tim.knox@maf.govt.nz

46. Dr John Hedley
Principal Adviser
International Coordination – Plants
Biosecurity New Zealand
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
P.O. Box 2526, Wellington
New Zealand
Tel desk: 64 4 894 0428
Tel mob: 64 29 894 0428
Fax: 64 4 894 0733
E-mail: john.hedley@maf.govt.nz

PAKISTAN

47. Dr Tasneem Ahmad
Adviser and Director General
Department of Plant Protection
Ministry of Food and Agriculture
Government of Pakistan
Karachi, Pakistan
Tel: 021-9248607
Fax: 021-9248673
E-mail: tasneem91@yahoo.com;
dg1@plantprotection.gov.pk

PHILIPPINES

48. Dr Larry R. Lacson
Chief, Plant Quarantine Service
Bureau of Plant Industry
692 San Andres Street, Malate, Manila
Philippines
Tel: (+63 2) 404 0409 / 524 3749 / 524 2812
E-mail: lacsonlr@yahoo.com
Website: pqs.da.gov.ph

49. Dr Jesie Binamira
Philippine National IPM Programme Officer and
ASEAN IPM Knowledge Network
Director
Department of Agriculture, Eliliptical Road
Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines
Tel/Fax: (63-2) 920 4099
E-mail: jbinamira@yahoo.com

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

50. Mr In-Tae Bae
Director General
National Plant Quarantine Service
Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and
Fisheries (MIFAFF)
433-1, Anyang 6-dong, Manan-Gu, Anyang City
Gyeonggi-Do, Republic of Korea
Tel: +82-31-420-7600
Fax: +82-31-420-7605
E-mail: itbae@korea.kr

51. Mr Young-Tae Kim
Deputy Director
Bilateral Negotiation and Cooperation Division
Ministry for Food, Agriculture, Forestry and
Fisheries (MIFAFF)
Government Complex, Jungang-dong 1
Gwacheon City, Gyeonggi-Do
Republic of Korea
Tel: +82-2-500-1875
Fax: +82-2-504-6659
E-mail: youngkim@mifaff.go.kr

52. Mr Young-Chul Jeong
Deputy-Director
International Quarantine Cooperation Division
National Plant Quarantine Service/MIFAFF
433-1, Anyang 6-dong, Manan-Gu, Anyang City
Gyeonggi-Do, Republic of Korea
Tel: +82-31-420-7664
Fax: +82-31-420-7605
E-mail: ycjeong@npqs.go.kr

53. Dr Kyu-Ock Yim
Researcher
International Quarantine Cooperation Division
National Plant Quarantine Service/MIFAFF
433-1, Anyang 6-dong, Manan-Gu, Anyang City
Gyeonggi-Do, Republic of Korea
Tel: +82-31-420-7665
Fax: +82-31-420-7605
E-mail: koyim@korea.kr

SRI LANKA

54. Mr K. Piyasena
Deputy Director
Plant Protection Service
Gannoruwa, Peradeniya, Sri Lanka
Tel: 0812 388316
Fax: 0812 388316
E-mail: scppc@sltnet.lk;
ppsdoasl@sltnet.lk

THAILAND

55. Mr Udorn Unahawutti
Senior Expert on Plant Quarantine
Department of Agriculture
50 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 579 8516
Fax: 662 579 4129
E-mail: unahawut@yahoo.com

56. Mrs Walaikorn Rattanadechakul
Senior Agricultural Scientist
Plant Protection Research and Development Office
Department of Agriculture
50 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 579 8516
Fax: 662 579 4158
E-mail: walaikornr@yahoo.com

57. Ms Tasanee Pradyabumrung
Senior Standards Officer
Office of Commodity and system standards
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and
Food Standards
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
50 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 5612277 ext. 1452
Fax: 662 561 3357
E-mail: tassaprat@hotmail.com;
tasanee@acfs.go.th

58. Mr Prateep Arayakittipong
Standards Officer
Office of Commodity and System Standards
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity and
Food Standards
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
50 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 5612277 ext. 1453
Fax: 662 561 3357
E-mail: prateep@acfs.go.th

VIET NAM

59. Dr Dam Quoc Tru
Deputy Director General
Plant Protection Department (PPD)
149 Ho Duc Di Street, Dong Da, Hanoi
Viet Nam
Tel: (84) 43 851 8198
Fax: (84) 43 533 0043
E-mail: trudq@fpt.vn

60. Mr Ngo Tien Dung
Coordinator Vietnam National IPM Programme
Plant Protection Department, Ministry of
Agriculture and Rural Development
149 Ho Duc Di Street, Dong Da
Hanoi, Viet Nam
Tel/Fax: (84-4) 3533 0043
E-mail: ipmppd@fpt.vn

OBSERVER

61. Mr Doe Doe
Programme Director
The National Plant Protection Centre
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture
Thimphu, Bhutan
Tel: +975(02) 351016 / 351655
Fax: +975(02) 351656
E-mail: ddoe_chimi@yahoo.com

62. Ms Reinouw Bast-Tjeerde
Chair of the CPM
Manager, International Plant Protection Issues,
Multilateral Relations
Canadian Food Inspection Agency 1400
Merivale Road
T1-5-340 Ottawa, ON KIA OY9
Canada
Tel: +1 613-773-6091
Fax: +1 613-773-6088
E-mail: reinouw.bast-tjeerde@inspection.gc.ca

63. Mr Yukio Yokoi
Director
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Activities
Division
Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Department
Japan External Trade Organization (JETRO)
Ark Mori Building 6F
12-32 Akasaka 1-chome, Minato-ku, Tokyo
107-6006 Japan
Tel: +81-3-3582-5546
Fax: +81-3-3582-7378
E-mail: yukio_yokoi@jetro.go.jp

64. Mr Koji Sumida
Head
Yokohama Plant Protection Station
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
(MAFF)
5-57, kitanaka-dori, Kita-ku, Yokohama
Japan
Tel: +81-45-211-7164
Fax: +81-45-211-0890
E-mail: sumidak@pps.go.jp

65. Mr Hisashi Sakata
Associate Director
Plant Protection Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
(MAFF)
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo
Japan
Tel: +81-3-3502-5978
Fax: +81-3-3502-3386
E-mail: hisashi_sakata2@nm.maff.go.jp

66. Mr Marc Gilkey
USDA APHIS Director in the US Embassy
USDA-APHIS-International Services
New Delhi, India
Tel: 011-91-11-2419-8122
Fax: 011-91-11-2419-8857
E-mail: marc.C.Gilkey@aphis.usda.gov

IPM

67. Mr Johannes W. Ketelaar
Chief Technical Adviser
FAO Inter-Country Programme for IPM and
Pesticide Risk Reduction in South and
South East Asia
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Maliwan Mansion, 39 Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel: 662 697 4274
Fax: 662 697 4422
E-mail: Johannes.Ketelaar@fao.org

FAO/ROME

- 68. Dr Peter E. Kenmore**
Secretary IPPC and Deputy Director
Plant Production and Protection Division
Agriculture and Consumer Protection Department
Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations (FAO)
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome, Italy
Tel: 39-06-5705-2188
Fax: 39-06-5705-6227
E-mail: peter.kenmore@fao.org
- 69. Mr Jean-Pierre Chiaradia-Bousquet**
Senior Legal Officer
LEGA
FAO Rome, Italy
Tel: 39-0605705-3956
Fax: 39-06-5705-4408
E-mail: jeanpierre.chiaradiabousquet@fao.org

FAO/RAP

- 70. Mr Piao Yongfan**
Senior Plant Protection Officer and
Secretary of APPPC
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Maliwan Mansion
39 Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: 662 697 4268
Fax: 662 697 4445
E-mail: Yongfan.piao@fao.org
- 71. Ms Nongyao Ruenglerpanya**
Secretary
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Maliwan Mansion
39 Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: 662 697 4264
Fax: 662 697 4445
E-mail: N.Ruenglerpanya@fao.org
- 72. Mr Prapin Lalitpat**
Consultant
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Maliwan Mansion
39 Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: 662 697 4162
Fax: 662 697 4445
E-mail: Prapin.Lalitpat@fao.org

PLANT PROTECTION AGREEMENT FOR THE ASIA AND PACIFIC REGION

Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission rules of procedure

Rule I. Definitions

For the purpose of these Rules, the following definitions apply:

- (a) **Agreement:** the Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific Region approved by the Council at its twenty-third session (November 1955), subsequently amended;
- (b) **Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons:** the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairpersons of the Commission.
- (c) **Commission:** the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission established in pursuance of Article II of the Agreement.
- (d) **Conference:** the Conference of the Organization.
- (e) **Contracting Government:** a party to the Agreement.
- (f) **Contributing Contracting Government:** a Contracting Government that has accepted the amendments to Articles II, III, IV and XIV to the Agreement introducing mandatory contributions and entering into force on 4 September 2009.
- (g) **Convention:** the International Plant Protection Convention.
- (h) **Council:** the Council of the Organization.
- (i) **Delegate:** the representative of a Contracting Government as specified in Article II of the Agreement.
- (j) **Delegation:** the delegate and his alternate(s), experts and advisers.
- (k) **Director-General:** the Director-General of the Organization.
- (l) **Observer Nation and Observer Organization:** any Member or Associated Member of the Organization, or a Nation that is not a member of the Commission, nor a Member or an Associated Member of the Organization but is a Member of the United Nations, any of its Specialized Agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency, and attends a session of the Commission; or an Intergovernmental Organization with which the Organization has concluded a cooperation agreement.
- (m) **Organization:** the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- (n) **Region:** the Asia and Pacific Region as specified in the Agreement.
- (o) **Secretary:** the Secretary of the Commission.

Rule II. Scope

These Rules of Procedure shall apply to all sessions of the Commission and the activities of the Secretary. They shall also apply, *mutatis mutandi*, to its subsidiary bodies unless the Commission decides otherwise.

Rule III. Sessions of the Commission

1. Pursuant to Article II.3 of the Agreement, the Commission shall meet whenever convened by the Director-General, in consultation with the Chairperson and the Secretary, at least once every two years in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's programmes and the terms of the invitation by the country in which the session is to be held, as appropriate.

