

Report of the 15th APPPC Regional Workshop for the Review of Draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (IPPC Regional workshop Asia 2014)

15-19 September 2014
Busan, Republic of Korea



Summary

Officials from 18 member countries of the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) participated in this meeting in Busan – the 15th APPPC regional workshop on draft standards and the 9th hosted by the Republic of Korea. Participants were provided with an update on the activities of the IPPC including in particular the progress with the IPPC Implementation programme with the recent Open-ended working group meeting and the continued development of ePhyto awareness and systems with the APPPC regional workshop to be held in Bangkok in October.

The participants considered the three concept standards in the consultation process:
Amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)
International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004)
International movement of seeds (2009-003).

Comments on the amendments to the Glossary concerned some participants proposing the reconsideration of the definitions of seeds and grain with the removal of “in a botanical sense” from the definition and the definition of wood regarding the inclusion or exclusion of “processed wood material”.

The main proposal, among many comments, on the used vehicles, machinery and equipment draft concerned the insertion of a high risk category of machinery that automatically attracted cleaning and treatment if necessary. The PRA process would then be applied to the risk depending on circumstances category.

Many comments were made by participants on the movement of seed draft ISPM. It was suggested that a number of sections be deleted including Annex 1 and Appendix 2. Participants felt that the draft could be taking more note of the industry requirements than those of NPPOs. More languages were suggested to deal with the situations that could arise with the re-export of seed and the need to additional official phytosanitary information. It was recognized that not all NPPOs would be able to supply this assistance to industry.

Regarding phytosanitary treatments, a few comments were made by the participants. The steward of the TPPT noted that the APPPC members might consider accepting a wider range of treatments – particularly those with different efficacy levels and those with limited application (to one pest species or one host).

The meeting briefly considered the draft ISPMs within the SCCP consultation. Some comments were made on the draft on phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly management and on the international movement of wood.

Further items include updates on Phytosanitary technical resources and IPPC training materials, the ePhyto programme, the implementation programme and the sea container draft standard.

In concluding the meeting, participants recognized the contribution of Mr Motoi Sakamura over many years. It was hoped that the meeting for next year would be held in October 2015, in the Republic of Korea.

Report

1. Opening Session

The workshop on review of draft ISPMs was attended by twenty-nine Plant Quarantine officers and experts from 18 countries Australia, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Vietnam.

Welcome address by Republic of Korea

Mr Eung Bon Kim, Director-General of Department of Plant Quarantine, QIA opened the meeting by welcoming the participants to Busan on behalf of the Korean government. Korea has hosted the meeting for 9 years. He was confident that the workshop would provide opportunities to share opinions on the draft standards and to liaise and cooperate over other phytosanitary matters.

Opening address by FAO

Dr Piao welcomed participants to this 15th meeting for examining draft ISPMs. He expressed the sincere thanks of the participants to the Korean government for supporting this workshop which allows members to share their views on the developing standards. It also assists countries to develop their technical expertise on standards. Dr Piao noted that there were four areas to be covered in the meeting. These were the standards, the treatments, the SCCP standards, and lastly IPPC issues. He hoped all members would participate fully.

Dr Piao thanked participants for making the effort to attend the meeting and hoped that they would enjoy their stay in Busan

Local and logistical information

Mr Baek provided some background information. Dr Yim noted that Busan is the largest port in Korea. It also has many small ports including a new port (Newport). The field trip will include the Busan Regional Office which has over 100 inspectors where participants could see the QIA seed inspection procedure followed by a cruise around the port of Busan.

2. Presentation of update

Update IPPC business

Dr Yim provided a short update of IPPC activities. CPM 9 adopted Appendix 1 to ISPM 12, Annex 2 to ISPM 26 (Establishment of PFA for FF) and annex to ISPM 28 (phytosanitary treatments including VHT for and annex to ISPM 27 (Diagnostic protocol for *Tilletia indica*).

Dr Yim described the new implementation programme which is to strengthen the focus of CPM on implementation on the IPPC and ISPMs. It was considered by CPs that much work had be completed on ISPMs and more emphasis needed to be applied to implementation.

CPM 9 approved a pilot programme to support the implementation of ISPM 6. An OEWG on implementation developed a work systems for the programme for the CPM to consider. Dr Yim stressed that the programme requires strong commitment from CPs and that resources will be a problem. This is a very unusual programme for a treaty organization like the IPPC and provides great opportunities for its members.

Dr Yim mentioned the Secretariat enhancement evaluation. A ToR was agreed at CPM 9 and the evaluation will be carried out by the OED of FAO. A three person evaluation team has been appointed. The focus will be on management, organization and efficiency of the Secretariat. The report will be submitted March 2015. Dr Yim noted that the evaluation team has already been working with the Bureau.