2. The Director-General shall convene an extraordinary session of the Commission at the request of at least one third of the Contracting Governments.

3. Invitations to a regular session of the Commission shall be issued by the Secretary and sent to Contracting Governments and to potential Observer Nations or Intergovernmental Organizations, not less than forty-five days in advance of the date fixed for the opening of the session. Invitations to extraordinary sessions shall be issued not less than thirty days in advance of the date fixed for the opening of such extraordinary sessions.

4. In order that a proposal to hold a session of the Commission or any of its organs, in a given country, may be considered, such a country (i) must have ratified, without reservation, the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations, or (ii) given the assurance that all delegates, representatives, experts, observers, or other persons entitled to attend such a session in accordance with the terms of the Agreement or these Rules, will enjoy the privileges and immunities necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the session.

Rule IV. Registration

The Secretary shall

- (a) make arrangements for the registration of delegates and observers, including by establishing a standard format to that effect;
- (b) report to the Commission on the registration of delegates and observers, as may be required.

Rule V. Agenda

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article II of the Agreement, the agenda for each regular session of the Commission shall include the following items:

- (a) election of the Chairperson and of the Vice-Chairpersons, as appropriate;
- (b) adoption of the agenda;
- (c) consideration of the report by the Secretary on the financial and administrative affairs of the Commission, and of the report by the Chairperson, or the Secretary as appropriate, on the activities of the Commission;
- (d) consideration of the programme of work and the estimates for the budget and the levels of mandatory contribution for each Contributing Contracting Government;
- (e) consideration of the reports on inter-sessional activities of the subsidiary bodies of the Commission; and of significant developments in the pest and disease situation and management in the Region;
- (f) consideration of the time and place of the next session;
- (g) consideration of items referred to the Commission by the Conference, the Council, the Director-General, or the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures of the Convention, or its Secretary.

2. The agenda shall include, upon approval by the Commission, items approved at the previous session, proposed by the subsidiary bodies of the Commission and by a Contracting Government.

3. The agenda of an extraordinary session shall consist only of the items relating to the purpose for which the session was called.

4. Formal proposals relating to items on the agenda and amendments thereto introduced during a session of the Commission shall be made in writing and handed over to the Chairperson or the Secretary, who shall arrange copies to be circulated to all delegates attending the session.

Rule VI. Secretariat

Notwithstanding the terms of the mandate assigned to the Secretary, the duties of the Secretariat shall include, as appropriate, to:

- (a) receive and transmit the Commission's official communications;
- (b) maintain contact with appropriate government officials, in particular the National Plant Protection Organizations, with the Regional Plant Protection Organizations recognized as such by the Organization under the provision of Article IX of the Convention, and with the Secretary of the Convention, to facilitate consultation and cooperation on all matters pertaining to the objectives of the Commission;
- (c) maintain an active and effective network of national focal points for routine communication on progress and results of the activities of the Commission;
- (d) prepare and implement work programmes, prepare budgets and ensure timely reporting to the Commission and to the Director-General;
- (e) manage the funds of the Commission in accordance with the its Financial Rules and the Financial Regulations and procedures of the Organization;
- (f) formulate proposals regarding the budget and programme of work, or other activities, of the Commission financed by the regular budget of the Organization;
- (g) promote, facilitate and monitor the development of databases for plant protection;
- (h) advise on the coordination of the programmes of research of the Contracting Governments;
- (i) participate in the oversight of activities of projects carried out under the general framework of the Commission or its subsidiary bodies;
- (j) organize sessions of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies and other related technical meetings, as well as prepare, or arrange for the preparation, of background documents and papers and a report on the Commission's activities and the programme of work for the submission to the Commission at its regular sessions, and arrange for the subsequent publication of the report and the proceedings of the Commission, as well as its subsidiary bodies and related technical meetings;
- (k) take such appropriate steps as may be required to ensure coordination between the activities of the Commission and those carried out by the Organization through the Plant Production and Protection Division, and with the Secretary of the Convention, with particular reference to all matters having policy, financial or programme implications.

Rule VII. Chairmanship

1. The Commission shall elect, from among delegates or their alternates attending the session at which they are elected, the Chairperson and three Vice-Chairpersons of the Commission, who shall assume office immediately following the regular session at which they were elected and who shall be elected for two regular sessions. The Chairperson and the Vice-Chairpersons shall be eligible for re-election for a further two regular sessions.

2. The Chairperson shall exercise the functions conferred on him elsewhere in these Rules and, in particular, shall:

- (a) declare the opening and closing of each plenary meeting of the Commission;
- (b) direct the discussions at such meetings and ensure observance of these Rules, accord the right to speak, propose questions and announce decisions;
- (c) rule on points of order;
- (d) subject to these Rules, have complete control over the proceedings of the session;
- (e) appoint such committees of the session as the Commission may direct.

3. In the absence of the Chairperson, or at the request of the Chairperson, the functions of the Chairperson shall be exercised by one of the Vice-Chairpersons.
4. The Chairperson, or the Vice-Chairpersons when acting as Chairperson, shall not vote and another member of their delegations shall represent their Contracting Government.
5. In case either the Chairperson or any of the Vice-Chairpersons are unable to serve, the Secretary shall temporarily exercise the functions of the Chairpersons and shall conclude the session when its agenda is fully covered.
6. The Commission may adopt rules, consistent with the present Rules, clarifying the functions of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson, with particular reference to any functions performed during the inter-session period.

Rule VIII. Decision-making, voting arrangements and procedures

1. Each Contracting Government shall be represented on the Commission and shall have one vote. A majority of the Contracting Governments shall constitute a quorum. Except as otherwise provided in the Agreement or in this Rule, all decisions of the Commission shall be taken by a majority of votes cast unless, by consensus, another method of arriving at a decision is reached.
2. Except as otherwise provided in Rule VIII.5 below, voting in plenary sessions of the Commission shall be by a show of hands, except that a vote by roll call shall be taken if a special majority is required by the Agreement or these Rule, or if a request for a vote by roll call is made by any delegation.
3. A vote by roll call shall be conducted by calling upon delegations in English alphabetical order.
4. The record of any roll call vote shall show the votes cast by each delegate and any abstention.
5. Voting on matters relating to individuals, except the election of the Chairperson and Vice-Chairpersons of the Commission and its committees, shall be by secret ballot.
6. When, on the first ballot, no nominee for an office obtains a majority of the votes cast, there shall be taken a second ballot confined to the two candidates obtaining the largest number of votes. If, on the second ballot, the votes are equally divided, the Chairperson shall decide between the candidates by drawing lots.
7. If the Commission is equally divided when a vote is taken on a question other than an election, a second vote shall be taken at the next meeting of the current session. If the Commission is then equally divided, the proposal shall be regarded as rejected.
8. Voting arrangements and other related matters not specifically provided for by the Agreement, or by these Rules, shall be governed, *mutatis mutandis*, by Rule XII of the General Rules of the Organization.
9. Observers may, upon invitation of the Chairperson, address the Commission and participate but with neither the right to express their consensus nor to vote.

Rule IX. Committees and other subsidiary bodies, and technical meetings

1. The establishment of Committees and other subsidiary bodies, and the holding of technical meetings shall be subject, whenever required, to the availability of necessary funds in the relevant approved budget. When the related expenses are to be borne by the Organization, the determination of such availability shall be made by the Director-General. Before taking any decision involving expenditure in connection with the establishment of subsidiary bodies, the Commission shall have before it a report from the Director-General on the administrative and financial implications thereof.
2. Committees and other subsidiary bodies, and technical meetings, established or held under this Rule, shall be:
 - (a) established or held for the purpose of providing the Commission with independent advice on technical, economical, administrative and legal, and environmental issues under its mandate;
 - (b) open to all Contracting Governments.

Rule X. Budget and finance

1. Any estimates of expenditures to be covered by the budget of the Organization shall be reported by the Secretary to the Commission for information. Such estimates are part of the general budget of the Organization and, without prejudice to the relevant rules of the Organization and the decisions of its Governing Bodies, they constitute the limits within which funds may be committed for purposes approved by the Conference of FAO.

2. Any estimates of expenditures to be covered by the mandatory contributions provided for by Contributing Contracting Governments under Article III of the Agreement, shall be submitted by the Secretary to the session of the Commission for approval by consensus. Once approved, they are forwarded to the Director-General, provided that any budgetary or financial matters relative to the budget of the Commission shall be dealt with in accordance with the Financial Rules of the Commission and the Financial Regulations and procedures of the Organization.

Rule XI. Observers

At the opening of a session of the Commission, the Secretary circulates a list of observers who have requested to be present at the session.

Rule XII. Records and reports

1. At each session, the Commission shall approve a report embodying its decisions, views, recommendations and conclusions. Such other records, for its own use, as the Commission may, on occasion, decide, shall also be maintained.

2. The report of the Commission shall be transmitted after each session, by the Secretary, to the Director-General, and circulated by the Secretary to all Contracting Governments, to other Regional Plant Protection Organizations and to observers that attended the Session, for their information, and, upon request, to other Members and Associate Members of the Organization.

3. Recommendations and decisions of the Commission having policy, programme or financial implications for the Organization shall be brought by the Secretary, through the Director-General, to the attention of the Conference or Council of the Organization for appropriate action.

Rule XIII. Expenses

1. Expenses incurred by representatives of Contracting Governments and any delegation, when attending sessions of the Commission, as well as the expenses incurred by observers at sessions, shall be borne by their respective government or organization.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XIII.1 above, the expenses of Contracting Governments which are developing countries, especially lesser-developed countries, and countries with economies in transition, invited to attend sessions of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies, may be met by the core administrative budget of the Commission on decisions taken under exceptional circumstances as declared by the Commission.

3. Any financial operations of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies shall be governed by the appropriate provisions of the Financial Rules of the Commission and the Financial Regulations and procedures of the Organization.

Rule XIV. Languages

The languages of the Commission shall be the languages of the Agreement.

Rule XV. Amendments

Amendments to these Rules may be adopted on the motion of any delegation by a two-thirds majority of the Contracting Governments, at any plenary meeting of the Commission, provided an announcement is made at a plenary meeting and copies of the proposal for the amendment have been distributed to delegations not less than twenty-four hours before the meeting at which action is to be taken.