The ePhyto system and hub evaluation have progressed. A steering group met in July and a pilot hub is being developed. The APPPC will have a regional meeting in October on this subject. The National Reporting Obligation Group (NROAG) in their recent meeting has

developed a work plan. With Capacity Development, more manuals have been developed as can be seen on the Phyto Resource page. Nominations are being called for the CDC.

Dr Yim then listed all the officials from different countries that were working on behalf of the region in the different IPPC groups and noted the appreciation of their efforts by the countries of the region.

Dr Piao noted the recent surveillance methodology workshop in Malaysia. He hoped that countries were introducing the new technology. With systems approaches, a workshop was held in Bangkok in 2013. Also there has been a workshop with NAPPO on the application of ISPM 15. With ePhyto there will be a workshop in October in Bangkok with at least 20 countries participating. Dr Piao said that participants should recognize that with the workshops on ISPMs 6, 12, 14, and 15, the APPPC has a considerable input into implementation.

Dr Piao noted that one country had made a nomination for the CDC.

3. Adoption of agenda

Dr Yim from the Republic of Korea was elected as Chairperson, Dr Hedley from New Zealand was elected as the rapporteur, Ms. Mei Lai Yap from Singapore was elected as an Assistant to the Rapporteur for using OCS. The agenda was adopted.

4. Review and discussion on draft ISPMs

Amendments to ISPM 5

4.1 *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)*

Dr Hedley introduced this draft with a power point presentation.

Dr Yim encouraged participants to use the OCS and submit their comments.

Some countries did not want to have two definitions of bark and preferred the use of the biological definition.

Members agreed with the revision of additional declaration. Some members have difficulty with the phrase concerning “botanical sense” and want this to be defined.

Grain and seed - Thailand suggested to remove “(in a botanical sense)” as some seeds are fruits. Sweetcorn is not a seed but a fruit. Other members also have difficulty with botanical sense and want this to be defined. Nepal prefers the use of sowing rather than planting. So there is some dissatisfaction with the definition.

Mark – no comment

Visual examination – no comment

Wood – Australia had an issue with the exclusion of processed wood material (PWM) - which is included in the international movement of wood draft ISPM. Australia thinks that PWM is regarded as a wood commodity. The proposed definition of wood as a commodity excludes PWM. Hong Kong China supported the exclusion of PWM. It was suggested to add bamboo products to the list of excluded products. China suggested that PWM should be withdrawn from the international movement of wood. This would lead to PWM being an orphan term but it is noted that the material has low risk. The point was questioned – does industry refer to PWM as wood? No participant knew. A general suggestion could be that PWM be included as wood with bamboo excluded. China’s suggestion of removal of PWM from both the standard and definition was not supported. It was noted that rattan is also not included.

4.2 *International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004)*

This draft was introduced by Dr Hedley with a power point presentation.

Thailand noted that certification could be used with a Conformity Assessment Body provided assurance that items are clean.

A general comment was drafted by China – Clarify the use of 2 terms “seeds and plants as pests” and “plants for planting”. It was suggested to use “plants for planting” instead of “seeds and plants as pests”. It was pointed out that “seeds and plants as pests” is one kind of pest which is included in the term of pest according to the definition of pest in ISPM 5 – any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to plants or plant products (ISPM 5).

Various proposals included the following:

Para 28 : line 2 - remove horticulture as included in agriculture
line 5 - add to pests “or regulated articles”

Para 37 - delete to leave “The following elements may affect the level of pest risk” only.

Para 42 bis(new) - Category A (see Annex 1) are deemed to be high risk regulated articles requiring the application of measures.

It was suggested that Appendix 3 become an Annex 1.

Para 51 - 2.1 remove “and contamination controls” – as all are treatments and deal with the prevention of contamination. Other paras require consequential rephrasing.

Para 70 - suggested that changed to “Facilities and waste disposal requirements” as per para 47.

Para 82 - it was suggested to add “and in consultation with the NPPO of the exporting country where necessary.”

Para 83 - it was suggested to add sentence “In case of large sized used vehicles, machinery and equipment the NPPO of the importing country may conduct shipment inspection at the exporting country before export”. However, this was amended to read as follows and proposed to be added to Para 63 –“When circumstances warrant, consignment clearance may be arranged to take place in the exporting country.”

Para 93 - last sentence deleted ...National operational forces ...unnecessary.