Rule XVI. Application of the General Rules of FAO

The provisions of the General Rules of the Organization shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to all matters not specifically dealt with under the present Rules.

Rule XVIII. Entry into force

These Rules and any amendments thereto shall come into force upon their approval by the Commission.

PLANT PROTECTION AGREEMENT FOR THE ASIA AND PACIFIC REGION

Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission financial rules

Rule I. Definitions

For the purpose of these Rules, the following definitions apply:

- (a) **Agreement:** the Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific region approved by the Council at its twenty-third session (November 1955), subsequently amended.
- (b) **Commission:** the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission established in pursuance of Article II of the Agreement.
- (c) **Contracting Government:** a party to the Agreement.
- (d) **Contributing Contracting Government:** a Contracting Government that has accepted the amendments to Articles II, III, IV and XIV to the Agreement introducing mandatory contributions and entering into force on 4 September 2009.
- (e) **Delegate:** the representative of a Contracting Government as specified in Article II of the Agreement.
- (f) **Delegation:** the delegate and his alternate(s), experts and advisers.
- (g) **Director-General:** the Director-General of the Organization.
- (h) **Mandatory contribution:** the contribution paid by a Contributing Contracting Government as per Articles II, III, IV and XIV to the Agreement in its amended version entering into force on 4 September 2009.
- (i) **Organization:** the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- (j) **Secretary:** the Secretary of the Commission.

Rule II. Applicability

1. These Rules shall govern the financial administration of the Commission established in pursuance of Article II of the Agreement.
2. For all matters not covered by these Rules, the Financial Regulations and procedures of the Organizations shall apply.

Rules III. Financial period

The financial period shall be two calendar years.

Rules IV. Budget

1. The budget comprises the mandatory contributions referred to in Rule I.(h) above and any voluntary contribution; it may also reflect, in an appropriate manner, expenditure borne by the Organization.
2. The estimates for mandatory contributions:
 - (a) are prepared by the Secretary who circulates them to the Contributing Contracting Governments, as well as to Contracting Governments, not less than forty-five days before each regular session;
 - (b) cover income and expenditure for the financial period to which it relates and is presented in United States dollars;

- (c) are presented by lines of expenditure and divided into sub-lines of expenditure as appropriate, which shall reflect the programme of work covered by such estimates, including such other information, annexes or explanatory statements as may be requested by the Commission.
3. At the end of each financial period, the Secretary reports to the Commission on:
 - (a) the amount of the voluntary contributions and other forms of assistance received during the past financial period from organizations, individuals and other sources;
 - (b) the activities funded by such voluntary contributions.
 4. The budget referred to in Rule IV.1 above shall provide for:
 - (a) administrative expenditure, including an amount to cover the Organization's costs equal to 13 percent of the budget of the Commission;
 - (b) expenditure for activities of the Commission provided that the relevant estimates are presented in a single total only, and that detailed estimates for each particular activity are approved as "supplementary details" of the budget;
 - (c) contingencies for the purposes, and in accordance, with the criteria fixed by the Commission.
 5. At each biennial session, the Commission shall:
 - (a) adopt the estimates for mandatory contributions as well as the related programme of work for the coming biennium;
 - (b) endorse the expenditures made on the basis of the estimates referred to in Rule IV.5(a) above, and the expenditures made for the activities funded by the voluntary contribution referred to in Rule IV.3(b) above.
 6. The budget of the Commission shall be submitted to the Finance Committee of the Organization for its information.
 7. When a Government referred to in Article X of the Agreement, or a Contracting Government, becomes a Contributing Contracting Government during the course of a financial period, any contribution made by such new Contributing Contracting Government is considered as a voluntary contribution as per Rule IV.3(a) above.
 8. Expenditures shall consist of such expenses as are incurred in the implementation of the programme of work, including necessary project staff costs and the administrative and operational support costs incurred by the Organization and charged strictly in accordance with the policy on support cost reimbursement approved in conformity with the Financial Regulations of the Organization.

Rule V. Appropriations

1. After the estimates have been adopted as per Rule IV.5(a), the appropriations therein shall constitute the authorization for the Secretary to incur obligations and make payments for the purposes for which the appropriations were adopted and up to the amounts so adopted.
2. In cases of emergency, the Secretary is authorized to accept additional contributions from a Contributing Contracting Government or a Contracting Governments or grants from other sources, and incur expenditure against them for emergency actions for which such contributions or grants were specifically provided. Such contributions, grants and expenditure related thereto shall be administrated in accordance with the Financial Regulations of the Organization and shall be reported in detail to the next session of the Commission.
3. Any appropriation not utilized at the closure of the biennial budget shall be cancelled or, where an obligation remains a valid charge, transferred against current appropriations.
4. Any balance of contributions exceeding expenditure at the closure of the biennial budget shall be integrated into the budget of the following biennial period.
5. Transfers between lines of expenditure may be effected by the Secretary who shall report accordingly to the Commission.

Rule VI. Provision of funds

1. The appropriations of the part of the budget constituted by mandatory contributions shall be financed by contributions from Contributing Contracting Governments determined and payable in accordance with Article III of the Agreement. Pending receipt of annual contributions, the Secretary is authorized to finance budgeted expenditure from the uncommitted balance of the biennial budget, as mentioned in Rule V.3 above.
2. Before the beginning of each calendar year the Secretary shall inform the Contributing Contracting Governments of their obligations in respect of mandatory contributions.
3. Mandatory contributions shall be due and payable in full preferably within 30 days of the receipt of the communication of the Secretary referred to in Rule VI.2 above, or as of the first day of the calendar year to which they relate, whichever is later. As of 1 January of the following calendar year, the unpaid balance of such contributions shall be considered to be one year in arrears.
4. Any contributions to the biennial budget shall be assessed in United States dollars and shall be calculated in accordance with the pertinent scale of contributions adopted by the Commission and annexed to these Rules and forming an integral part thereof. The contributions shall be paid in United States dollars unless otherwise determined by the Commission.

Rule VII. Funds

All contributions, donations and other forms of assistance received shall be placed in one or more Trust Funds administered by the Director-General in conformity with the Financial Regulations of the Organization.

Rule VIII. Accounts

1. With respect to the Trust Funds referred to in Rule VII above, the Organization shall maintain the following accounts:
 - (a) a general account to which shall be credited receipts of all mandatory contributions paid under Article III of the Agreement and from which shall be met all expenditure chargeable against the sums allocated to the biennial budget;
 - (b) such additional accounts as may be necessary to which shall be credited the voluntary contributions and from which shall be met all expenditure related thereto.
2. Financial reports on the income and expenditure of each such account shall be prepared and submitted to the Commission and the Contracting Governments for such period and at such frequency as determined by the Commission.

Rules IX. Amendments

Amendments to these Rules may be adopted on the motion of any delegation by a two-thirds majority of the Contracting Governments, at any plenary meeting of the Commission, provided an announcement is made at a plenary meeting and copies of the proposal for the amendment have been distributed to delegations not less than twenty-four hours before the meeting at which action is to be taken.

Rule X. Application of the general rules of FAO

The provisions of the General Rules of the Organization shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to all matters not specifically dealt with under the present Rules.

Rule XI. Entry into force

These Rules and any amendments thereto shall come into force upon their approval by the Commission.

Annex

SCALE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

The scale of contribution is based on percentage of contributions to UN regular budget. It is subject to change at biennium basis in line with UN scale of assessment.

Scale of contributions (2010-2011) – APPPC

No.	APPPC member countries endorsing mandatory contributions	Percentage contributions to UN regular budget for 2007-2009 based on UN scale of assessments ¹	Percentage contribution of APPPC's endorsing countries based on UN scale of assessment	Adjusted % contributions based on UN's 22% maximum assessment rate and LDC ceiling criteria (0.010%)
1.	China ²	2.667	33.832	22.000
2.	Republic of Korea ²	2.173	27.566	22.000
3.	Australia ²	1.787	22.669	22.000
4.	India	0.450	5.708	12.288
5.	New Zealand	0.256	3.247	6.991
6.	Malaysia	0.190	2.410	5.188
7.	Indonesia	0.161	2.042	4.396
8.	Philippines	0.078	0.989	2.130
9.	Pakistan	0.059	0.748	1.611
10.	Viet Nam	0.024	0.304	0.655
11.	Sri Lanka	0.016	0.203	0.437
12.	DPR Korea	0.007	0.089	0.191
13.	Fiji	0.003	0.038	0.082
		7.871		99.970
14.	Bangladesh ³	0.010	0.127	0.010
15.	Cambodia ³	0.001	0.013	0.010
16.	Lao PDR ³	0.001	0.013	0.010
	Total	7.883	100.000	100.000

Notes:

- ¹ The rates derive directly from the United Nations Scale of Assessments established for 2007-2009 for 192 member States. Reference is made to General Assembly's Resolution No. 6/137 on scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations, which was distributed on 13 February 2007. The total rates form the basis for calculating the percentage contributions of APPPC's endorsing countries, the total of which adds up to a full 100 percent.
- ² The UN scale of assessment is subject to a maximum assessment rate of 22 percent, as set out in the UN General Assembly's resolution 55/5 B of 23 December 2000 (Reference: Item 1(h) on Page 2).
- ³ The percentage share of contributions by each of the three least developed countries (LDCs) including, on September 2009, Bangladesh, Cambodia and Lao PDR does not exceed 0.010 percent. Based on the criteria of the UN scale of assessment, the maximum assessment rate for the least developed countries (LDC ceiling) is 0.010 percent, as set out in the UN General Assembly's resolution 55/5 B of 23 December 2000 (Reference: Item 1(g) on Page 2).

The above share of contributions is based upon the list of Least Developed Countries prepared by UN Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (UN-OHRLIS) which was established by the UN General Assembly in 2001.

APPPC RSPM

**Guidelines for Protection against South American
Leaf Blight of Rubber**

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	67
Scope	67
References	67
Definitions and abbreviations	67
Outline of requirements	68
Background	69
Purpose	69
REQUIREMENTS	69
1. The prevention of the introduction of SALB	69
1.1 Import requirements	70
1.1.1 Host material (<i>Hevea spp.</i>) as identified in the SALB PRA	70
1.1.2 Non-host material (SALB endemic countries)	71
1.1.3 Risk management methods	71
1.2 Points of entry inspection systems	71
1.3 Laboratory diagnostic system	72
1.4 SALB surveillance systems	72
2. Eradication or control programmes	72
3. Training programmes	73
3.1 Inspection, diagnostic and disinfection procedures	73
3.2 Surveillance programmes	73
3.3 Eradication and control measures	73
3.4 Management of programmes	73
4. Minimum requirements for personnel and facilities	74
5. National and regional coordination and cooperation	74
5.1 National	74
5.2 Regional	74
APPENDICES	
Appendix 1 Summary of the assessments of introduction, spread and consequences to rubber growing countries	75
Appendix 2 SALB Endemic Countries	76
Appendix 3 Risk management methods for SALB	77
Appendix 4 SALB surveillance system	81

GUIDELINES FOR PROTECTION AGAINST SOUTH AMERICAN LEAF BLIGHT OF RUBBER

INTRODUCTION

Scope

This standard provides guidelines for members of the APPPC, particularly rubber growing countries, to assist them to improve or develop their phytosanitary measures, including prevention, eradication and control, against South American leaf blight of rubber (SALB). It covers all the areas of plant health dealing with the protection of member countries rubber industries from SALB.

References

- A visit to Brazil to study spore viability, dispersal contamination and post harvest of fruits*, FAO TCP/RAS/3002, 61 pp. 2006. Chee, K.H.
- Evaluation of fungicides for control of South American leaf blight of Hevea brasiliensis*, Annual Applied Biology, 84, 147-152. 1978. Chee, K.H.
- Glossary of phytosanitary terms*, 2007. ISPM No. 5, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*, 2004. ISMP No. 20, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for inspection*, 2005. ISPM No. 23, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for surveillance*, 1998. ISPM No. 6, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for pest risk analysis*, 1995. ISPM No. 2, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*, 1998. ISPM No. 9, FAO, Rome.
- Holiday, P. (1970) South American Leaf Blight (*Microcyclus ulei*) of *Hevea brasiliensis*. Phytopathological Papers No. 12, Commonwealth Mycological Institute, England 31 pp.
- International Plant Protection Convention*, 1997. FAO, Rome.
- Pest risk for quarantine pest including analysis of environment risk and living modified organisms*, 2004. ISPM No. 11, FAO, Rome.
- Pest Risk Analysis for South American leaf blight (SALB) of rubber (Hevea)*, 2007. Report of the Twenty-fifth Session of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission, RAP Publication 2007/27, Bangkok.
- Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific Region*, 1990, FAO, Rome.
- Santos, A.F. Dos; Pereira, J.C.R. Avaliação de fungicidas sistêmicos e protetores, e suas, misturas no controle de *Microcyclus ulei*. Agrotrópica, v. 16, n. 3, p. 141-147, 1986.
- Training requirements for plant quarantine inspectors*, 2004. APPPC RSPM No. 2, RAP Publication 2004/24, FAO, Bangkok.

Definitions and abbreviations

Except where noted, the definitions are from ISPM No. 5, *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*.

Control (of a pest)	Suppression, containment or eradication of a pest population [FAO, 1995]
devitalization	A procedure rendering plants or plant products incapable of germination, growth or further reproduction [ICPM, 2001]
eradication	Application of phytosanitary measures to eliminate a pest from an area [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly eradicate]

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 [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; formerly inspect]
intermediate quarantine	Quarantine in a country other than the country of origin or destination [CEPM, 1996]
pathway	Any means that allows the entry or spread of a pest [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]
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 [FAO, 1995]
Pest Risk Analysis	The process of evaluating biological or other scientific and economic evidence to determine whether an organism is a pest, whether it should be regulated, and the strength of any phytosanitary measures to be taken against it [FAO, 1995; revised IPPC, 1997; ISPM No. 2, 2007]
phytosanitary import requirements	Specific phytosanitary measures established by an importing country concerning consignments moving into that country [ICPM, 2005]
phytosanitary procedure	Any official method for implementing phytosanitary measures including the performance of inspections, tests, surveillance or treatments in connection with regulated pests [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999; ICPM, 2001; ICPM, 2005]
point of entry	Airport, seaport or land border point officially designated for the importation of consignments, and/or entrance of passengers [FAO, 1995]
surveillance	An official process which collects and records data on pest occurrence or absence by survey, monitoring or other procedures [CEPM, 1996]
treatment	Official procedure for the killing, inactivation or removal of pests, or for rendering pests infertile or for devitalization [FAO, 1990, revised FAO, 1995; ISPM No. 15, 2002; ISPM No. 18, 2003; ICPM, 2005]

Outline of requirements

Guidelines for the protection of APPPC rubber growing countries against SALB, based on the 2007 *Pest risk analysis for South American leaf blight (SALB) of rubber (Hevea)*, are proposed by considering five major areas:

- the prevention of the introduction of SALB into Asia and Pacific region using import requirements, and systems for points of entry inspections, laboratory diagnostics, and surveillance;
- the establishment of eradication or control programmes in case of entry of SALB;
- the development of training programmes on inspection and diagnostic methods, surveillance, eradication and control programmes;
- the minimum resources, in terms of for personnel and facilities, for protection against SALB;
- the establishment of coordination and cooperation activities for SALB programmes.

Systems for preventing the introduction of SALB include the establishment of import requirements for host material (including budded stumps and bud wood, seeds, *in vitro* plants and foliage) and non-host material (inanimate goods or non-host organic material, travellers from SALB endemic countries and other items). Risk management can include measures such as inspection for freedom from infection; surface sterilization and post-entry quarantine for plants for planting; seed treatment for seeds; and removal, destruction or heat treatment for contamination of non-viable host material. The operational structures supporting the prevention of the introduction of SALB include points of entry inspection systems, a laboratory diagnostic system and SALB surveillance systems.

Rubber growing countries should also, within their SALB protection programme, develop and establish contingency plans for eradication or control programmes in case the disease is found in a country. Training programmes for inspection, diagnostic and disinfection procedures, surveillance, eradication and control measures, and staff management need to be developed. A minimum resource level of personnel and facilities should be established for SALB protection programmes.

In managing a national SALB protection programme, NPPOs should ensure that a centralized committee is set up to coordinate activities and that appropriate links are made with other related bodies to exchange information. For a regional coordination programme, the commission may consider establishing an SALB cooperation committee, the activities of which could be supported by all member countries.

BACKGROUND

The South American leaf blight (SALB) is caused by the fungus *Microcyclus ulei* (P. Henn) v. Arx and is the most destructive disease of rubber. It has been a major constraint in the production of rubber in South America. The disease could also cause great economic damage to the rubber growing countries of Asia and the Pacific region if it were to be introduced into the area. This was recognized by countries of the region when establishing the Plant Protection Agreement for the Asia and Pacific region (the Agreement) in 1956, with the promulgation of Article IV and Appendix B to the Agreement which dealt specifically with SALB. This obliged members to prohibit the import of: plants or seed of the genus *Hevea* from outside the region; plant material of genus *Hevea* not capable of further growth or propagation (such as fresh or dried herbarium specimens); and any plants of other than genus *Hevea* from SALB endemic areas into their countries unless certain stringent phytosanitary import requirements were met.

When revising the Agreement in 1999 to bring it in line with the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, the 1956 provisions relating to SALB were found to be inconsistent. APPPC decided that a pest risk analysis (PRA) on SALB should be developed by APPPC member countries.

The PRA for SALB was completed and accepted by the 25th session of the APPPC in August 2007 (subsequently referred to as the SALB PRA). The PRA is the guideline used to develop this standard on SALB.

Purpose

This standard provides guidelines for APPPC member countries that grow rubber to prevent the entry, spread and establishment of SALB, taking into account the SALB PRA.

The guidelines cover five major areas:

- the prevention of the introduction of SALB into Asia and Pacific region using import requirements, and systems for points of entry inspections, laboratory diagnostics, and surveillance;
- the establishment of eradication or control programmes in case of entry of SALB;
- the development of training programmes on inspection and diagnostic methods, surveillance, eradication and control programmes;
- the minimum resources, in terms of for personnel and facilities, for protection against SALB;
- the establishment of coordination and cooperation activities for SALB programmes.

REQUIREMENTS

1. The prevention of the introduction of SALB

The prevention of the introduction of SALB into rubber growing countries can be achieved by an integrated programme including:

- strict phytosanitary import requirements (enabled through legislation) that reduce any potential risk from imports to a level acceptable to the importing country
- an inspection system at points of entry that ensures compliance with import requirements
- a laboratory diagnostic system for the identification of the pathogen
- an efficient surveillance system that ensures early detection of the pest.

1.1 Import requirements

Import requirements should be determined based on the SALB PRA which describes the pathways of entry and the relative risks of those pathways taking into account consequences and the appropriate level of protection of the individual country.

The SALB PRA noted the pathways for the entry of the pathogen as:

- Budded stumps and budwood
- foliage (stem and leaf material not for planting)
- flowers, fruit and seeds
- plants *in vitro*
- rubber wood
- travellers
- inanimate goods or non-host organic material (contaminated by spores)
- inanimate goods or non-host organic material contaminated by host plant material

Appendix 1 is a summary of the assessments of introduction, spread and consequences from the SALB PRA.

The NPPO of each rubber growing member country should consider import requirements as follows:

1.1.1 *Host material (Hevea spp.) as identified in the SALB PRA*

As identified in the SALB PRA, planting material of *Hevea* from SALB endemic countries (see Appendix 2) is categorised as high risk. Importing countries should apply measures as necessary. Rubber growing countries should consider limiting the entry of high risk material to designated entry points. Measures are described in the SALB PRA and include the following.

For budded stumps and bud wood*:

- prohibition of imports if an importing country does not have the capacity to apply effective measures to mitigate risk to an appropriate level of protection
- restriction of quantity based on the capacity of the post-entry quarantine (PEQ) station
- restricting the length of each budwood stick to less than 1 metre
- pre-export inspection and treatment
- measures applied on arrival (in an appropriately secure facility)
- restriction of imports to Government Research Institutes only and using PEQ stations
- other PEQ facilities or intermediate quarantine for at least one year and certified free from SALB by an SALB expert.