Para 94 -it was suggested to change “seeds and plants as pests” to “plants for planting”. There was some discussion that the military does not plant plants – so this should not be plants for planting.. (Note: seeds are included in the ISPM 5 definition of plants.)

Countries should note this confusion at the beginning of their comments and suggest that the steward amend the draft to indicate the intention of the EWG.

Para 113 - suggested that remove dunnage as is included in WPM. Dr Yim noted that dunnage for machinery can be large and cause problems. Could add (particularly dunnage).

Para 115 - change to “Verification procedures may be implemented”

Para 131 - Appendix 3 – suggested that this becomes Annex 1.

-Suggested to remove horticultural

-Whole table – replace all “such as” with “for example” easier for some countries to understand High risk categories include Agricultural, forestry ..., Earth moving used vehicles..., Use military vehicles, Waste management Therefore the first 4 categories of the table would be defined as high risk.

-Remainder termed as low risk or insignificant risk (the last two) or risk depending on circumstances.

Add “inspection prior to export by importing NPPO” to the measures in the high risk category. For High risk regulated articles, this should be added to the measures section “approved measures including the cleaning measures and prevention of contamination listed in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. Exporters should ensure that such regulated articles have appropriate documentation see section 2.3”.

For risk depending on circumstances regulated articles, this should be added to the measures section “the NPPO of the importing country should undertake a PRA to determine the appropriate measures, if deemed necessary”.

This was discussed at length. It was noted that the original EWG draft had the automatic treatment of high risk articles which was modified by the SC so that all items have to undergo a PRA. The Chair suggested that countries could consider the suggested new format.

4.3 *International movement of seeds (2009-003)*

The power point presentation was introduced by Mr Sakamura. The introduction stated that seeds are a special import in that they can be stored, mixed etc before being sold. Record keeping is very important. The difference between seed-borne and seed-transmitted pests was noted. Weed seeds are termed contaminating pests in this draft.

Para 8 – it was suggested to delete substantial parts -. ...guidance on :inspection, sampling, detection of pests; the likelihood for pest groups to be present in the seed pathway and their potential to establish and spread; and forest tree seeds.

One participant mentioned that this draft seems to be written for the industry not for NPPOs with unnecessary critical comments in para 40. The confusion with restrictive/restricted conditions was noted.

It was suggested that the re-export subject was not sufficiently obvious in the text as it is in the scope. There could be a section on the difficulties of re-export.

A workshop member noted that this draft is for NPPOs to deal with phytosanitary issues – not primarily for seed trade facilitation. Section 2 could be removed.

Para 9 – it was suggested - The standard applies to seeds (as a commodity class), seeds for laboratory testing and destructive analysis and seeds for planting under restrictive conditions. Regulated pests associated with seed which may be seed-borne, seed transmitted and contaminating pest are considered in this standard.

- It was suggested that controlled to replace restrictive. Another suggestion was that quarantine should be usedas the definition covers many situations.

Para 30 at end -....likelihood of introduction and spread. The “processing” in para 30 is IPPC processing. It was not that the others are seed industry seed processing – which refers to cleaning, screening etc.

Para 33 has a processing as well – which is a seed processing

Para 34 – it was proposed to remove this as it is unnecessary.

Para 36 – increase changed to multiplication

Para 37 – delete – as repeats information

Para 38 – processing removed and replace with seed screening, possibly seed treatment or coating, ...or could useseed processing (seed screening, seed treatment or coating)

Also, add reference to country of originother destinations including the country of origin over an extended period...

The redundancy of the background was noted – as with all ISPMs.

Para 40 – delete - unnecessary criticism.

Para 41 – delete – unnecessary opinion.

Para 43 and 44 – it was suggested that these paras are of little use to anyone.

Para 47 – last sentence to agree with other ISPMsPhytosanitary measures that are required as phytosanitary import requirements to be technically justified based on PRA.

It was suggested that there be a new section –

1.1 Seed itself as pest

When seed of a species is to be imported into a country for the first time, an NPPO may undertake a PRA to determine the potential risk of the plant as a pest

Para 52 – delete as no difference from other commodities

Para 53 – suggest to delete. Redundant.

Para 55- it was suggested that this section be re-titled - Pest risk associated with seed use

Para 56 Last sentence – the pest risk associated with seed use should be considered

Para 59 – deleted

Para 60 – suggested to remove last sentence

A re-arrangement of par 58 – 69 was suggested:

Seeds not for planting

1. Seeds used for testing or destructive analysis
2. Seeds used for destructive biochemical analysis

Seeds for planting

1. Planted in controlled conditions and not for release
2. Planted in controlled conditions for release
3. For release

Paras 64 and 67 - It was suggested that quarantine should be used instead of control or restricted conditions.

Para 68 use germplasm instead of genetic resources/genebanks.

Para 75-76 could be deleted as seed certification schemes are not phytosanitary measures.

There was considerable discussion on resistant varieties with some members preferring the use of tolerance levels.

Para 79 - Pest tolerant varieties suggested. The following paragraph proposed:

Pest tolerance may be a useful measure when used in combination with other phytosanitary measures in a systems approach. The use of pest tolerance as a phytosanitary measure must be assessed on a case by case basis.

Para 84 – add bacteriocides to chemical or biological treatments or disinfectants

Para 88 – delete “and prevents tampering”.

Para 90 – change traceability to trace-back

Para 91 – remove phytosanitary before measure (2nd word)

Para 96 – could be divided into two points – field selection and use of resistant varieties

Para 101 – add field before sanitation

Para 104 – prefer “protected environment”

Para 109 – put seed drying as a measure before this.

Para 119 – add viroid

Para 132-amend first sentence to read - Visual examination can be done by inspectors ... Last sentence could be deleted.

Para 135 – add some guidance on how to judge if the seed coating is acceptable or not ie should the coated material be removed. There were some suggestions that this section be removed to the PRA section. It was noted that the coated seed can be washed before inspection or the coating cracked off. The seed can then be incubated.

Or the last clause could be deleted. The para could be moved to 134.

Para 142 – delete – as guidance is available in ISPM 31- rephrase:

Testing of samples from small lots when statistically valid should be required as per ISPM 31:2008. Equivalent means should be explored as per ISPM 24.

Para 150 – remove 2nd sentence

Para 161 – could delete – already addressed in the sampling section. There is too great an emphasis on special procedures for small seed lots.

Para 167 A delegate from Hong Kong noted that this should not be there as they might not have the staff to undertake these inspections.

A new 3rd sentence could say “The system for this assistance may be difficult to arrange; it may be possible to use bilateral arrangements between NPPOs to facilitate the provision of this information.” Some countries did not want this addition. Others wanted to delete the whole paragraph. It was noted that the matter of re-export is an important provision for the seed industry.

The matter of equivalence was discussed and it was regarded as necessary.

Para 178 – One country wanted “ at least 3 years”

Annex 1 – it was suggested that this could be an Appendix. Some members thought this could be deleted altogether. Certainly, section 2 should be deleted. If retained it should be re-written to be accurate and refer to pathogens not just fungi, nematodes etc.

The Chair stressed that the standard is for NPPOs and CPs need to study the draft carefully.

Seed transmission (information exchange – science), re-export certification, testing procedures for small samples, testing protocols (harmonisation of protocols ISPM 27) were the most important items that could be subjects for harmonisation.

Seed commodity can have contaminations – this could be mentioned in the beginning of the standard.

It was suggested that information regarding contaminating plant debris could be added - to section 1.1 - in para 51. Some pests or regulated articles that are not seed borne may be associated with seed crop and subsequently be carried with a seed lot as contaminating pests etc. So soil and plant debris could be added to the list.

Re Annex 2 and forest seed. One participant noted that the movement of forestry seed is essentially similar to that of other seed – and there was no need for essential requirements relating to forest seed.

Regarding Appendix 1 – references – no comments

Regarding Appendix 2 classification of seed treatments – little valuable information – could be deleted. (remove reference to it in the body of the text.)

4.4 Comments on phytosanitary treatments

Dr Rossel discussed the range of treatments. He noted that there will now be opportunity to suggest more treatments from a range of methods by countries.

A number of countries have submitted formal objections to certain treatments. The TPPT has made recommendations re these objections. Dr Rossel noted the great amount of data examined by the TPPT members.

- High temp forced air treatment for *Bactrocera melanotus* and *B. xanthodes* on *Carica papaya*.

Japan noted that the treatment proposes 60% RH but the paper noted in the draft records 90%.

But Dr Rossel noted that there were many more papers studied by the TPPT. The steward might be asked to explain this discrepancy.

- Vapour heat treatment for *Bactrocera dorsalis* on *Carica papaya* var *solo*

Comment was made on the efficacy level noted. The ripeness of the fruit was questioned regarding the effectiveness of the treatment. It was noted that the treatment is for the fruit flies and the stage of fruit development would likely be that when they could be attacked by a fruit fly.

China commented that the fruit pulp would not reach 46 degrees in large scale treatment in the three hours. However, it was stated that although ED 9.86 is not probit 9, this will be satisfactory for some countries – a country may accept it or not. In 1996 eggs were used as the most tolerant stage – but this should be the 2nd stage should be used. Dr Rossel stated that the TPPT had considered all the evidence available.