For seeds:

- restrictions on the quantities of seed imported
- only healthy seeds should be imported
- washing with a surface sterilant and dressing with a fungicide immediately prior to export.

* budded stumps includes seedling stumps

For *in vitro* plants:

- growing the plants aseptically on agar for more than three months followed by appropriate inspection or testing.

For foliage:

- the prohibition of foliage of *Hevea* from SALB countries unless treated to remove the risk.

1.1.2 Non-host material (SALB endemic countries)

Non-host material includes travellers, inanimate goods and non-host organic material.

Travellers from SALB endemic countries

Where a rubber growing country has determined a level of risk associated with travellers from SALB endemic countries, the travellers should be required to make a declaration to the NPPO point of entry inspector if they have visited a SALB endemic country in the last 21 days and have visited a rubber plantation. Special care should be taken with such items such as camping equipment and hiking boots, farm equipment and decorative plant material as these are more likely to contain non-viable host material greater than 1 cm² that may be contaminated with SALB. Measures to remove possible contamination may include cleaning, disinfection or destruction.

Inanimate goods

Cargo such as machinery that has been used in rubber plantations as well as household effects (gardening tools/equipment) in SALB endemic countries may be contaminated with non-viable host material carrying the pathogen. Measures include steam cleaning to remove all organic material which should be destroyed. Machinery should be dismantled if necessary. Where suspect material cannot be removed or the material cannot be destroyed (e.g. herbarium material) the material should be heat treated for a minimum of 30 minutes at 56 °C or a level that achieves the importing countries appropriate level of protection.

Non-host organic material

Other items, such as planting material and foliage, of non-SALB hosts may need to be assessed for possible SALB contamination and phytosanitary procedures and appropriate treatment applied.

1.1.3 Risk management methods

A number of risk management methods from section 4 of the SALB PRA are given in Appendix 3.

1.2 Points of entry inspection systems

When determined necessary, consignments from SALB endemic countries, including traveller's hand-carried items, should be subjected to inspection by NPPO inspectors at points of entry.

Points of entry inspection systems should be such to ensure that consignments and travellers comply with import/entry requirements.

NPPOs should follow the general guidelines provided in ISPM No. 23: *Guidelines for inspection*.

Specific points relating to inspection for risk items concerning SALB include:

- examination of documents associated with consignments to ensure that all permitted planting material has the correct certification
- examination of manifests to identify inanimate goods or non-host organic material that might be contaminated with the spores of the pathogen or host material that need to be inspected
- trained personnel to be stationed at entry points to recognize live and dead plant material of *Hevea*

- inspection of consignments, including used machinery, that have been in the rubber plantations of SALB infected countries
- equipment and chemicals for disinfection and disposing of any suspect material or non compliance consignment should be available to inspectors
- to ensure appropriate security, systems for packing and transporting suspect material to diagnostic laboratories should be available
- phytosanitary action, as noted in ISPM No. 20 *Guidelines for an import a phytosanitary import regulatory system*, section 5.1.6.1), should be taken where non-compliance occurs or SALB is detected.

1.3 Laboratory diagnostic system

Countries should have, or have access to, appropriate laboratory diagnostic tools. This may include the following:

- diagnostic facilities for the identification of suspect fungal isolates. These laboratories should be established at or near the designated entry points where possible.
- the laboratories should follow standard procedures for the diagnosis of the pathogen(s) on specimens.

1.4 SALB surveillance systems

NPPOs in rubber growing countries should establish and maintain national systems for surveillance for SALB – see ISPM No. 6. It is essential that any incursion of the pathogen is detected before it establishes and becomes widespread.

Additional surveillance programmes may be implemented in countries if the disease occurs in neighbouring country or is intercepted at an entry point. Such surveillance systems would be ongoing. Specific surveillance systems are described in Appendix 4.

2. Eradication or control programmes

To be prepared in the event that the disease is found in a country, the NPPOs of APPPC rubber growing countries should develop and establish contingency plans for eradication or control programmes according to ISPM No. 9 *Guidelines for pest eradication programmes*. The plans should include a system for preventing the movement of potentially infected or contaminated materials within and out of infected areas. Such plans could include the following components:

Operational procedures

- undertaking of a delimiting survey of the affected area
- undertaking other surveys as necessary
- documenting records of occurrences
- international notification
- carrying out an eradication feasibility study
- establishing and undertaking the eradication programme or control measures including surveillance, containment, treatment
- disinfection and destruction procedures
- systems for the prevention of the movement of possibly infected or contaminated material within and out of infected areas
- verification of eradication.

Required resources

- a means of identifying the disease in the field plus a diagnostic laboratory support for confirmation of identifications
- identification of appropriate eradication methodologies
- administrative systems including a management structure and documentation procedures
- trained operational staff
- regulations providing authority for procedure implementation (movement prohibitions, setting up check-points, etc.)
- information management system
- communications programme, including media, public awareness
- financial support.

3. Training programmes

NPPOs of rubber growing countries should establish training programmes for the staff on inspection, diagnostic and disinfection procedures; surveillance; eradication and control measures; and management of programmes for SALB. The components of such programmes are listed below:

3.1 Inspection, diagnostic and disinfection procedures

- procedures of inspection
- procedures of clearance
- inspection of document and import requirements
- recognizing the symptoms of SALB and its pathogen
- recognizing host plants and host plant parts
- laboratory diagnostic protocols and procedures for identification of the pathogen
- disinfection or destruction of infected or non-compliant materials
- disinfection procedures for personnel handling diseased material.

3.2 Surveillance programmes

- early detection systems
- identification of symptoms and the pathogen
- surveillance procedures and sampling techniques
- documentation and reporting.

3.3 Eradication and control measures

- knowledge on eradication and control procedures
- safe handling of chemicals and equipment
- use of a geographical information system to map affected areas
- application of fungicides
- eradication programmes (including simulated outbreak exercises).

3.4 Management of programmes

- eradication programme management
- programme documentation and recording
- communication with growers, industry representatives government departments, NGOs and public
- communications/media.

4. Minimum requirements for personnel and facilities

The NPPO of each rubber growing country should have as a minimum resource for protection against SALB:

- designated expert(s) on SALB
- trained inspectors for consignment inspection and for surveillance programmes
- diagnostic capabilities to detect and identify the pathogen
- PEQ facilities
- access to aerial spraying organizations or companies
- disinfection facilities including:
 - dipping tank with sodium hypochlorite
 - hot water jet system for disinfection
 - incinerator
 - UV Chamber
 - access to chemicals and any necessary registration for use

5. National and regional coordination and cooperation

5.1 National

The NPPO of each rubber growing country should coordinate the activities of the SALB programme or, where appropriate, establish a centralized body or committee (if one does not already exist) to do this. The activities of such a body or committee could cover the following areas:

- resource management
- programme documentation, evaluation and improvement procedures
- centralized communication with growers, industry representatives, government departments and NGOs
- establishment and maintenance of a national focal point
- surveillance planning
- public awareness initiatives and programmes.

5.2 Regional

The NPPO or the committee would also establish links with related bodies or committees in other rubber growing countries to exchange information and establish regional programmes where necessary to:

- seek technical assistance
- seek financial assistance
- ensure availability of technical expertise through regular regional and international workshops, training and seminars on SALB
- provide training on SALB
- cooperate with other regional and international organizations that deal with rubber and with the NPPOs of non-rubber growing countries (that could, for example, supply opportunities for intermediate quarantine, undertaking research)
- cooperate with SALB endemic countries in training, research, the safe transfer of rubber plant germplasm including the verification of phytosanitary systems and information exchange.

The Commission may consider the establishment of an SALB Cooperation Committee to oversee and coordinate various regional activities for the prevention of the introduction of SALB into the region. The NPPOs of all member countries should support regional activities for the prevention of the entry of the disease into the area where this is appropriate.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Table 1. Summary of the assessments of introduction, spread and consequences to rubber growing countries (source SALB PRA, 2007 Table 6)

Vector	Probability of entry	Probability of establishment	Probability of spread	Likely impact	Level of risk
Host material (<i>Hevea</i> species)					
Budded stumps or budwood	High	High	High	High	High
Foliage (stem and leaf material not for planting)	Low	High	High	High	Moderate
Flowers, fruit and seeds	Low	High	High	High	Low
Plants <i>in-vitro</i>	Negligible	N/A	N/A	N/A	Negligible
Non-host material					
Inanimate goods or non-host organic material	Negligible	N/A	N/A	N/A	Negligible
Inanimate goods or non-host organic material contaminated by host plant material	Low (if <1 cm ²)	High	High	High	Low (if <1 cm ²)

SALB Endemic countries
(source SALB PRA, 2007 Plate 5)

1. Belize
2. Bolivia
3. Brazil
4. Colombia
5. Costa Rica
6. Dominican Republic
7. Ecuador
8. El Salvador
9. French Guiana
10. Guatemala
11. Guyana
12. Haiti
13. Honduras
14. Mexico
15. Nicaragua
16. Panama
17. Paraguay
18. Peru
19. Surinam
20. Trinidad and Tobago
21. Venezuela

Risk management methods for SALB

(Source SALB PRA, 2007 Section 4)

This is a direct copy of the relevant section of the SALB PRA (with the reference to ISPM No. 5 being updated). The section numbers are changed to fit this appendix. References are to be found in the SALB PRA.

RISK MANAGEMENT

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 (ISPM No. 11 2004). The effectiveness of any risk management measures depends on our perception and understanding of the disease and the risk pathways. Phytosanitary measures drawn up on the basis of science and practicality are essentially easy to implement, have minimal economic impact and are discriminating.

Based on the assessment of risks completed in the previous chapters of this risk analysis, risk commodities have been divided into the following groups.

1. Viable host material:
 - 1.1 Plants for planting: Whole plants and cuttings, and plants in-vitro;
 - 1.2 Seeds, flowers and fruit.
2. Non-viable (inanimate) host material:
 - 2.1 Cargo pathway (including sea freight, airfreight and mail);
 - 2.2 Passenger pathway (including accompanied luggage).

For goods or passengers originating from an area not known to be free of SALB, the following risk management measures may be applied.