Japan questioned the identity of the fruit flies from the Philippines and stated that the draft should not refer to *B. dorsalis* it should be the *B. dorsalis* complex.

There were no comments on the following drafts:

Cold treatment for *Ceratitidis capitata* on *Citrus Clementina* var *clemenules*

Cold treatment for *Ceratitidis capitata* on *Citrus sinensis* var. *Navel* and *Valencia-late*

Vapour heat treatment cod *Ceratitidis capitata* on *Mangifera indica*

Irradiation treatment for *Ostrina nubilalis*.

Dr Rossel introduced the matter of approving phytosanitary treatments – stressing the fact that the APPPC should meet the needs of countries in this area. Dr Hedley supported the work of the TPPT and the need for a range of treatments for a great range of products to facilitate trade for all countries. Dr Yim noted the work of Korea in this area and supported the work of the TPPT in producing treatments for the approval of CPM. There is a range of irradiation treatments but we need more heat and cold treatments approved. China noted their support for the work of the TPPT. The limited application of some treatments for one species or even one cultivar was mentioned. The IPPC could try to develop treatments for several pests or for one pest in several products. Dr Yim noted that there was not enough data and experimental evidence to support the use of treatments over multiple products. This has been the concern of the TPPT. Dr Piao suggested that APPPC countries might be able to suggest with treatments that are currently being used.

5. Discussion on IPPC related topics

Update and discussion on substantial concerns commenting period (SCCP) on the draft ISPMs

International movement of growing media in association with plants for planting

This item was introduced by Mr Sakamura. He showed several examples of growing media.

China noted the prohibition of soil by many countries.
There were no other comments from the meeting.

Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (*Tephritidae*) management

After the adoption of this ISPM, it and the host standard will be revised.

The order of the strategies was criticized – with the suggestion that exclusion being the first on the list.

It was suggested that this could be an additional section 2.7 – Evaluation of effectiveness.

The validity of implementation of phytosanitary measures may be evaluated by concerned parties including a site visit, with evaluation and recognition of the effectiveness of measures.

Or this could be dealt with by point 5 – Verification and documentation.

5.1 International movement of wood

This was introduced by Dr Rossel. One country said this is a good introductory document but lacks requirements.

Tables 68 and 75 are much the same and these could be combined and the pest list of the last column could be deleted.

5.2 Amendments to ISPM 5

The amendments were introduced by Dr Hedley. There were no comments by the participants.

6. Discussion on other topics related to the IPPC

Busan is the 5th largest port in the world. The wharves have been moved to the Newport area. Most of the sea containers are from China and the United States. The West Coast is shallow and ports are not common. The central mountains inhibit the development of east coast ports.

6.1 National reporting obligations Advisory group

The Secretariat produced PP display was presented by Dr Rossel. The latest meeting has agreed to a work plan. This will go to the SPG and the CPM. The objectives include the improvement of communication between countries. The role of the Official contact points was discussed. The OCP functions were noted – re the enquiry point. The benefits were noted in particular the development of trust between countries. The challenges regarding functions were described along with how to meet the national reporting obligations. It was stated that the first exercise has been to find out if the CPs are working out at all.

6.2 ePhyto update

This session was presented by Mr Sakamura. The ePhyto Steering group has been established and drawn up a work programme including an analysis on using a hub for the exchange of material. The two key elements are harmonisation and transmission. Harmonisation needs a consistent format and the consistent use of terms. Efficient electronic transmission speeds up information exchange reduces costs and minimizes the opportunity for fraud and assists with the single window concept development. The differences between point to point transmission

and the use of a hub were described. This matter is being discussed with FAO Legal and is technical specification for a hub and the transmission system are being developed. The awareness of IPPC members is being raised through a series of meetings. The hub concept and point to point transmission will be discussed at CPM 10. OIRSA may be the pilot hub but the APPPC will probably offer to do this as well.

6.3 Update on CPM implementation programme

A power point display was presented by Dr Hedley.

6.4 Phytosanitary technical resources or IPPC training materials

Mr. Yuji Kitahara, from the IPPC Secretariat introduced this topic. A list of material was provided – including the Market access manual, Transit manual, Dielectric heating factsheet, PRA awareness raising material. The PRA advocacy material was presented. Existing technical material submitted have been reviewed by CDC and are being posted. Some 217 items of resource material have been posted.

The project for training PCE facilitators was noted. This is being funded by STDF. The use of the resource page was promoted by the speaker. Material in any language can be submitted to the Secretariat for the resource page.