1. Management options for viable host material

Viable host material includes any plant parts that are being imported into the region for the purposes of propagation or could be propagated by conventional means.

1.1 Plants for planting

The IPPC definition of plants for planting includes whole plants and cuttings, and plants *in-vitro* (ISPM No. 5 2009). For the purposes of this risk analysis only budded stumps and budwood have been considered for measures as they are the most likely form to be transported between countries for planting.

1.1.1 Budded stumps and budwood

Management of the phytosanitary risks associated with the import of budded stumps and budwood for propagation should start in the country of origin. Efforts should be made to ensure that, as far as is reasonable and possible, budded stumps and budwood exported to the PRA area should be free of SALB. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ): *Postentry Quarantine Manual for State Inspectors* (2006) states that to achieve an appropriate level of assurance from plant inspections, plants should be inspected over two growing seasons. It is therefore considered appropriate that mother plants of budded stumps and budwood should undergo periods pre-export and post entry inspection for signs of SALB before being distributed in the PRA area.

In the case of SALB and the susceptible *Hevea* species, the period of greatest disease expression is at the time of new foliage growth. Therefore budded stumps and budwood should only be harvested from mother plants that have been recently inspected during a period of optimal disease expression and no signs of SALB were detected. To further lessen the likelihood of contamination, harvesting of budded stumps and budwood should only occur when the bark has been hardened (brown in colour) and during the low-disease season (e.g. dry weather). Budded stumps and budwood should be no longer than 1 metre when exported, and the material dipped into a suitable surface sterilant followed by a suitable systemic fungicide. All packaging material should be destroyed on arrival in the PRA area.

During the post-entry quarantine inspection period plants should be maintained in an environment that both stimulates SALB expression and limits the ability of SALB to escape the facility and infect surrounding host plants. No fungicides effective against SALB should therefore be applied to plants during the inspection period (new leaf growth) as fungicides may mask disease expression. SALB containment can be achieved either through the use of high security quarantine facilities or by ensuring no host plants are within 3 km of the boundaries of the facility. To ensure any infected plants are removed from the post-entry quarantine facility as possible, plants should be inspected daily by staff trained to detect signs of SALB infection. Suitably qualified plant pathologists should also inspect the plants every two weeks to verify the daily inspections by facility staff.

If SALB is positively identified in the quarantine facility, all host plants in the facility should be treated with an appropriate fungicide, and another inspection period instigated.

Based on the aforementioned recommendations, the following measures should be applied to budded stumps and budwood before export from the SALB affected country or region, during transport to the PRA area, and on arrival in the PRA area.

Pre-export inspection and treatment

- Mother plants should be inspected by suitably qualified plant pathologist for signs of SALB infection and deemed to be free of SALB infection. Inspections should take place immediately before the harvesting of budded stumps or budwood and during a period considered optimal for disease expression;
- Harvesting of budded stumps and budwood should only occur when the bark has been hardened (brown in colour) and during the low-disease season (e.g. dry weather). Budded stumps and budwood should be no longer than 1 metre when exported;
- Budded stumps and budwood should be packaged for export in a manner that limits the likelihood of infestation during transport;
- Budded stumps and budwood should be dipped in an appropriate surface sterilant and a systemic fungicide effective against *M. ulei*;
- Budded stumps should be free from soil.

Measures on arrival (in an appropriately secure facility)

- Budded stumps and budwood should be dipped in an appropriate surface sterilant and a systemic fungicide effective against *M. ulei*;
- All packaging material should be destroyed or appropriately sterilized, and the budded stumps and budwood repackaged after treatment.

Post-entry quarantine

- Imported budded stumps and budwood should be grown in a suitable post entry quarantine facility for at least one year or after new foliage has been produced at least six times;
- Plants should be inspected for signs of SALB daily by suitable trained facility staff and fortnightly by suitably qualified plant pathologists;

- Should any signs of SALB be detected, plants showing signs should be destroyed and all other *Hevea* plants within the facility should be treated with suitable fungicide (treatment may require six or more applications);
- Prior to release from the facility all plants in the facility should be inspected by a suitable qualified plant pathologist for signs of SALB infection;
- Plants may be released from the post entry quarantine facility only after having all plants in the facility have been free from any signs of SALB for at least one year or after new foliage has been produced at least six times.

Intermediate quarantine

Intermediate quarantine offers a further option to mitigate risk. This system can have some logistical, maintenance and financial problems when used for rubber, but it may operate successfully in some specific circumstances.

1.1.2 Plants in vitro

Plants *in vitro* should not be considered a risk pathway for the entry of *M. ulei* if the cultures are axenic. However, at the moment the practice is not commercially used.

1.2 Seeds and fruit

As the risk from seeds and fruit material relates to surface contamination only, all such products exported from SALB regions should be surface sterilized immediately prior to export.

Flowers and fruits should be washed with a surface sterilant such as 200 ppm of sodium hypochlorite (Chee 2006). Only healthy seeds should be selected for export, washed with water and soaked in formalin (5 percent) for 15 minutes, and then air dried and dressed with thiophanate methyl, benomyl or mancozeb (Chee 1978; Santos and Pereira 1986).

2. Management options for non-viable host material

Non-viable host material is essentially leaves or other parts of a host plant (susceptible *Hevea* species) that are imported either deliberately or as contaminants into the PRA area from countries or areas not known to be free of SALB. These types of host material are not able to be propagated by normal means.

2.1 Cargo pathway

Cargo from SALB infested countries or areas should be screened for goods or shipments that are likely to contain or be contaminated by non-viable host material. A profile list should be established that identifies cargo most at risk of containing non-viable host material.

Cargo such as used machinery (cars, logging equipment, chainsaws, cutters etc.) that may have been used in rubber plantations should be thoroughly steam cleaned of all organic material larger than 1 cm², and dismantled if there are parts that can not be easily cleaned. Household effects should be inspected for gardening equipment that may be contaminated by organic material.

Any organic material that is thought to be from a susceptible *Hevea* species, is larger than 1 cm², and can not be removed from the goods or can not be destroyed (e.g. herbarium material), should be heat treated for a minimum of 30 continuous minutes at 56 °C or greater.

2.2 Passenger pathway

Passengers and accompanied luggage arriving within 21 days from areas not known to be free of SALB should be inspected for both viable and non-viable host material. Special care should be taken with such items as camping equipment and hiking boots, farm equipment, and decorative plant material as these are more likely

to contain or be contaminated by non-viable host material greater than 1 cm². Measures may include cleaning, disinfection or destruction.

3. Residual risk after measures

While the measures above, if strictly and effectively enforced, should be expected to manage the phytosanitary risks posed by SALB to the PRA area, it should still be considered possible that slippage (undetected risk items) may result in the establishment of SALB in the region. Efforts should be made to manage this residual risk by establishing an effective monitoring system that would be expected to detect an establishment event early enough to allow for an effective eradication programme to be completed.

SALB surveillance system

1. Responsibilities of the Survey and Monitoring Officer

- Plan surveys and monitoring programmes
- Produce format and guidelines on survey procedures
- Identify agencies and persons to implement surveys
- Monitor, coordinate and direct all survey
- Report immediately the event of detection of SALB or any other disease and pests not hitherto found
- Assist in the identification of SALB

2. Types of surveillance

There are several types of survey each conducted for different purposes as outlined in ISPM No. 6 *Guidelines for surveillance*. These may include: initial detection surveys, delimiting surveys, monitoring or evaluation surveys and nationwide surveys.

2.1 Detection Survey

The initial detection surveys will be conducted to determine if the disease is present for the first time. A detection survey should include the following components:

2.1.1.1 Areas

Areas that should be inspected include rubber estates, smallholdings and nurseries which are likely to be exposed to:

- travellers and air carriers
- planting materials from SALB endemic areas.

2.1.1.2 Coverage

- points of entry, parcel/post office, tourist routes,
Any rubber trees found within 2 km from the site
- Rubber estate, small holding and rubber research institute
All rubber tree growing areas within a plantation/institute.

2.1.1.3 Sampling procedure

All trees in the nurseries should be inspected. For mature plantings, the numbers of sampling point is one (1) every 5 hectares.

2.1.1.4 Survey frequency

The survey in the nurseries should be carried out monthly during the wet season and fortnightly on mature stands during refoliation irrespective of weather.

2.2 Farmer-based detection survey

For rubber growing areas (small holders or plantation-owned), a detection survey must be farmer-based. The owners of these estates or smallholdings shall be provided with leaflets biennially informing them to be vigilant for SALB and to report immediately to the Survey and Monitoring Officer in the event of any suspected presence of SALB in their respective holdings. This instructional and informative leaflet should be prepared and distributed by the Survey and Monitoring Coordinator for dissemination to all estates and smallholders.

2.3 Delimiting surveys

When an infection of SALB is suspected or detected in an area, a delimiting survey should be conducted immediately to determine the extent of the infection. This involves inspection (as outlined under the Sampling Procedure, Section 2.1.1.3) of all the surrounding fields starting from the centre of the infected area and extending to a radius of 5 km (beyond the affected areas).

2.4 Monitoring/Evaluation surveys

The purpose of the monitoring and evaluation surveys is to monitor the effectiveness of the eradication measures that have been carried out and to establish whether the disease has been contained, eradicated or has spread to other areas surrounding the infested zone. Hence monitoring and evaluation surveys will have to be conducted once the eradication procedures have been initiated. They need to continue until eradication is declared or until it is determined that eradication is not possible. If the incursion is contained, ongoing monitoring surveys will be necessary.

2.5 Nationwide survey

In the case of a detection of SALB, a nationwide survey should be conducted to determine if the disease has spread or an incursion has occurred in other part of the country. The results may initiate emergency measures to be implemented by other countries.

3. Reporting of surveys

After completion of each survey round, the report from each survey should be submitted immediately to the coordinator. Any suspected detection of SALB should be notified to the NPPO immediately.

APPPC RSPM

**Guidance on the Operation of
Land Border Entry Points for Local Trade**

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	85
Scope	85
References	85
Definitions and abbreviations	85
Outline of requirements	86
Background	86
Purpose	86
REQUIREMENTS	86
1. General phytosanitary import requirements for land border entry points	86
2. Specific requirements for land border entry points for local trade	87
2.1 Establishment of land border entry points for local trade	87
2.2 Risk analysis	87
2.3 Phytosanitary measures for local trade	87
2.4 Inspection of local trade	87
2.5 Pest surveillance	88
2.6 Emergency response	88
2.7 Public awareness	88
3. Cooperation	88
3.1 Information exchange	88
3.2 Surveillance	89
3.3 Pest control programmes	89
3.4 Certificate verification	89
3.5 Research programmes	89
3.6 Capacity building	89

GUIDANCE ON THE OPERATION OF LAND BORDER ENTRY POINTS FOR LOCAL TRADE

INTRODUCTION

Scope

This standard on the operation of land border entry points to reduce the risk of pest entry provides guidance on:

- general requirements of land border entry points
- specific requirements of local trade
- bilateral and regional cooperation.

It applies to movement of plants, plant products and other regulated articles through land border entry points of APPPC member countries.

References

- Agreement on application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures*, 1994. World Trade Organization, Geneva
- Guidance for the establishment and application of emergency actions and emergency measures*, 2007. RSPM No. 5, APPPC, Bangkok. RAP PUBLICATION 2007/29
- Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*, 2004. ISPM No. 20. FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for inspection*, 2003. ISPM No. 23, FAO, Rome
- Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*, 2004. ISPM No. 24, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*, 2001. ISPM No. 13, FAO, Rome.
- Guidelines for surveillance*, 1998. ISPM No. 6, FAO, Rome
- Guidelines on lists of regulated pests*, 2003. ISPM No. 19, FAO, Rome
- International Plant Protection Convention*, 1997. FAO, Rome
- Pest reporting*, 2002. ISPM No. 17, FAO, Rome
- Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environment risk and living modified organisms*, 2004. ISPM No. 11, FAO, Rome
- Plan of response to significant and emergent entry-exit pest situation*, 2005. AQSIQ, China

Definitions and abbreviations

Except where noted, the definitions are from ISPM No. 5, *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*.

land border entry point	Entry point on a land border between countries (of port entry point). (New definition)
local trade (across a land border)	Cross-border trade of limited amounts of commodities sold in specified border regions by border residents of two countries on designated sites. (New definition)
port entry point	Entry point within the boundary of a country, such as an airport or seaport. (New definition)

Outline of requirements

This standard provides guidance for plant quarantine at land border entry points for local trade of goods. The use of general phytosanitary import requirements for large consignments arising from long distance trade or local trade that are moved through land border entry points is noted. The specific import risk management measures for local trade may include:

- phytosanitary measures such as listing specific products, limiting the size of consignment, stipulating specific border regions, designating sites for marketing and restricting the traders who can use the system
- entry point inspections
- pest surveillance
- emergency response capability
- public awareness programmes.

The operation of land border entry points is facilitated by bilateral or regional cooperation in information exchange, surveillance, pest control programmes, certificate verification, research programmes and capacity building.

BACKGROUND

Many member countries of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) share long land borders across which many consignments of plants, plant products and other regulated articles pass through land border entry points. Trade across land borders can differ considerably from trade across sea borders. While long-distance trade in large consignments exists and uses the established regulatory systems, a large proportion of cross border trade concerns the local trade of large numbers of small consignments which require specific border region import regulatory systems. Dealing with this trade of small amounts of plant material is the major problem of many land border entry points. The examination of each small consignment would be generally resource intensive and could interfere with local trade. Although local trade has been going on for many years and may pre-date formal controls, the risks are known and recognized. However, this trade is increasing and the associated risks need to be addressed. It is evident that various countries have different procedures and requirements.

The APPPC at its 25th session in 2007 decided that guidance on the operation of land border entry points to deal with local trade was appropriate. This standard provides guidance to harmonize the phytosanitary measures taken by APPPC member countries in land border areas to facilitate local trade.

Purpose

This standard offers guidance for the harmonization of procedures for land border points of entry to deal with the specific problems arising from local trade and encourage cooperation between neighbouring countries. The measures described for the operation of land border entry points should substantially decrease any risk of plant pest entry through local trade.

REQUIREMENTS

1. General phytosanitary import requirements for land border entry points

The general requirements for a land border entry point are essentially the same as those for port entry points and are described fully in ISPM No. 20: *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*.

For the movement of larger consignments of commodities arising from long distance trade or local trade, these general requirements are applicable.

2. Specific requirements for land border entry points for local trade

2.1 Establishment of land border entry points for local trade

The establishment of land border entry points by the NPPO should take into full consideration factors such as geographic conditions, transportation, commodity, trade volume and pest category and status. Plant quarantine services should be located near the border crossing point to facilitate the efficient operation of commodity inspection.

2.2 Risk analysis

Each member country should carry out pest risk analyses as necessary for the entry of plants, plant products and other regulated articles to determine the risk levels according to different types of commodities and to establish import risk management measures. This may be undertaken jointly or analyses shared between the countries that share the land border as a basis for developing measures for local trade.

When considering risk management measures for local trade, measures other than inspection should be considered including restrictions on the area of sale, on traders, on the size of consignments, and on the species and goods that can be traded.

2.3 Phytosanitary measures for local trade

In establishing land border entry points for local trade, the following criteria should be taken into account in preparing measures to supplement low level consignment inspections:

- ***Lists of specific products***
Based on risk analysis, NPPOs should prepare lists of plants, plant products and other regulated articles that can be moved in local trade. These may be supplemented by lists of prohibited plants, plant products and other regulated articles to assist inspectors.
- ***Size of consignments***
To minimize risk, the size of consignments for local trade should not exceed a certain threshold. This threshold should be determined between neighbouring member countries through consultation. In many cases there are existing arrangements concerning the value threshold for items of local trade stipulated by Customs. This could be applied for trade in plants, plant products and other regulated articles.
- ***Specified border region***
Consignments for local trade should be restricted to specified border regions and movement from these regions would be prohibited to reduce the risk of spread of pests. These regions could coincide with similar Customs regions.
- ***Designated sites for marketing***
Consignments for local trade should be traded at designated sites to facilitate surveillance and risk management.
- ***Restriction on traders***
Those who can undertake local trade should be restricted to residents of the specified border region. Where an identification system exists for the population of a specified border region, this may be used to identify residents of the region who may undertake local trade across land borders.

2.4 Inspection of local trade

Where inspection is carried out it should be undertaken at land border entry points. If this is difficult the NPPO should take supplementary measures after import such as surveillance at a designated site for marketing.

Inspection should be based on the identified risks. When the plant health situation is normal (i.e. there is not an outbreak situation), the NPPO should conduct inspections using profiling evaluations based on previous experience and pest risk analysis. When an outbreak or spread occurs, the NPPO of the importing country should undertake the intensive inspection of all consignments associated with the pest or prohibit specific items.

When necessary, an importing country may carry out the inspection of plants, plant products and other regulated articles in the exporting country before export if appropriate bilateral arrangements can be agreed.

2.5 Pest surveillance

NPPOs should carry out general surveillance in the specified border regions and specific surveillance for nominated pests in high risk areas such as market areas near the land border entry point and areas near transport centres (Refer to ISPM No. 6: *Guidelines for surveillance*).

2.6 Emergency response

NPPOs should establish emergency response procedures. The following should be specified (Refer to RSPM No.5 of APPPC: *Guidance for the establishment and application of emergency actions and emergency measures*):

- person in charge
- facilities for controlling the pest
- relevant technical reserves
- chemicals and reagents necessary for controlling the pest
- joint action mechanism with other relevant authorities.

2.7 Public awareness

NPPOs should make publicly available promotional information on the danger of pests, plant quarantine laws and regulations, and penalties for non-compliance at land border entry points.

3. Cooperation

NPPOs of neighbouring countries may cooperate bilaterally or regionally in defining and maintaining the pest status of an area that spans land borders. Cooperation may be by means of:

- harmonization of measures to prevent the introduction and spread of pests with areas of similar pest status that span national borders
- consistent regulation of material to facilitate local trade across land borders
- consistent emergency responses in the case of pest outbreaks.

3.1 Information exchange

NPPOs of neighbouring countries may establish an exchange mechanism to carry out exchange of information including:

- laws and regulations on plant quarantine
- organizational structure
- distribution and occurrence of pests
- pest risk analyses
- non-compliance and emergency measures
- results of surveillance activities.

3.2 Surveillance

When necessary, NPPOs of neighbouring countries may jointly carry out pest surveillance in specified border regions.

3.3 Pest control programmes

NPPOs of neighbouring countries may take joint action for pest control in border areas when quarantine pests of common concern occur.

3.4 Certificate verification

When phytosanitary certificates are used, NPPOs of neighbouring countries should provide each other with information on certificate identification, such as anti-counterfeit features of certificates, and serial numbers of certificates.

3.5 Research programmes

When necessary, NPPOs of neighbouring countries may jointly carry out research programmes on technologies of quarantine, inspection and treatment.

3.6 Capacity building

NPPOs of neighbouring countries may cooperate in capacity building including the provision of facilities, training and technical support.

APPPC STANDING COMMITTEES ACTIVITIES FOR 2010-2011

1. Activities by the Standing Committee on Plant Quarantine

Activities	Cost (US\$)	Facilitator
Pre-CPM meeting	0	Secretariat/NZL
To develop a working group for SALB To set up a few projects for SALB Plan for consultations	60 000	Malaysia
Pest incursion and eradication methodology workshop	50 000	Australia
Implementation of standards	20 000	Republic of Korea
Information management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Information support and exchange ● Continuation of country plant protection profiles ● Databases ● Publications ● Website ● Remuneration for staff 	150 000	Republic of Korea

2. Activities by the Standing Committee on IPM

Activities	Cost (US\$)	Facilitator
Capacity building	Not determined yet	Secretariat
Knowledge sharing on BPH		Republic of Korea
Biological control		China
Pest surveillance and monitoring		India
Pest risk reduction and safety and food safety		Viet Nam
Climate change		Bangladesh
IPM in fruits		Thailand
IPM vegetables		Cambodia
IPM in estate crops		Indonesia
FFS training and FFS TOT		Philippines
Pest management policy and advocacy		Nepal
Workshop on intensification of crop production and IPM (with specific focus on sustainable pest management)		China

3. Activities by the Standing Committee on Pesticide Management

Activity	Objective	Outcome	Cost (US\$)
a) Proposal to place one Pesticides Management Officer in FAO office in Bangkok and/or others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To facilitate the development of pesticides management in Asia and the Pacific To harmonize the regulatory system 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To facilitate and oversee all pesticides related programme in Asia and the Pacific To organize conferences or meetings for pesticides management authorities in Asia and the Pacific 	
b) Establish contacts of Pesticides Regulatory Authorities amongst APPPC members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To facilitate communication amongst members 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To establish a directory of contacts of Regulatory Authorities of APPPC members 	
c) Information exchange on pesticides registration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To facilitate information exchange through the use of APPPC Portal 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Registration Approval Committee Structure Registered pesticides list (botanical and chemicals) List of Banned pesticides (reason for ban) List of pesticides alternatives List of Restricted use pesticides (reason for restriction) Guidelines of registration procedures Guidelines on data requirement procedure Guidelines on labeling Classification of pesticides Pesticides law 	
d) Information exchange on pesticides management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To facilitate information exchange on pesticides management 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> List of accredited laboratory (GLP) List of poison control centres Guidelines on disposal of expired and obsolete Pesticides Information on management and treatment of pesticides poisoning Exchange of information application technology 	
e) Responsible trade on pesticides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To facilitate responsibility amongst sources of pesticides 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Exporting countries to provide information on authentic manufacturers and status of products upon request from importing countries (All products registered in China, ICAMA provides certified copies and detailed information to facilitate registration of products in other countries) 	
f) Risk reduction activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To facilitate risk reduction activities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Member countries continue to have activities to reduce and prohibit the use of highly hazardous pesticides To phase out of highly hazardous pesticides based on the criteria set by FAO (Financial implication for register new compounds and disposal of toxic and obsolete and expired pesticides) 	

Activity	Objective	Outcome	Cost (US\$)
		3. To establish voluntary programme for proper disposal of empty pesticides containers	
g) Implementation and ratification of Rotterdam Convention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve the status of information sharing and international trade 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encourage ratification 2. Timely submission of import response and final regulatory notification 3. Encourage exchange of information 4. Improved data collection on severely hazardous pesticides formulation 5. Regular meetings of DNAs 	

APPPC WORK PROGRAMME FOR THE 2010-2011 BIENNIUM

The programme is structured following the strategic directions as described in the strategic plan.

1. Plant protection measures

1.1 Pre-CPM consultation for APPPC members

A Pre-CPM consultation will provide APPPC member with an opportunity for discussion of CPM agenda items more specifically, including the draft ISPMs which will be presented for adoption by the CPM. This meeting facilitates a better understanding of the specific concerns of participants and allows the development regional views on some issues. This meeting will not involve any financial input from the APPPC.

1.2 SALB working group

The Commission will set up a working group on SALB to develop detailed guidelines to support the APPPC SALB standard. The working group would arrange a workshop to develop and consider harmonized plant import requirements for rubber planting material and other pathways as noted in the PRA, and a workshop concerning inspection, diagnostics and disinfection in SALB endemic countries. The budget for the second workshop would be supplemented by individual participating countries to cover additional expenses (e.g. expenses for travel to workshops in SALB endemic countries). The SALB working group will be led by Malaysia with participation of China, India, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam.

1.3 Pest incursion management

The Commission recognizes this area as extremely important. It is proposed that the subject be considered by means of a workshop. Experts on pest incursion management and pest eradication will be invited. Training material will be developed. It is suggested that a working group be established. This group will be led by Australia with the participation of China, India, Indonesia, Republic of Korea and New Zealand.

Note: A workshop on this subject is proposed in the business plan.

2. Information management programme

The Commission will develop a system for the collection and dissemination of plant protection information within the region including the development of the website of APPPC.

The information management programme could continue with the development and maintenance of plant protection profiles. This could be linked to the questionnaire system proposed for the IPPC implementation review and support system. It will be revised and published every two years.

There is need for enhancement of coordination of funding for plant protection activities in the region as well as promotion of acceptance of revised APPPC Agreement.

The Commission will consider compilation, documentation and presentation of 'Best Practices' of IPM and pesticide risk reduction for member countries. Support, including financial support, could be sought from the regional IPM programme or any other related projects.

This programme requires the appointment of a full/part time project staff or a National Programme officer. The officer will not only promote information exchange among APPPC members but also provide assistance to the Executive Secretary. Such an appointment has been discussed before and is noted in:

- the report of the 13th session which suggests the funds may be used for additional staff.
- the strategic plan adopted at the 25th session.

- the report of the working group meeting on the procedures for finance, Administration and planning for the APPPC (2008) where agreement was noted that some trust funds can be used for a project staff person

3. Capacity development

3.1 Implementation of ISPMs

The need for support for the implementation of ISPMs was noted in the discussions of Commission members. A working group will be established to investigate how the Commission members can assist in the implementation of standards. This working group will select an ISPM or ISPMs and, if appropriate, look at the development of training material. This group will be led by Republic of Korea with participation of Australia, India, Philippines and New Zealand.

3.2 Cooperation with counterparts

The Commission closely cooperates with potential supporters and counterparts for their assistance and financial support for providing technical assistance in improvements of country capacity in implementation of RSPMs, ISPMs, pesticide risk reduction through IPM, the Rotterdam Convention and the international Code of Conduct on the distribution and use of pesticides, etc.

4. International agreements

4.1 Regional workshops

Sponsor(s) will be sought to facilitate the holding of the regional workshop on review of draft ISPMs.

5. Estimated budget for specific activities (2010-2011) in US\$

5.1 Estimated costs for specific activities (2010-2011) supported by the trust fund from *mandatory contribution*

1) SALB working group activities	\$60 000
2) Implementation of ISPMs	\$20 000
3) A workshop on pest incursion management	\$50 000
4) Information management (including staffing cost) biennium	\$150 000
5) Support of sustainable development of IPM	\$20 000
6) Administration 13 percent	\$39 000
Total:	\$339 000
	(\$169 500 per year)

Note: The annual mandatory contribution level by countries during 2010-2011 will be based on the above estimated costs.

Mandatory contributions by APPPC's contributing contracting members (2010-2011)
(Based on the adopted APPPC financial rules, contribution rates, work plan and total amount required)

No.	APPPC member countries endorsing mandatory contributions	Adjusted percentage contributions based on UN's 22% maximum assessment rate and LDC ceiling criteria (0.010%)	Estimated contributions for 2010	Estimated contributions for 2011	Estimated contributions for 2010-2011
1.	China	22.000	37 290	37 290	74.580
2.	Republic of Korea	22.000	37 290	37 290	74.580
3.	Australia	22.000	37 290	37 290	74 580
4.	India	12.288	20 828	20 828	41.657
5.	New Zealand	6.991	11 849	11 849	23 698
6.	Malaysia	5.188	8 794	8 794	17 588
7.	Indonesia	4.396	7 452	7 452	14 904
8.	Philippines	2.130	3 610	3 610	7 221
9.	Pakistan	1.611	2 731	2 731	5 462
10.	Viet Nam	0.655	1 111	1 111	2 222
11.	Sri Lanka	0.437	741	741	1 481
12.	DPR Korea	0.191	324	324	648
13.	Fiji	0.082	139	139	278
		99.970	169 449	169 449	338 898
14.	Bangladesh	0.010	17	17	34
15.	Cambodia	0.010	17	17	34
16.	Lao PDR	0.010	17	17	34
	Total	100.000	169 500	169 500	339 000

5.2 Estimated costs for specific activities (2010-2011) supported by the trust fund from *voluntary contributions* or other sources

1) Regional workshops on draft ISPMs (one per year)	\$50 000
2) Promote acceptance of revised APPPC	\$20 000
3) Training workshop on capacity development in implementation of ISPMs/RSPMs and other international treaties	\$40 000
4) Promotion of IPM and GAP, etc.	\$35 000
5) Commission study and review of the implementation of the Code of Conduct on the distribution and use of pesticides	\$20 000
Total:	\$165 000

Note: This figure is only indicative costs for potential activities listed in the section 5.2, the activities will be depending on availability of voluntary contributions from member countries and other sources.

**PLACE AND DATE OF SESSIONS OF
THE ASIA AND PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION COMMISSION**

First	–	Bangkok, Thailand	3 to 7 December 1956
Second	–	Kandy, Sri Lanka	2 to 7 December 1957
Third	–	New Delhi, India	7 to 12 December 1959
Fourth	–	Manila, Philippines	11 to 19 June 1962
Fifth	–	Canberra, Australia	26 November to 2 December 1964
Sixth	–	Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	27 March to 3 April 1967
Seventh	–	Noumea, New Caledonia	15 to 23 July 1969
Eighth	–	Jakarta, Indonesia	4 to 11 October 1971
Ninth	–	New Delhi, India	2 to 9 November 1973
Tenth	–	Canberra, Australia	9 to 16 February 1976
Eleventh	–	Kathmandu, Nepal	22 to 29 September 1978
Twelfth	–	Chiang Mai, Thailand	27 October to 3 November 1980
Thirteenth	–	Manila, Philippines	18 to 23 April 1983
Fourteenth	–	Jakarta, Indonesia	5 to 10 August 1985
Fifteenth	–	Bangkok, Thailand	27 to 30 October 1987
Sixteenth	–	Suweon, Rep. of Korea	26 to 30 September 1989
Seventeenth	–	Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	2 to 7 October 1991
Eighteenth	–	Beijing, China	23 to 28 August 1993
Nineteenth	–	Los Banos, Philippines	27 November to 1 December 1995
Twentieth	–	Chiang Mai, Thailand	26 to 29 August 1997
Twenty-first	–	Yogyakarta, Indonesia	19 to 23 July 1999
Twenty-second	–	Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam	17 to 21 September 2001
Twenty-third	–	Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia	4 to 8 August 2003
Twenty-fourth	–	Bangkok, Thailand	5 to 9 September 2005
Twenty-fifth	–	Beijing, China	27 to 31 August 2007
Twenty-sixth	–	New Delhi, India	31 August to 4 September 2009

ISBN 978-92-5-106458-0



9 789251 064580

I1301E/1/11.09/300