6.5 Update on sea containers draft ISPM

This was presented by Dr Hedley. It was noted that this area is very difficult to deal with.

There needs to be a clear, simple standard for the industry to be able to follow. The matter of a survey of high risk areas or high risk items was noted. This is difficult to deal with because of the random movement of sea containers but it may be possible to outline some general areas of concern that NPPO should take note of.

7. Tentative date and venue for the 2015 consultation on draft ISPMs

This will be held in Korea (Western Province) probably in October 2015.

8. Any other business

There was none.

9. Closing Session

The Chair thanked the members of the group for their participation in particular from Dr Piao for the organization of meeting and contributions from Dr Rossel, Mr Hancocks, Dr Hedley, Mr Sakamura and Dr Ha. Dr Yim thanked Mr Sakamura for all his work over 9 years with the Standards Committee. Dr Piao noted that more countries were prepared for the meeting with comments available. He also thanked the Korean government, Dr Yim, Mr Baek and their staff for all the work preparing for and organizing the meeting. Dr Piao noted how much work the chair had done at the meeting to steer the discussions.

Mr Sakamura said that he was to retire from the government service soon. He noted that he had really enjoyed working with the group. He hoped that he will be able to work with participants on other occasions.

Annex1

Agenda

Monday

08:30-08:55 Registration

09:00-09:20 **Agenda 1: Opening Session:**
- Welcome address by Republic of Korea
- Opening address by FAO
- Local and logistical information

09:20-10:00 **Agenda 2: Presentation of update**
- Update IPPC business
- QIA activity

10:00-10:10 - Group photo

10:10-10:30 Coffee break

10:30-10:40 **Agenda 3: Adoption of agenda**
- Election of Chair
- Election of rapporteur
- Adoption of agenda

10:40-11:40 **Agenda 4: Review and discussion on draft ISPMs**
Review on Draft 1: Draft amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001)

11:40-12:30 Review on Draft2: *International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment* (2006-004)

12:30-14:00 Lunch break

14:00-15:30 Continuation of review on the draft 2

15:30-16:00 Coffee break

16:00-17:30 Continuation of review on the draft 2

Tuesday

08:30-10:30 Review on Draft 3: *International movement of seeds* (2009-003)

10:30-11:00 Coffee break

11:00-12:30 Continuation of review on the draft 3

12:30-14:00 Lunch break

14:00-15:30 Comments on phytosanitary treatments

15:30-16:00 Coffee break

16:00-17:30 Continuation of the comments on phytosanitary treatments
Review all comments made by participants

Wednesday

08:30-10:30 Discussion on IPPC-related topics
- Update and discussion on substantial concerns commenting (SCC) on the draft ISPMs

- International movement of growing media in association with plants for planting
- Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management

10:30-11:00 Coffee break

11:00-12:30 Continuation of the update and discussion on SCC

- International movement of wood
- Amendments to ISPM 5

12:30-14:00 Lunch break

14:00-15:30 Continuation of the update and discussion on SCC

15:30-16:00 Coffee break

16:00-17:30 **Agenda 5: Discussion on other topics related to IPPC**

- National reporting obligations
- *PRA advocacy material*
- ePhyto update
- Update on the CPM Implementation programme
- Phytosanitary technical resources *or/and IPPC training materials*
- Update on sea containers draft ISPM

Thursday

Field visit

Friday

08:30-10:30 Continuation of **Agenda 5: Discussion on other topics related to IPPC**

- National reporting obligations
- *PRA advocacy material*
- ePhyto update
- Update on the CPM Implementation programme
- Update on sea containers draft ISPM
- Phytosanitary technical resources

10:30-11:00 Coffee break

11:00-12:30 Continuation on Agenda5

12:30-14:00 Lunch break

14:00-15:30 **Agenda 6: Tentative date and venue for the 2015 consultation on draft ISPMs**
On-line participant survey (each participant should fill the on-line form) <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/regionalippcworkshop2014>

15:30-16:00 Coffee break

16:00-16:30 **Agenda 7: Any other business**

16:30-16:40 Closing Session

Lis of Participants

AUSTRALIA

1. Dr. Jan Bart Rossel
Director
International Plant Health Programs
Australian Government Department of
Agriculture
7 London Circuit, Canberra City ACT
2601
Tel : +61 408625413
Email : bart.rossel@agriculture.gov.au

2. Bruce Hancocks
7 London Circuit, Canberra City ACT
2601
Tel : +61 419463625
Email :
bruce.hancocks@agriculture.gov.au

BANGLADESH

Mr. Md Mozaffar Ahmed
Deputy Director
Room #, 403, rear Building, Plant
Protection Wing
DOAE
Khamarbari, Dhaka-1215
Cell : + 88 01712944630
Email : mozaffar1956@gmail.com

CAMBODIA

Mr. Op Pich
Deputy Director
Department of Plant Protection, SPS,
MAFF, Kingdom of Cambodia
Email : op.pich@yahoo.com

CHINA

1.Ms.Liu Hui

Agronomist, National Agro-Tech
Extension and Service Centre
Ministry of Agriculture, P. R. China
No. 20 Maizidian Street, Chaoyang
District
Beijing, 100026, China
Tel: 8610- 59194524, 13126816387
Fax: 010-59194526
Email: liu_hui@agri.gov.cn

2.Ms. Wu Xingxia
Deputy Director
Research Centre for international standard
and technical Regulation
AQSIQ, P.R. China
No.18 Xibahe dongli, Chaoyang District
Beijing, China,100088
Tel: 8610-84603962, 13520592618
Fax:010-84603817
Email: wuxx@aqsiq.gov.cn

3. Mr. LAU, Siu-ki, Clive
Senior Agricultural Officer (Regulatory)
Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation
Department
People's Republic of China Hong Kong
Special Administrative Region Government
5/F, Cheung Sha Wan Government Offices
303 Cheung Shan Wan Road
Kowloon, Hong Kong
Tel: + 852 2150 7039
Email: clive_sk_lau@afcd.gov.hk

INDONESIA

1.Mr. Arif Kuriniawan
Control Plant Pest Organisms Export on
Agricultural Quarantine Agency
Email: atarif@yahoo.co.id

2.Mr. Hermawan, MSc.
Head, Sub-Div. of Seed Import
Quarantine
Email: hermawan@deptan.go.id;
hermawan1961@gmail.com

JAPAN

1. Mr. Motoi Sakamura
Director
Kobe Plant Protection Station,
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and
Fisheries (MAFF)
Address: 1-1, Hatobacho, Chuoku, Kobe
6500042, Japan
Tel: +81-78-331-0969
Fax: +81-78-391-1757
Email: sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp

2.Mr. Masahiro Sai
Deputy Director,
Plant Protection Division, Food Safety
and Consumer Affairs Bureau, MAFF
Address: 1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-
ku, Tokyo, Japan
Tel: +81-3-3502-5978
Fax: +81-3-3502-3386
Email: masahiro_sai@nm.maff.go.jp

LAO, PDR

1.Mr. Siriphonh Phithaksoun
Director of Plant Protection Center
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Lane Xang Avenue, Patuxay Square, P.O.
Box 811, Vientiane, Lao, PDR
Tel: +856-21-812164
Email: syriphonh@gmail.com

2.Mr. Maniphone Khenphimsoulivong
Technical staff of PPC
Plant Protection Centre
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Lane Xang Avenue, Patuxay Square, P.O.
Box 811, Vientiane, Lao, PDR
Tel: +856-21-812164
Email : enohpinam@gmail.com

3.Mr. Khanxay Somchanda
Head of Entomology unit, PPC
Plant Protection Center
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Lane Xang Avenue, Patuxay Square, P.O.
Box 811, Vientiane, Lao, PDR
Tel: +856-21-812164
Email : khbombay2004@yahoo.com;
khbombay1976@gmail.com

MALAYSIA

Mrs. Datin Jatih Aliah bibti Timin
Principal Assistant Director
Plant Biosecurity Division, DOA
3rd Floor, Wisma Tani KL, Sultan
Salahuddin Road
KL, 50632,, Malaysia
Tel: 60-3-2697-7210
Fax: 60-3-2697-7205
Email: djatilaliah@gmail.com

MYANMAR

Ms. Myint Yee
Assistant Research Officer
Department of Agricultural Research
Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation
Yangon, Myanmar
Email: yeemyint1@gmail.com

NEPAL

Mr. Achyut Prasad Dhakal
Program Chief
Ministry of Agricultural Development
National Plant Quarantine Program
Hariharbhawan, Lalitpur, Nepal
Tel: 977-1-5553798, 077-1-5524352
Cell: 977-9841574566
Email: achyutprdhakal@yahoo.com

NEW ZEALAND

Dr. John Hedley
Principal International Advisor
International Standards Policy Branch

Ministry for Primary Industries
P.O. Box 2526, Wellington, New Zealand
Tel: 644 894 0428, Mobile: 64298940428,
Fax: 644 894 0742
Email: john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz

PAKISTAN

Dr. Mubarik Ahmed
Plant Protection Advisor & Director
General
Department of Plant Protection
Government of Pakistan
Jinnah Avenue, Malir Halt
Karachi, Pakistan
Tel: +92-21-99248607
Fax: +92-21-99248673
Cell: +92-300-9215732
Email: gqtl_parc@yahoo.com

PHILIPPINES

Mr. Joselito L. Antioquia
Senior Agriculturist, Bureau of Plant
Industry
692 San Andres Street
Malate, Manila, Philippines 1004
Tel: (632) 4040409
Fax: (632) 5243749
Email: banglen2001@yahoo.com

REP. OF KOREA

1. Dr. Kyu-Ock Yim
Senior Researcher
Export Management Division
Dept. of Plant Quarantine /QIA
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural
Affairs
178, Anyang-ro, Manan-gu, Anyang city
Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea
Tel: 82-31-420-7664
Fax: 82-31-420-7605
Email: koyim@korea.kr

2.Mr. Sang-Han Baek
Assistant Director
Export Management Division

Dept. of Plant Quarantine /QIA
MAFRA, Republic of Korea
Tel: 82-31-420-7665
Fax: 82-31-420-7605
Email: ignis@korea.kr

3.Ms. Michi Yea
Assistant Director
Risk Management Division
Dept. of Plant Quarantine /QIA
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and
Rural Affairs
178, Anyang-ro, Manan-gu, Anyang
Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea
Tel: 82-31-420-7661
Fax: 82-31-420-7606
Email: Kittymc@korea.kr

SINGAPORE

1.Ms. Mei Lai Yap
Programme Chief (Plant Health)
Director, Plant Health Laboratory Dept
Animal & Plant Health Centre
No 6 Perahu Road, 718827 Singapore
Tel: (65) 63165142
Fax: (65) 63161090
Email: Yap_Mei_Lai@ava.gov.sg

2.Koh Li Huan
Senior Scientist
Plant Health Laboratory Dept
Animal & Plant Health Centre
No 6 Perahu, Road,718827, Singapore
Email: Koh_li_huan@ava.gov.sg

SRI LANKA

Dr.(Ms.) M.T.M.D.R. Perera
Research Officer
National Plant Quarantine Service
Canada Friendship Mawatha, Katunayake
Sri Lanka
Tel : +94714295433
Email: dayanirenuka2014@yahoo.com

THAILAND

1. Ms. Ing-orn Panyakit
Standards Officer, Senior professional
level
Office of Standard Development
National Bureau of Agricultural
Commodity and Food Standards (ACFS)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel. +662 561 2277 #1452
Fax +662 561 3357
Email: ingorn2011@gmail.com

2. Mr. Prateep Arayakittipong
Standards Officer, Professional Level
Office of Standard Development
National Bureau of Agricultural
ACFS, MOAC
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 561 2277
Fax: 662 561 3357
Email: prateep_ming@hotmail.com;
prateep@acfs.go.th

3. Ms. Somrudee Rudeechoensakun
Standards Officer, Professional Level
Office of Standard Development
National Bureau of Agricultural
ACFS, MOAC
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900, Thailand
Tel: 662 561 2277
Fax: 662 561 3357

Email: dora_am29@hotmail.com

VIETNAM

Dr. Ha Thanh Huong
Standards Committee of IPPC
Deputy-Head of Plant Quarantine
Division
Plant Protection Department
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural
Development
149 Ho Dac Di Street, Dong Da District
Hanoi, Vietnam
Tel: (84-4) 8573 808
Fax: (84-4) 8574 719/5330 043
Email: ppdhuong@yahoo.com;
ppdhuong@gmail.com

FAO

Dr. Piao Yongfan
Senior Plant Protection Officer
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the
Pacific
39 Maliwan Mansion, Pra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200, Thailand
Tel: 66 2 697 4268
Fax: 66 2 697 4445
Email: Yongfan.Piao@fao.org

IPPC SECRETARIAT

Mr. Yuji Kitahara
Capacity Development, IPPC/FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, Italy
Telephone: +39 06 570 54402
Email: yuji.kitahara@fao.org

Comments on the draft ISPMs
(See separated zip files)

Acronyms

IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
APPPC	Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission
PRA	Pest Risk Analysis
ISPM	International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures
TPPT	Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatment
SCCP	Substantial Concerns Commenting Period
CPM	Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
PFA	Pest Free Area
FF	Fruit Fly
EWG	Expert Working Group
OEWG	Open-ended Working Group
OED	FAO Office of Evaluation
CDC	Capacity Development Committee
OCS	On-line comment system
SC	Standard Committee
SPG	Strategic Planning Group
OIRSA	Organismo Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria