



الاتفاقية الدولية  
لوقاية النباتات

国际植物  
保护公约

International Plant  
Protection Convention

Convention internationale  
pour la protection des végétaux

Международная конвенция по  
карантину и защите растений

Convención Internacional  
de Protección Fitosanitaria



**PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANISATION (PPPO)  
REGIONAL WORKSHOP TO REVIEW DRAFT INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS OF  
PHYTOSANITARY STANDARDS (ISPMs)**

**THEME: PLANT HEALTH INNOVATION FOR FOOD SECURITY**

**HYBRID MEETING**

**22- 24 AUGUST 2022**

**TANOA INNTERNATIONAL HOTEL,  
NADI, FIJI**

## Key Speakers

1. **Mr. Peter Thompson** South West Pacific (SWP) Representative to the Commission of Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau.
2. **Ms. Janka Kiss**. International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Rome, Italy
3. **Mr. Hemmant Nittukar**, Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), Regional Office, Apia, Samoa.
4. **Dr. Sophie Peterson**. Department of Agriculture, Canberra, Australia, SC member for South West Pacific (SWP) Region.
5. **Dr. Chris Dale**, Department of Agriculture, Canberra Australia; IC Rep for the South West Pacific.
6. **Dr. Viliami Kami**, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)- Program Leader, Markets for Livelihood.
7. **Dr. Visoni Timote**. Pacific Community (SPC) Land Resources Division (LRD). Suva, Fiji.
8. **Mr. Nilesh Chand**, Biosecurity Authority of Fiji, Suva, Fiji. IC Rep for South West Pacific.
9. **Dr, Disna Gurwardana**, Plant Health and Environment Lab, Auckland, New Zealand.
10. **Ms. Karen Pugh**, New Zealand Ministry of Primary Industries, Wellington, New Zealand.
- 11 **Ms. Jenny Dunn**, Department of Agriculture, Canberra, Australia.
- 12 **Ms. Tara Konarzweski**, Department of Agriculture, Canberra, Australia.

## WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) member countries convened in Nadi, Fiji on the 22-24 August 2022 for the first face to face meeting after the Covid 19 pandemic. The meeting reviewed 2 Annexes to ISPMs, revised 2 ISPMs and reviewed 2 amendments of the same ISPM.

The meeting was officially opened by the Executive Chairman of the Biosecurity Authority of Fiji (BAF) Board of Directors Mr. Naushaad Ali who stressed that while trade is an important vehicle for economic development in the region, ensuring to sustain produce quality and mitigation of phytosanitary issues will continue to be an on-going battle thus requiring more collaborative work to protect the region from the biosecurity risks. PPPO members were reminded that this is an important platform that they could use to raise issues that are important to our people and our region

The meeting opened with messages from the IPPC Secretariat (IPPC), Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and updates of IPPC activities from the Standards Committee (SC), Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC),

The PPPO made comments on the revision and amendment of the following ISPMs:

- i) Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011) Annex to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) Draft Revision of ISPM 8: *Determination of pest status in an area (2009-005)*.
- ii) 2021 and 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)
- iii) Revision of ISPM 18 (Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure) (2014-007)
- iv) Use of specific import authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006)
- v) Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002)

It was noted that the PPPO draft CPM recommendation on the Provision of Safe Aid was not approved to be developed into an ISPM however other avenues and work was discussed to continue to create awareness on this issue which is very relevant for our region.

The PPPO has considered to put forward a proposal on the Movement of Coconut as an annex to the next Call for Topics for Commodity Standard.

Finally, the meeting heard updates from the New Zealand Ministry of Primary Industries (NZMPI) on the Enhancing Pacific Market Access Program (EPMAP) and the Australia Department of Agriculture on the Pacific Export Operational Pathway Training Program (PEP).

The next meeting will be held in the Cook Island while Samoa is the back-up venue.

## **Recommendations for Action:**

The forum raised the following:

1. The PPPO is to nominate a representative to be an observer in the upcoming CPM Bureau meeting that is happening next week. There is funding available for bureau meeting but countries will need to apply for it.
2. Countries are encouraged to register for the e-Phytos solutions so that all countries can be on the same page with electronic exchange of phytosanitary certificates.
3. Awareness and training materials are available with the IC and countries are encouraged to liaise with the IC reps.
4. How can the PPPO or FAO assist in creating awareness and implementation of the Safe Aid?
5. Secretariat is working on the French translation of the Safe Food Aid Factsheet and will circulate it to French speaking members.
6. Countries are encouraged to think about any topics that would be useful to develop as regional standards so we can add to the list when we are ready.
7. PPPO is to consider putting forward the movement of coconut as an Annex to the commodity standard in the next Call for Topics.
8. Members are encouraged to reach out to the South West Pacific members if they have any questions about standard settings.
9. Countries to think about who they might like to nominate from their countries to be in the PPPO Standards Committee when it is formed.
10. Reminder for programs (PHAMA+, PACER+, FAO which are different market access and biosecurity program through NZ and Australia) to communicate and be aware of each other's activities to avoid duplication.
11. Members are encouraged to reach out to any of the IPPC representatives for the South West Pacific region if they have any questions, concerns, interests in getting involved.
12. Members are encouraged to get more involved through submitting input on IPPC documents, nominating to committees and panels.
13. Members are requested to respond to the Secretariat when request for information comes through
14. Samoa is invited to the October e-Phyto workshop to make presentation on their experience on the use of the GENs.

15. Countries who have registered in the GENs are to send in the names of 2 staff per country to participate in the October e-Phyto workshop in Nadi, Fiji.
16. If NPPOs or the PPPO feels that prioritizing of Specification needs to be done very quickly then this needs to be raised with the IC reps to raise the prioritization within the IC.
17. Secretariat is to circulate the email for the call for PCE Facilitators and anyone who wishes to be a PCE facilitator can submit their CV.
18. New members of the PPPO are encouraged to look at the resources available on the IPPC website as guide on PCE activities.
19. Countries are advised that if they wish to conduct PCE, they could work with PPPO Secretariat and engage with donors directly through biosecurity agencies (NZMPI or DAFF) to seek if PCE is part of the support that the country is seeking funding for.
20. Countries are also reminded that there are other evaluation tools independent of PCE that is part of donor programs that can be used (eg: NZMPI EPMAP).
21. PPPO has to agree to put in place a system where countries are responsible and be empowered to manage their phytosanitary certification evaluation when funding for PCE is difficult to obtain.
22. Countries are encouraged to provide reports on the NRO as this is the obligation of all contracting parties and it is foundational for trade and work on Pest Outbreak Alert Response System(POARS).
23. Countries are to note that Australia has provided a PPPO neutral, word version of the Pest Reporting Template which they can use to create their reports. They can then cut and paste whenever they go online.
24. PPPO Secretariat is able to assist those countries who have forgotten or lost their IPPC passwords.
25. Countries are reminded that PPPO have direct access to the IPP and if they wish to upload or update any information, they can do so through the PPPO.
26. PPPO members are reminded that the Call for Information on the commodity standard for mango will close by mid-September and this a good opportunity for the region to put up any issues on mango that is relevant to the region.
27. Member countries (Tuvalu and New Caledonia) have requested NZMPI(PHEL) to be included in the Diagnostic training program. Decision on this will be reverted to the countries through the PPPO.
28. Fiji is requested to maintain the link established during a regional meeting organized by the Red Cross Society in order to create the awareness on the Provision of Safe Aid proposal.

## **Presentations:**

All IPPC presentations are available at the link below:

1. All presentations are available in English and French and are posted here: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/regional-ippc-workshops/2022-ippc-regional-workshop/>
  2. All draft ISPMs for consultation are posted here: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispm/>
- 
1. All the available presentations from **Agenda 7.9 Topics of Interest in the Region** are available at the link below:

## Table of Contents

<b>Agenda 1: Official Opening of Meeting</b> .....	9
<b>Introduction</b> .....	9
<b>IPPC Secretariat- Mr. Osama.L.Lissy (IPPC Secreatriat- Video Message)</b> .....	9
<b>Regional Office/FAOR- Mr. Xiangjun Yao- FAO Sub-Regional Coordinator for the Pacific (delivered by Mr. Hemant Nitturkar)</b> .....	9
<b>The Pacific Community (SPC)- Program Leader, Markets for Livelihood Dr.Viliami Kami-</b> .....	10
<b>Pacific Plant Protection Organization(PPPO)- Mr. Nacanieli Waqa, PPPO Vice Chairman.</b> .....	10
<b>Official Opening- Mr. Naushad Ali- Executive Board Chairman for Biosecurity Authority of Fiji</b> .....	11
<b>Agenda 2: Meeting Arrangements</b> .....	11
2.1 Election of Rapporteur.....	11
2.2 Adoption of the Agenda .....	11
<b>Agenda 3: Administrative Matters</b> .....	11
- Participants List .....	11
- Introduction to the purpose of the workshop and expected outcome.....	11
- Facilitation of the workshop, hybrid engagements arrangements and sub-regional standards review and endorsement process.....	12
<b>Agenda 4: Updates on Governance and Strategic Issues</b> .....	12
4.1 Governance and Strategy (CPM Bureau)- Mr. Peter Thompson.....	12
4.2 Update from the Standards Committee (SC)-Dr. Sophie Peterson .....	12
4.3 Update from the Implementation Committee(IC) (including guides and training material.)-Dr. Chris Dale.....	13
<b>Agenda 5: Session 1</b> .....	14
Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations (this will involve presentations, sub-regional group discussions and questions from workshop's participants) .....	14
5.1 Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011) Annex to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae)).....	15
- Presentation and introduction of standard- Dr. Sophie Peterson. ....	15
• Facilitate review and discussions .....	15
Annex 1: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies .....	15
5.2 2021 and 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on phytosanitary terms) (1994-001) .....	18
• Presentation and introduction of standard .....	18
Facilitate review and discussions .....	19
5.3 Revision of ISPM 18 (Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure) (2014-007) .....	20
- Presentation and introduction of standard .....	20
- Facilitate review and discussions.....	21
5.4 Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002) .....	23
- Presentation and introduction of standard .....	23
- Facilitate review and discussions .....	23
5.5 Use of specific import authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006) .....	25
- Presentation and introduction of standard - .....	25
- Facilitate review and discussions .....	25

**5.6 Phytosanitary treatments and diagnostic protocols- information for community.**  
**26**

<b>Agenda 6:</b>	<b>27</b>
Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs	27
This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants	27
6.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities- Mr.. Hermant Nitturkar	27
6.2 RPPO activities- Executive Secretary PPPPO- Dr.Visoni Timote.	29
Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session)	31
This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants	31
7.1 Plant Health Innovation for Food Security: strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems and e-Commerce-Dr Chris Dale	31
7.2 ePhyto Solutions- Mr. Ilaisa Dakaica	32
7.3 Draft Specifications for new Guides and Training Materials- Mr. Nilesh Chand	34
7.4 Benefits of conducting Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations(PCE) and latest developments- Dr. Chris Dale	36
7.5 National Reporting Obligations- Mr. Nilesh Chand, IC Rep.	38
7.6 Emerging pests and Pest Outbreak and Alert Response System (Cases of FAW and Fusarium TR4)- Dr. Chris Dale	39
7.7 IPPC Commodity Standards: the start and some perspectives-Ms Janka Kiss	41
7.8 The IPPC Observatory- Mr. Nilesh Chand	42
7.9 Topics of interest for the region	44
7.9.1 Biosecurity and market access enhancement of the pacific partnership program (NZ)- Dr. Disna Gunawardana	44
7.9.2 Enhanced Pacific Market Access Partnership (EPMAP)- Ms. Karen Pugh	45
7.9.3 Presentation on PEP Training Program and PLD from Australia- Ms. Jenny Dunn and Ms. Tara Konarzewski	47
7.9.4 Pest List Database- Dr. Visoni Timote	48
7.9.5 Regional Standard setting- Dr. Sophie Peterson	48
7.9.6 Closing Remarks- Mr. Peter Thompson, SWP CPM Rep.	51
7.9.7 Climate change (including seeking advice/input from members for Visoni Timote's presentation to the IPHC on climate change in the region.	51
Agenda 8: Conclusion of the workshop/ Date and Venue of the Next Meeting	52
Agenda 9 Online survey of the workshop	52
Agenda 10: Adoption of the Report (Procedure to be decided)	52



## **Agenda 1: Official Opening of Meeting**

Prayer- PPPO Secretariat

### **Introduction**

#### **IPPC Secretary - Mr. Osama El-Lissy (IPPC Secretariat- Video Message)**

Mr. Lissy welcomed all PPPO members to this regional meeting of the IPPC. He stated that the Covid 19 challenged the way we work in unimaginable ways.

He reiterated the collaboration in new ways over past year has been virtual. This shows the resilience in new ways of working.

He stated that up to 40% plant production is lost to pest and disease each year. The Strategic framework 2020-30 has set the new strategic framework for work in this area going forward. He urged members to use this workshop to share ideas towards protecting plant health.

#### **Regional Office/FAOR- Mr. Xiangjun Yao- FAO Sub-Regional Coordinator for the Pacific (delivered by Mr. Hemant Nitturkar)**

Speaking on behalf of FAO Sub Regional Coordinator for the Pacific, Mr. Xiangjun Yao, Mr. Hermant Nitturkar welcomed the members of the PPPO on behalf of FAO

He outlined that the regional workshop is important for the IPPC Secretariat, as it help participants understand and cross-pollinate perspectives on the phytosanitary realities and challenges faced by our region

This is also an opportunity for agriculture and biosecurity stewards in each of the member countries to provide their comments to shape the ISPMs, and the Secretariat also receives inputs on how to better integrate the ground level issues and realities into the IPPC work plan as well as its implementation.

Outlining the ongoing pest risk in the region, Mr. Nitturkar mentioned that the ever growing international trade and climate change will create new pathways with potential to facilitate introduction, establishment and further spread of pests and diseases in this region. An ongoing example is the spread of the Fall Armyworm (FAW), which is a devastating polyphagous insect that feeds mainly on Maize, but also on more than 80 other crop including wheat, sorghum, sugarcane, vegetable crops and cotton. It started spreading from its native place in the Americas and as recently as 2016, only six African countries reported the pest.

Mr. Nitturkar also outlined the ongoing FAO activities in the region and at the same time confirmed that the emphasis remains on prevention.

## **The Pacific Community (SPC)- Program Leader, Markets for Livelihood Dr. Viliami Kami-.**

On behalf of the Director General, Dr. Stuart Minchin, Deputy Director General Dr. Paula Vivili, the Land Resources Division (LRD) Director Karen Mapusua, as well as the PPPO Secretariat, which is housed in LRD, Dr. Viliami Kami acknowledged the presence and representative of:

- IPPC Secretariat- Mr. Osama El-Lissy, IPPC Secretary
- South West Pacific Representatives to the CPM Bureau, Mr. Peter Thomson
- PPPO Vice Chair, Mr. Nacanieli Waqa, New Zealand Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI)
- Regional Office / FAOR – Ms. Xiangjun Yao, FAO Sub-Regional Coordinator for the Pacific
- Mr. Naushad Ali. Executive Board Chairman for Biosecurity Authority of Fiji

He mentioned that this meeting allows the PPPO to discuss issues of mutual interest and engage Pacific experts who understand Pacific issues, challenges and priorities. This meeting provides an opportunity for members to deliver their respective views and comments as the PPPO review the draft ISPMS in the coming days. The active participation by members will provide a strong regional response for the benefit of member countries. Despite the issues of restriction, this meeting will be in a hybrid format granting all members access. SPC strongly supports the ongoing efforts across multiple sectors to strengthen region.

SPC also acknowledge FAO for their support in making this event possible and the European Union-funded Safe Agricultural Trade Facilitation and Economic Integration in the Pacific (SAFE Pacific) project.

## **Pacific Plant Protection Organization(PPPO)- Mr. Nacanieli Waqa, PPPO Vice Chairman.**

As tradition for the region, the PPPO Vice Chair led the meeting in a one minute of silence to remember PPPO family members who have passed on.

Mr. Waqa acknowledged the presence and representative of the following:

- The Executive Board Chairman for Biosecurity Authority of Fiji, Mr. Naushad Ali;
- Chief Executive Officer, Biosecurity Authority of Fiji, Mr. Surend Pratap and host country representatives
- Distinguished country participants and heads of NPPOs
- Members of the PPPO ExCo
- The IPPC Secretariat and Phytosanitary Consultant for IPPC; Ms. Janka Kiss
- FAO representative
- The Bureau member for the South West Pacific, Mr. Peter Thomson
- Deputy Bureau member representative, Dr. Vivian-Smith Gabrielle
- PPPO Standard Committee representatives; Dr. Sophie Peterson, Dr. Joanne Wilson and Mr. David Tenakanai
- Program Leader, Markets for Livelihoods in SPC, D Viliami Kami

- PPPO Executive Secretary and staff of PPPO;

The Vice Chair stressed that while PPPO acknowledged and respectfully thank SPC for its support to the PPPO and based on the operations now, member countries would deserve more and better. He reiterated that PPPO is not an option but a priority and is requiring better support. It is obvious from PPPO perspective that the PPPO Secretariat is struggling however member countries would like to collaborate closely with SPC as member countries are committed in ensuring that PPPO continues and becomes stronger.

The world has changed and as signatories to the PPPO and IPPC, and as regulatory authorities of each respective country, member representatives have an immense responsibility of ensuring to show commitment during the 3 days workshop this week. The Vice Chairman encouraged members to use this opportunity to ask questions and seek clarifications from the experts.

### **Official Opening- Mr. Naushad Ali- Executive Board Chairman for Biosecurity Authority of Fiji**

The Executive Board Chairman acknowledged the presence of the representatives of the IPPC, FAO, PPPO Bureau Member for South West Pacific and regional participants.

It was stressed that while trade is an important vehicle for economic development in the region, ensuring to sustain produce quality and mitigation of phytosanitary issues will continue to be an on-going battle thus requiring more collaborative work to protect the region from the biosecurity risks.

Global data shows the cost of destruction caused by pests and disease to be in the billions of dollars therefore the ability to prevent invasive exotic pest and diseases from entering our shores is critical to maintaining both our trade and fragile eco-systems of the Pacific and by extension, the livelihood of the people who depend upon them.

The BAF Executive Board Chairman wished all the participants a fruitful meeting.

## **Agenda 2: Meeting Arrangements**

### **2.1 Election of Rapporteur**

Ana and Emily are the rapporteurs for the meeting.

### **2.2 Adoption of the Agenda**

Fiji moved and second by Australia to adopt the agenda after amendments have been included.

## **Agenda 3: Administrative Matters**

- **Participants List.**
- **Introduction to the purpose of the workshop and expected outcome.**

Responsibilities of the IPPC Contact Point and participants are available with the agenda.

The link for the guidelines <https://www.ippc.int/en/online-comment-system> are also available and participants are encouraged to read this guidelines and understand.

Heads of NPPOs joining online are also encouraged to go through these guidelines.

- **Facilitation of the workshop, hybrid engagements arrangements and sub-regional standards review and endorsement process.**

## **Agenda 4: Updates on Governance and Strategic Issues**

### **4.1 Governance and Strategy (CPM Bureau)- Mr. Peter Thompson**

Mr. Thomson began this update by highlighting the importance of this meeting and that any input by the PPPO to the IPPC is critical as the mantra- We are the IPPC- is maintained. He provided a brief history of the IPPC and governance was also provided.

Mr. Thompson also acknowledged member countries from the Pacific who have been nominated to the Focus Group in Safe Aid confirming that it will put the PPPO in good stead for that work. He added that members are encouraged that if the PPPO speak up, its voice will be heard and it can be very influential.

At the same time countries are encouraged to register for the e-Phytos solutions so that all countries can be on the same page with electronic exchange of phytosanitary certificates.

Members were reminded about e-Commerce which involves buying things online and sometimes from countries that are not used to biosecurity. The e-Commerce work of the IPPC is raising awareness of the parcels that may not have had any biosecurity checks and working with the big players eg. Amazon to be aware about the rules so they can comply. An informal working group has been set up under the IPPC in line with this.

Mr. Thomson also encouraged members to be observers during the Bureau meeting. These meetings will remain face to face and there are funding available for developing countries to attend these meetings. Members will need to apply to the secretariat for this funding. Mr. Thomson also reminded the PPPO that the next meeting is next week and if any interested member could contact the representative.

### **4.2 Update from the Standards Committee (SC)-Dr. Sophie Peterson**

The SC is hoping to meet in November 2022 for first face to face meeting in a number of years. Dr. Sophie Peterson was elected as chair of standards committee for the next 3

years and she is looking forward to working with colleagues from the Southwest Pacific in particular to ensure that the voice of members is heard and implemented.

She explained that there are 88 topics in total to be addressed in the work plan which means that there are a lot of work to be done. Specification comments are due at the end of this month and Specifications are important because they provide the writing instructions for draft ISPMs.

Dr. Peterson highlighted the draft standards and specifications that are out for country consultation this year. The new and important work from the technical panel for commodity standards is beginning and there are two representatives from this region on that group.

She provided update on the future work of the SC, including review of the current draft ISPMs. She encouraged PPPO members to reach out to the South West Pacific members if they have any questions about standard settings.

Members discussed ways that they can use to get the comments together as a region. As an example, in Australia and New Zealand there is a process to engage with other stakeholders in the country to get the comment from them as well to contribute to the comments. But it is up to the individual circumstances of the country how it would be best for them to contribute.

### **Future SC Work**

SC will meet in November to discuss revised draft and to see if they can be presented to the CPM for adoption.

### **Questions and Comments:**

- Tonga acknowledged the presentation and the representation of the region to the SC at the standard meetings.
- Vanuatu suggested that countries be given time for discussion and can submit their own comment in the OCS due to in countries activities.
- Kiribati stated that due to staff turn-over, time and assistance is needed to learn how to work the OCS.

**Action Item:** Secretariat is to take note and understand concerns coming from the countries.

### **4.3 Update from the Implementation Committee(IC) (including guides and training material.)-Dr. Chris Dale.**

Dr. Dale acknowledged the other SW Pacific members to the IC, Mr. Nilesh and Dr. Lalith, other regional members for the good work they do.

He provided an update of the list of topics the IC are currently working on including NROs, POARS and emerging pests as well as guides and training materials that NPPOs and RPPOs could use to strengthen their ability to implement ISPMs.

He reminded the members that there will be a call from October to November for new members to the IC to replace outgoing members so encourage anyone interested to think about applying.

Dr. Dale clarified that the IRSS was adopted in 2008 as a system to monitor compliance but this has now been agreed to be updated through the IPPC Observatory.

In discussing the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE), Dr. Dale clarified that the plan for the PCE desktop study is being finalised and a new PCE webpage has also been released. Any countries interested in having a PCE done can talk to regional IC members who will facilitate that.

He also mentioned that the revise procedures for dispute avoidance and settlement have been updated although the dispute avoidance responsibilities will remain with the IC. The IC is also looking for opportunities to integrate the climate change action plan into the NROs. IC has developed a lot of webinars which are available for access on the IPPC website.

Finally, members can get involved in many ways including reviewing guides and training material and case studies. If anyone has any topics to propose to the IC they are encourage to submit them to the work plan.

### **Questions and Comments**

- Australia: What overlap is there between the POARS work and the observatory work?

Dr. Dale clarified that POARS is related to the emerging pests work and is a more technically focused work. The observatory is more of a survey monitoring mechanism,

- Vanuatu: acknowledged information and make mention of Vanuatu using those resources for awareness with the stakeholders such as Customs Brokers.

### **Agenda 5: Session 1**

**Section 1: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations (this will involve presentations, sub-regional group discussions and questions from workshop's participants)**

## 5.1 Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies (2018-011) Annex to ISPM 37 (Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae))

### - Presentation and introduction of standard- Dr. Sophie Peterson.

SC Chair provided background on the specification development, including the reason for the revision because there are many terms that describe the host status of fruit to fruit flies so wanted a document to provide some standardized understanding of the definitions of the terms used.

Implementation issues identified already include quality of sources/information There is some information available on the IPPC to assist with this.

SC Chair noted that the Expert Working Group(EWG) flagged that a re-write of annex 37 may be required depending on what comes out of this revision.

### • Facilitate review and discussions

**Para 1: Heading:** Draft Annex to ISPM 37: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of **fruit** to fruit flies (2018-011)

#### **General Comment:**

**NZ:** the word 'fruit' in the title to be changed to 'plant parts'

**Reason:** as there are fruit flies that attack other plant parts as well. NZ will submit this as a country comment

PPPO supports the heading as it is since fruit is the commodity that is being traded

## **Annex 1: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit to fruit flies**

### **1.Introduction:**

**Para 28: PPPO Comment:** the word 'dispute' to be changed to 'different interpretation

**Reason:** dispute could have a different meaning and that dispute would be the last step in the resolution of the conflict.

**Para 29: Host terminology in available literature and alignment with the host status categories used in this standard.**

#### **Technical Comment:**

**NZ-use 'conditional non-host'**, A conditional non-host is a plant species or cultivar that is a host of the target fruit fly under natural or semi-natural conditions but is not a host in fruit of a specified physical condition (eg state of maturity, undamaged) under natural or semi-natural conditions.

**Para 30: In addition to the terms ....**

**Comment:**

**NZ-** work needs to be done to align the words.

**Australia-** enquiring if NZ is proposing a change in the annex or the revision of the ISPM 37

**Para 31: in which the target fruit fly develops.....'natural conditions'**

**Comment:**

**NZ-** needs clarification on the term 'natural condition'

**Para 34: that shows evidence of infestation under 'semi-natural' or 'certain', clearly described 'natural conditions' (including field trials); and**

**Comment:**

PPPO comment- semi-natural definition to be clarified and the word certain to be deleted.

**Para 35: in which the target under clearly described "conditions"**

PPPO comment: the term 'condition' is ambiguous and does not clarify whether it is natural or otherwise therefore use circumstantial condition or a suitable word.

### **3.0 Criteria for determining host status**

#### **3.1 General evaluation criteria**

**Para 44:** details of the fruit-collection conditions (e.g. commercial or non-commercial environment; 'picked from the plant or collected from the ground';

**PPPO Comment:** fruits that have "fallen" on the ground to distinguish between fruits that grown on the ground e.g. watermelon.

**Para 46** "details of the condition of the fruit, including the stage of its maturity (or other indicators of ripeness, such as dry matter content, color, sugar content, **ripeness scale**) and the condition of its **skin or rind** (whether it is damaged or is free from any mechanical or natural damage);

**PPPO comment:**

1. Ripeness scale is subjective therefore suggests to change and use 'accepted level of ripeness'
2. Include the word 'peel' and to now read: skin, peel or rind.



**Para 48:** if used a description of the fruit-dissection method (e.g. peeling and fruit cutting for detection of eggs or larvae) for determination of infestation and, where there is infestation,

if used the fruit fly rearing method (e.g. fruit-holding conditions, including temperature, humidity, day length, substrate for pupation including soil moisture) for development to adults (taking in consideration that eggs and larvae should not have been transferred from infested fruit to artificial diet for rearing); and

## **1.2 Criteria for natural host**

Para 55: description of any phytosanitary treatments applied to be replicated as detailed in 3.3

NZ: suggestion and change in wording: changing treatment to procedure which is to broaden the scope to include any phytosanitary procedure

PPPO comment.

## **1.3 Criteria for Conditional host**

**Para 61:** evidence of the presence of the target fruit fly species in fruit under semi-natural or '**certain**', clearly described environmental conditions (e.g. under certain conditions of population pressure from conspecific fruit flies, presence of other fruit fly and insect species, fruit fly management measures, absence of other natural or conditional hosts in the area, temperature, humidity or rainfall).

**Comment:** PPPO suggest that the word '**certain**' is to be deleted to be consistent with previous comment.

## **3.4 Criteria for non-host**

**Para 66:** 'description of the fruit-handling procedures' (e.g. harvesting procedures, post-harvest processing and treatment, and transportation procedures).

PPPO provided fruit handling procedures including packaging for each criteria in a table however it needs to be translated into a paragraph to indicate the exception of treatment with non-host and conditional non-host.

**Para 75:** a description of the method used in the 'laboratory experiment' (e.g. cages used, exposure period, presence of food and water in cages, number of females used per cage, presence of males in cages, use of a natural host as a control in separate cages to demonstrate normal oviposition behaviour, time of conduct of experiment, conditions during experiment, number of replicates using different cohorts).

**Comment:** PPPO seek clarification whether the lab experiment to determine non-host after using non-host determination such as field testing. If so, then this could also be an option.

## **4. Assessing the uncertainty of the host status determination**

**Para 77:** Available information relating to the host status of plant species or cultivars to fruit flies at varying levels of quality, completeness, reliability and ‘applicability’, and these will, in turn influence the level of uncertainty associated with the host status determination.

**Comment:** add the word ‘currency’ after applicability and add the word currency throughout the document to ensure use of more up to date information.

**Para 80:** The quality, completeness, reliability and ‘applicability’ of the information sources used will dictate the level of uncertainty associated with the resulting host status determination: the greater these are, the lower the uncertainty..... Using ‘less’ reliable sources can increase the level of uncertainty.

**Comment:** to also include currency and applicability of the information sources and change less reliable to not reliable.

**Para 82:** A new plant species or ‘cultivar’ is introduced into an area where a fruit fly species is present, or where a fruit fly establishes in a new area and encounters new plant species.

**Comment:** PPPO suggests to use ‘hybrid’ instead of ‘cultivar’. This should also change throughout the document.

**Para 86:** If there is a taxonomic change that splits a fruit fly species into two or more species, the host range of each component species is ‘likely’ to be different.....

**Comment:** taxonomic split could happen at the molecular level which would not change the host range. It is suggested to use the word ‘may be’ instead of ‘likely’

**Para 87:** The result of an analysis of host status should be accompanied by a determination of the level and nature of the associated uncertainty.

**Comment:** PPPO feels that more guidance is needed in order determine the level and nature of the uncertainty and whether it should be part of the standard or presented as a supporting document.

## **5. Application of host status of a fruit fly**

**Comment:** change cultivar to hybrid as appearing in para 91,92,93

## **5.2 2021 and 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)**

- **Presentation and introduction of standard**

SC Chair presented a brief introduction on the 2021 Amendments to ISPM 5 where the proposals are:

- 3 additions
- 9 revisions
- 2 deletions

This would be the 2<sup>nd</sup> round of consultation for the above.

In the 2022 Draft Amendments to ISPM 5 two (2) revisions were proposed and this is the 1<sup>st</sup> round of consultation for the revisions.

- The glossary is updated every year therefore it is important to use current versions. Members are also encouraged to refer to online links (available in the presentation) to access more information.

### Facilitate review and discussions

#### REVIEW TITLE: 2022 SECOND CONSULTATION: 2021 DRAFT AMENDMENTS OF ISPM 5 (1994-001).

##### ADDITIONS

1. **Identity of consignment:** The components of a **consignment** as covered by its **phytosanitary certificate** and described in the sections “name of produce and quantity declared”, “botanical name of **plants**” and “country of origin”. Place of production or production site may also be specified.
2. **General Surveillance:** An **official** process whereby data on **pests** in an **area**, collected from various sources other than specific surveillance, are analysed and verified.
3. **Specific Surveillance:** An official process whereby analysed and verified information on pests in an area is obtained through surveys.

##### REVISIONS

1. **Surveillanc :** An official process whereby analysed and verified information on pests in an area obtained general surveillance, specific surveillance or a combination of both.
2. **Integrity of Consignment:** When the status of the consignment’s identity is unchanged, its packaging undamaged and it shows no other signs of tampering.
3. **Phytosanitary security of the consignment:** Status of a consignment when its integrity has been maintained and its infestation and contamination by regulated pests, prevented through the application of phytosanitary measures
4. **Emergency Measure:** An official regulation promptly established to prevent the entry, establishment or spread of a pest in a new or unexpected situation not addresses by existing phytosanitary measures, an emergency measure may or may not be a provisional measure.

5. **Provisional Measure:** temporary **official regulation** or procedure to prevent the **entry, establishment or spread** of a **pest**, established without full **technical justification** because of a current lack of adequate information; and subjected to periodic review and full **technical justification** as soon as possible.
6. **Inspectio :** Official visual examination of plants, plant products or other regulated articles to determine if pests are present or to verify conformity with phytosanitary requirements.
7. **Test:** Official examination (other than inspection) of plants, plants products or other regulated articles to determine if pests are present identify pests or verify conformity with specific phytosanitary requirements.
8. **Compliance Procedure** (for a consignment): Official process of documents checks, verification of consignment integrity, **inspection or testing and verify to determine** if a consignment complies with phytosanitary import requirements or phytosanitary requirements related to transit.
9. Release of Consignment: **Authorisation for entry of a consignment after completion of the compliance procedure**

## DELETIONS

### 1. Clearance of Consignment

### 2. Germplasm

No comment.

**REVIEW TITLE: 2022 FIRST CONSULTATION: 2022 DRAFT AMENDMENTS OF ISPM 5 (1994-001).**

## REVISION

1. **Phytosanitary Actio :** An official procedure as inspection, testing, surveillance or treatment, undertaken to implement phytosanitary measures or to enable phytosanitary certification
2. **Phytosanitary Procedure:** Any official method of implementing phytosanitary actions undertaken to apply phytosanitary measures or to enable phytosanitary certification.

### 5.3 Revision of ISPM 18 (Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure) (2014-007)

#### - Presentation and introduction of standard

SC Member informed the meeting that this is 2<sup>nd</sup> round of consultation. She stated this ISPM was created by the IPPC TPPT and was aligned with readily adopted and newly developed ISPMs 42, 43, 44.

This includes responsibilities for treatment providers and maintaining treatment records. Irradiation may not have been available in country but can accept products that have gone under irradiation treatment.

All comments are available for the public, countries can see that on line.

## - **Facilitate review and discussions**

### **Background**

**Para 46:** The effectiveness of the treatment process also includes “phytosanitary measures applied to prevent infestation or contamination after irradiation.

#### **Comment**

Include term phytosanitary

### **Requirements**

#### 1. Irradiation Objective

**Para 51:** The objective of using irradiation as a phytosanitary measure is to achieve, at a specified efficacy, certain pest and ‘vector responses’ such as:

**Para 52:** mortality of vectors or pathogen

**Para 56:** devitalization of plants (e.g. seeds may germinate but seedlings do not grow; or tubers or do not sprout).

**Comment:** the term ‘as pest’ after devitalisation of plants has been removed.

### **Irradiation application**

#### **Para 64: Comment:**

NPPOs are to include the level of acceptance for irradiation treatment of food. It is proposed to raise a question and submit as country comment.

### **3.2 Dose mapping**

**Para 90:** The dose distribution in a process load is specific to the irradiator, the path that the commodity takes through the irradiator, the process load and the characteristics of the commodity. If any of these factors change, dose mapping should be repeated, as such changes affect dose distribution.

**Comment:** Further description of the process load would be beneficial such as half pallet vs full pallets, speed of conveyor, density, packaging material.

## 5.1 Approval of treatment facilities and authorization of treatment providers

**Comment:** This overlapped with ISPM 45 and suggestion in how this can be referenced or reflected.

**Para 102:** Treatment facilities should be approved by the NPPO of the country (In collaboration with International Atomic Energy Agency(IAEA)

Comment: IAEA being the international authority.

## 5.4 Monitoring and Auditing

**Para 114:** The NPPO of the country in which the irradiation is conducted should monitor and audit treatment facilities and ‘providers’. The NPPO should maintain an audit schedule and ensure that such audits are conducted by appropriately trained personnel. Continuous supervision of irradiation by the NPPO should not be necessary “(unless bilaterally agreed)” provided treatment procedures are properly designed by the treatment provider and can be verified to ensure a high degree of system integrity for the facility, process and commodity in question. The monitoring and auditing should be sufficient to detect and correct deficiencies promptly.

Comment:

- The use of the word ‘providers’ is in line with the phytosanitary context.
- The inclusion of the phrase “unless bilaterally agreed’ ensures NPPO may not need to supervise the treatment.

## 7. Inspection

**Para 150 :** Live target pest is to now read : Live(including live target pests)

**Comment:**

- The mention of live target pest is associated with dosage that would make it sterile. If the target pests are found, it means that the pest is sterile.
- Implementation support for NPPOs inspectors will be needed to implement this standard as live pests are not normally associated with effective treatment application

## Annex 1: Criteria

**Para 196:** Sentence to now read:

Adequate systems are in place to control non-compliant lots and when necessary to suspend facility.

## **5.4 Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002)**

### **- Presentation and introduction of standard**

SC Chair provided back ground, reasons, history and highlights of revision for ISPM 4 and also touched on the major drafting issues.

This ISPM is approved for 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation in order to be current and to be aligned to the recently reviewed ISPMs 6 & 8

### **- Facilitate review and discussions**

## **Introduction**

Para 33: The sentence is too long and suggests dividing the paragraph to 2 sentences.

Paragraph will now read:

“This standard describes the requirements for initiating, establishing and maintaining pest free areas (PFAs) as a phytosanitary measure to support the phytosanitary certification of plants, plant products and other regulated articles exported from the PFA.”

“If technically justified a PFA, as a phytosanitary measure required by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of an importing country for the protection of an endangered area in its territory.”

## **Outline of Requirements**

Para 41: Break up sentence for clarity. Paragraph will now read as follows:

When initiating, establishing or maintaining a PFA, NPPOS should follow the requirement outlined in this standard. Requirements include:

- systems to establish and maintain pest freedom,
- verification that pest freedom has been attained or maintained,
- appropriate corrective actions for pest detections, proper documentation of these activities and appropriate record-keeping, and transparency and stakeholder communication. The measures used to establish or maintain the PFA should be based on an assessment of pest risk.

**Para 45:** Paragraph is unclear whoever this is applicable to land lock states. It is suggested that the sentence is to be re-worded and it now reads:

‘A PFA may be applied to an entire country or part of it. A PFA may, as appropriate, include the territory of all ‘of a country or the territory’s or parts of several ‘countries’. Within a single country, more than one PFA may be established for the same pest, depending on the ‘biology of the pest’, geographical nature of the country, the distribution of the pest and its hosts.’

**Para 46:** When a PFA is established it is usually for one specific pest, but a PFA may also be established for a group of pests with similar biology. In this standard, “pest” is used hereafter to refer to “defined pest or group of pests”.

## **Para 49: Requirements**

**Para 56:** verification that pest freedom has been maintained;(as agreed by relevant bilateral partners)

**Para 61:** “Measures” should be based on the biology of the specified pest, the relevant pathways and the characteristics of the PFA

**Comment:**

Fiji proposes to use the word ‘control’ instead of ‘measures’

PPPO will maintain the term ‘measure

Fiji can use the term control as country comment

## **1. Initiation of a pest free area**

### **1.1 Pest to be controlled.**

**Para 69:** When initiating a PFA, an NPPO should first specify the pest that is to be controlled (including its relevant scientific name) and implement valid detection and diagnostic methods and take into account its relevant aspects of its biology.

**Comment:** using the term ‘relevant’ scientific name to cater for the different groups pest stated before.

### **1.2 Identification of an area**

**Para 71:** The area being considered for pest freedom may be the entire country, a part of a country, or all or part of several countries. The area should be described specifically enough to allow it to be readily identified **eg using GPS coordinates** This is important when NPPOs are providing evidence to support the claim that the area is free of the pest, but also when NPPOs are subsequently reporting the pest status of the PFA and when raising public awareness.

**Comment:** to reference currency of information.

## **3.4 Corrective action plans, including response to and outbreak**

**Para 107:** Paragraph is to now read:

In the event of the pest being detected in the PFA, the NPPO should determine, based on ISPM 6 and ISPM 8, the type of corrective action to be taken.

**Para 109:** ‘An’ eradication programme should follow ISPM 9 and include the following steps:

**Comment:** Changed ‘The’ to ‘An’ and also add the colon (:) at the end of the sentence to indicate that the step are listed below.

## **3.5 Provisions for suspension, reinstatement, or withdrawal of the pest free area**



**Para 118 Inclusion as last sentence:**

“The time frame for meeting the criteria should be agreed by the relevant NPPOs at this time.”

**Para 120:** If the criteria for eradication within the demarcated outbreak area cannot be fulfilled within a reasonable timeframe (as ‘determined’ by the ‘relevant’ NPPOs), then either the PFA should be withdrawn or the delimitation of the PFA should be reviewed.

**Comment:** both NPPOs are to be involved in this.

**6. Communication and Stakeholder engagement.**

**Para 131:** Information (eg maps and GPS coordinates) about the phytosanitary measures applied to maintain the PFA should be communicated to relevant stakeholders.

**Comment:** Map is considered information therefore placed as an example.

**7. Recognition of pest free areas.**

**Para 134:** Bilateral and multilateral recognition of PFAs should take place in accordance with ISPM 29 (*Recognition of pest free areas and areas of low pest prevalence*).

**Comment:** including ‘Multilateral’ recognitions. ISPM 38 allows for multilateral recognition.

**5.5 Use of specific import authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006)**

**- Presentation and introduction of standard –**

Dr Peterson provided a history and overview of this standard that is going through its 2<sup>nd</sup> consultation stating that SIAs do not replace the obligations of the NPPOs to clearly communicate the phytosanitary requirements of an importation,

The annex also identifies how the annex maybe used and that is when official consent is necessary or when the import of that commodity be otherwise be prohibited for phytosanitary reasons. Also when the import requirements for that particular import has not yet been established.

There are four main section in this annex.

**- Facilitate review and discussions**

**Annex 2: Use of specific import authorizations.**

**Para 29:** The national plant protection organisations(PNPO) of importing countries may choose to use specific import authorizations(SIAs) as referred to in this standard “(section 4.2.2 in ISPM 20)”

## **2.1 Information Requirement**

**Para 37** : name of the NPPO, “under the NPPOs official letterhead or logo” ....

**Para 44**: phytosanitary import requirements and “supplementary requirements (such as additional declaration, manufacturer declaration is also covered)

## **3. Uses of specific import authorizations**

**New para below 61**: ‘human health purposes’

**Para 68**: ...where an IRA have not been conducted or in progress. “This is to prevent stakeholders from using this loophole”

**Para 82**: monitoring trade under the SIAs, “compliance with the SIAs” and considering transferring.....

## **4.2 Importers**

**New Para after 85**: “Not seeking an SIA where a GIA is available”.

## **4.3 Exporters**

**Para 93**: complying with the requirements of the SIA “and other relevant standards and regulations”

## **4.4 The NPPO of the exporting country**

**Para 98**: verification of the SIA submitted by “the” exporter”.

## **5.6 Phytosanitary treatments and diagnostic protocols- information for community.**

The SC Rep for SWP Dr Sophie Peterson provided a brief introduction for these phytosanitary treatments and diagnostic protocols and advices that countries can spend time to review them and put their comments on the OCS.

Two draft diagnostic protocol are out for first consultation and they are:

a) Draft DP: *Mononychellus tanajoa* (2018-006)

b) Draft DP: Genus *Ceratitis* (2016-001)

One Phytosanitary treatment is out for second consultation namely:

a) Draft PT Irradiation treatment for *Pseudococcus jackbeardsleyi* (2017-027).

The specification for the commodity standard for mango is also out for consultation whoever it has shorter consultation period ending in August 2022.

Dr. Peterson also advises the PPPO that there has been a change in the standard setting process for phytosanitary treatment. If no major changes is received from the first consultation, then the standard will not go out for second consultation. It is therefore important for countries to send their comments during the first round of consultation.

One of the reasons that these was proposed by the SC and adopted by the CPM was related to Commodity standards which will have a list of pests for the commodity pathway and then a comparative list of measures against those pests. This is done to speed up the adoption of phytosanitary treatment and change commodity standards faster.

Countries can also contact the SC reps if they have further enquiries regarding this agenda topic.

## **Agenda 6:**

### **Section 2: Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs**

**This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants**

#### **6.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities- Mr.. Hermant Nitturkar**

The focus of the capacity development activities at FAO in relation to plant protection has been on prevention, eco- friendly and sustainable measures. Mr. Nitturkar reiterated that while ISPMs will remain on paper, the actions carried out by the member countries will have an impact on the people outside of the meeting.

Mr. Nitturkar stated that when the meeting is over there are partners and stakeholders that we engage with and make them change their behavior towards the vision that we set for ourselves. But the main impact that we have in terms of food security, nutrient security etc depends on what the millions of farmers and community members and consumers do. That is where we take our capacities to and that's why the building capacity is important.

FAO wants to build capacities of people, organisations and the enabling environment to be able to take the science to the masses. Through their support, FAO hopes to build the effectiveness of the NPPOs for the nations to realize the potential for the increase productivity for self-reliance and also for trade so that there's good food available for the population and high quality products is available for export.

Mr. Nitturkar confirmed that FAO wants to be seen as partners to increase the awareness, skill, bringing in tools and create platforms available where people can share and exchange ideas and complements their activities. PCE is one of the ways which will help the countries to identify their strength and weakness and address gaps so that processes are harmonized. In the PCE, national stakeholders identify strengths and weakness and develop robust phytosanitary certification system in the countries.

#### **Some of the ongoing FAO Projects.**

Technical Cooperation Program(TCP)- trying to reduce the chemical hazards from usage and promote locally sustainable. FAO is currently working in Cook Island, Fiji, Samoa, Kiribati, Solomon Island and Vanuatu and is working closely with SPC to build a regional scheme for pesticide evaluation.

Mr. Nitturkar confirmed that FAO is also trying to increase availability of bio pesticide evaluation control range. This is through small scale entrepreneurs who multiply these and get it available. Usually the farmers are aware of new technology and want it but they do not have access to these bio control measures or anything else required for use.

Mr. Nitturkar also confirmed another TCP is on Fall Army Worm(FAW) where a regional project is ongoing right now in Fiji, Samoa, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands.

Solomon Island has reported the detection of FAW and FAO is on the ground working with the Ministry of Agriculture to determine its spread, determine how to reduce its island to island spread and also how to create the awareness in different parts of the country so that we can be prepared to

1. Avoid FAW entering the island as it is very difficult to control its spread once it is detected in the country.
  - There is a workshop on Global Action on FAW happening in the Philippines in October. Some of the representative of the countries will be participating in there.
2. Building Capacity in Tissue Culture in Samoa- this is an ongoing activity for maintenance of the program and also multiplication of tissue culture.

Other projects:

- Biosecurity in Fiji
- IPM

In closing, Mr. Nitturkar reminded members that when safe and wholly ISPMs are developed in meeting like this, it gets reflected on the ground through, sustainable pest control and crop husbandry so that good, high quality and sustainable food is produced.

### Questions and Comments:

- **Vanuatu:** enquired of countries could put forward request for support in other areas that are not being currently assisted.

FAO: Some projects are ongoing and if new projects request is received it would be referable that more countries are demanding the same projects. FAO will send out future meetings and workshops details so that member countries can be aware of the projects. There is still possibility too include new projects.

- **Kiribati:** requesting if they could be included in the Tissue Culture Project.

FAO will discuss this with Kiribati separately on how they can be assisted.

- **Australia:** Requesting that when engaging the countries in the region to include Australia and New Zealand because they also have capacity building projects in the region with a number of donor countries or organisations. It will be great to have an integrated project plan for the region.

FAO- request is being considered.

PPPO Chair acknowledged FAO and reconfirm partnership and working together in the region.

## 6.2 RPPO activities- Executive Secretary PPPO- Dr.Visoni Timote.

**Biosecurity Activities:** these regional engagements on capacity building are done virtually.

**Sea Container Hygiene Standard(SCHS):** working in close collaboration with colleagues from DAFF in reaching out to the 3 sub-regions where 120 officers attended this training. It is noted that some of the countries such as Cook Island and Tuvalu missed out on the SCHS Training.

### **Work with BAF**

The production of 10 Short video clips under the SAFE projects yet to finalise and sign the operation agreements. This will be shared with countries once finalised.

### **EU SAFE Pacific Project.**

Seven areas with 3 Implementing parties:

- SPC- Biosecurity, SPS and Value Chain
- PIFS- Forum Secretariat
- UNCTAD-Oceania Customs Organisation.

### **Upgrade of the PLD**

This activity is done in collaboration with DAFF and the collaboration is acknowledged. To date we are able to push out the proposal on that and signed a contract 3 weeks ago with the IT consultant company- ACTON.

### **Safe Food Aid Factsheet**

Six (6) factsheets were developed with the assistance of DAFF and various NPPOs. Assistances given is highly acknowledge. Noting after natural disaster Aid pathways can be biosecurity risk pathways as well  
e-Copies of the factsheets will be shared with the members while the printed copies will be distributed later once printed.

Also working on a French translation that will be circulated to French speaking members.

## **Gap Analysis on Emergency Response Plan(ERP) and Early Warning System**

This survey has been circulated earlier and members are requested to respond so that gap analysis on the ERP can be addressed

## **Pacific Ecological Security Conference**

This conference is happening in Palau from the 3-5<sup>th</sup> of October. There are 3 working groups organised and the PPPO is leading the working group on Invasive Ants.

Any comments from member countries is welcomed.

## **Grant Fund Agreement (GFA)**

Acknowledge the collaboration by NZMPI.

The five (5) Key direct areas includes:

- Development and Management of the Export System and Export Plans- 5 members countries,
- Review of the PCE. Currently waiting for the contract to be finalised hopefully next week and Dr Stephen Butcher to carry out his work.
- Advertised the position of the coordinator.
- GIS electronic export facilitation system-Fiji and Tonga to pilot this program.
- ePhyto work.

## **Assistance to the PPPO**

Good opportunities and we will be reaching out to the member countries  
Currently we are working on the TOR for the short term consultant that will be working with the countries on this work.

## **Upcoming Events**

- PPPO ExCO Meeting- 25-26 August 2022
- APPPC Regional Workshop(Hybrid)
- Sea Container Hygiene System Workshop
- International Plant Health Conference in London – 21-23 Sept, 2022.
- PPPO Full Board- 31 Oct- 4 Nov, 2022
- Pacific Week of Agriculture- hosted in Fiji 14-18 Nov 2022

The Secretariat acknowledged the support from the all the NPPOs.

## **Questions and Comment**

**Tonga:** acknowledge the support of the Secretariat and commented that some of the projects such as the SCHS is also available on PACER Plus country like Tonga. Suggesting that collaboration should happen so as not to duplicate the projects.

### **Section 3: Moving together from ideas to action (facilitated session)**

**This section will consist of presentations followed by discussion and questions from the participants.**

#### **7.1 Plant Health Innovation for Food Security: strengthening pest outbreak alert and response systems and e-Commerce-Dr Chris Dale**

Dr Dale discuss the work done by the IC on strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response System(POARS) and e-Commerce for the past 12 month as well as the ongoing work.

#### **POARS**

The concept of emerging pest and emergency issue was discussed during the CPM 14 in 2019 based on the concern of Fall Army Worm *Spodoptera frugiperda* and it was aligned with the development agenda item in the IPPC Strategic Framework (2020-2030). The scope is limited to quarantine or potential pest and the FG started meeting virtually from January 2021.

A definition of ‘emerging pest’ was proposed for consideration to the Technical Panel for Glossary through the SC. Dr. Dale also explained the overarching components of the response system and explained the administration components which includes- Policy Model, Legal framework, finance model, data management and communication system and Oversight. The technical component includes Pre-presence to detection and Post detection.

The Global Pest Outbreak and Response System Framework connects down to the RPPOs and NPPOs. The CPM Bureau plays a critical role in it coordination efforts with the RPPOs and NPPOs to relevant stakeholders such as CABI and EFSA. Similarly, with other development agencies such as USAID and JICA, other financial institutions such as World Bank and IMF and other UN Organisations such as FAO and IAEA

Dr. Dale also discussed the Considerations relating to the information systems and tools available through the POARS stating that there is a dedicated webpage designed to have automated processes, data visualization, tools and specific webpages’

After much deliberation on the governance of POARS, the CPM-16 agreed that a POARS Steering Group is the most practical solution to advance the priorities on the topic.

#### **e-COMMERCE**

Dr Dale stated that the IPPC work on e-Commerce guide started in 2012. It is focused on high risk hosts such as seeds transported through mail and parcel through international borders by postal services or couriers. He explained the background of the e-Commerce and described its relation to plant health that this could be a pathway for the introduction and spread of plant pests.

He also stated the key challenges face in this arena. There is tremendous growth in e-Commerce with a rapid increase of parcels and small packages moving across borders. This is supported by the fast growth in digital technologies that shortens the delivery time of these items. This puts pressure on the normal components of a phytosanitary import system where relevant laws have to be implemented to regulate this trade. NPPOs also face challenges in identifying regulated articles in the courier pathway.

Dr. Dale reminded the members of upcoming e-Commerce activities which will include the launch of the e-Commerce Guide later this year.

The monitoring and evaluation role will be done through the IPPC Observatory to evaluate the achievement of the objective as outlined in the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030.

## **7.2 ePhyto Solutions- Mr. Ilaisa Dakaica**

Mr. Dakaica briefly discussed the background of the ePhyto Solutions that was officially launched in 2019 and the coordinator started in 2021 and project initiated in 2022.

The objective was to

- introduced the GENS to the Pacific Island Countries(PICs)
- develop and deliver operational training through capacity building.
- improve effectiveness of Pacific farmers and exporters trade within the Pacific.
- Participate in PICTA and access markets in NZ and Australia and other countries
- Reduce non- compliance for Pacific countries
- Access international markets
- Ensure that issues of accessing markets within the Pacific Islands are properly coordinated
- Develop the capacity for the PIC with regard to phytosanitary certificates

The implementation plan consists of four phases:

1st phase: getting the countries to be registered into the GENS.

2ndphase: Training will be conducted for this through the e-Phyto e-learning portal provided by the IPPC.

3rd phase: training for users and online training and ready for adoption

4th phase: the testing phase which include sending e-Phytos to countries that are already establishing the ePhyto system.

He stated that countries selected for the 2021-2022 for GENS implementation were Marshall Island, Palau, Cook Island, Tuvalu, Tonga, PNG, Nauru, Kiribati, Tokelau, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Niue.

Marshall Island, Palau, Cook Island, Tuvalu, Tonga, PNG were provided with their GENS pages.

Nauru, Kiribati and Samoa had their GENS pages created and is only left with Tokelau and Vanuatu



Mr. Dakaica clarified that during the testing phase, Cook Island and Marshall Islands send export certificates to Fiji and Samoa. Fiji and Samoa has send certificates to NZ and participated in the testing phase. It is encouraging to see regional coordination and countries moving ahead with the GENS;

He explained that Cook Island is receiving ePhyto but have not send out any certificates as it is noted that there are not many commercial exports coming out of the PICs bit they do issue for personal consignments. Cook Island had stakeholder training in June 2022 and the Head of the NPPO Cook Island is acknowledged for coordinating the launch of the ePhyto. Similarly, Marshall Island is getting ready to receive ePhyts from countries even though they don't have much exports but is working through the ePhyto system.

Mr. Dakaica also informed the meeting that training and testing is planned for Tonga, Tuvalu, Nauru and Fiji in October and hopefully get them in the GENS production by the end of 2022. In this GENS production stage, countries will receive ePhyto through GENS as well as the original paper phytos.

Mr. Dakaica further requested exporting countries such as NZ and Fiji are to follow this pathway so that the new GENS production countries have the opportunities to fill the ePhyto and check the documentation before the consignment arrives and check for documentation compliance, familiarize themselves with the ePhyto i.e what it looks like, identify the authorizing officer of the exporting country and giving confidence in receiving the ePhyto.

It is hoped that once the new GENS production country is ready and confidence in using the system they will no longer be receiving the original paper certificates,

### **Face to Face Engagement**

Mr. Dakaica stated that the PPPO Regional ePhyto workshop will be held on the 24-28 October 2022 at the Tanoa International Hotel, Nadi Fiji. Requesting countries who have registered in the GENS for 2 participants per country where training will include live GENS where you will be sending certificates to each other.

UNICC and IPPC is also working on the French interface for French speaking countries.

Acknowledged funding support from DAFF, NZMPI, DFAT, MFAT and SPC.

### **Questions & Comments:**

- **Cook Islands-** acknowledged all the work that has been done for ePhyto. Even though small island countries like Cook Islands don't have commercial exports but there a lot of personal consignment. How can that be incorporated in to the GENS?

**Ilaisa**-UNICC is focusing on stream lining ePhyto for personal consignment but in the meantime paper certificates through the ePhyto GENS are still being accepted. There will also be the opportunity to put together submissions to be presented to IPPPC/ UNICC during the October workshop. PPPO can make that submission. PPPO is fortunate that all 3 phases are ongoing now.

- **New Caledonia**- relayed their appreciation for all the work done and waiting for the French interface.

**Ilaisa**- Only countries that are registered in the GENS will be invited to attend the face-to-face October workshop, while those who are not registered yet will be invited to observe the process virtually.

- **Samoa**- Shared the experience and advantage of having to use ePhyto during the lock down and ensure that trade continues. However, NPPO Samoa still trying to get the exporters to use the system. While it takes time to adopt and understand new system, training and more capacity building under the support of PACER PLUS is helpful to maintain and sustain the system.

**-Ilaisa**- Samoa is being invited to the October workshop and to make presentation on their experience on the GENS.

### 7.3 Draft Specifications for new Guides and Training Materials- Mr. Nilesh Chand

Mr. Nilesh Chand acknowledged the leadership and support of the SWP Members. He described IPPC Guides and training materials which are resources developed by the IPPC aimed to enhance the phytosanitary capacity of the NPPOs

These technical resources or tools are accurate, practical and easy to understand and aimed to help NPPOs effectively implement the IPPC, ISPMs and the recommendation of the CPM.

The guidelines and training materials are developed by international expert working groups nominated by the NPPOs. The Expert Working Group(EWG) are nominated because of their knowledge and practical experience.

The guidelines and training material go through a process of verification before actual publication ensuring that they globally relevant and highlight current best practices.

#### **Specifications:**

Detailed guidelines that the EWG to follow as they develop the product.

#### **Participating in Consultation**

NPPOs have this opportunity to raise issues, share experiences and that are relevant to the NPPOs and especially the region.

Mr. Chand also discussed the following topics:

- Implementation of risk-based inspection for imported consignments guide (2018-022)
- 2022 Consultation on draft ICD specifications.
- Authorization of entities to perform phytosanitary actions guide (2018-040)
- National Reporting Obligations Guide (revision; 2021-026)
- Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) facilitator materials (2014-008)

He also encourages members to take part on the several ways that NPPOs can contribute to the production of a guideline or training materials.

### Question & Comments

- **NZ-** once the specification is being agreed, is there a time line given for the specification to be completed once it's got funding and how do you decide when to complete?

**Nilesh:** Usually there is no time line set as it depends of the product being developed, the resources available particularly the human resources and there are consultation involved with is normally not as productive as it is hoped to be. The project is completed when good feedback is coming in and the project can be progressed well and complete. Usually there should be a push by the NPPOs and members can discuss with the IC reps.

**CD:** in terms of specifications developed. The task gets prioritised. If it is felt at the national level or regional level that prioritising needs to be done very quickly, NPPOs or region needs to provide feedback to the IC reps to raise the prioritisation within the IC.

- **Chair-** Even though PCE is NPPO led but there is still issue with funding. Why don't we get conformation when there is funding and how do the countries know that they can be provided training in the process as well?

**Nilesh:** they need financial support to develop this training kit which is going to provide training materials for new PCE Facilitators to understand the PCE tool, module, the processes and the benefits that the PCE will provide to a country.

1. There is no financial resource.
2. There is a need to develop the new training materials in order to have new facilitators on board. These facilitators need to align themselves to different regions of the world in order to understand how PCE activities are happening over there. For the Pacific there is a PCE Facilitator from the Caribbean who has similar experience with our PCE and will be supporting the PPPO in that regard.

The IC will provide the notification in the event that there are resources available and countries to align themselves to this cost share and get PCE conducted in the NPPOs.

**Chair:** Why do we need a facilitator from the Caribbean, why not facilitators in the region to provide that.

**Nilesh:** Recently there was a call for PCE facilitators in the region and the secretariat is going to circulate the email for those who wants to be facilitator to submit their CV.

- **Australia:** Is there a limit for facilitators for the region and is there a cost associated with the nomination

**Nilesh-** there is no limit, the secretariat requires as many as possible who are available to take up the job whenever required. Secondly, there is a cost which is time- this is a time cost position

**Chris:** in response to question from Australia, there are no costs involved but a significant time consideration particularly where the facilitator will be required to travel to other countries for PCE activities.

#### 7.4 Benefits of conducting Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations(PCE) and latest developments- Dr. Chris Dale

Dr. Dale defined PCE as a fully comprehensive NPPO-led, facilitator-enabled evaluation tool. It is supported by the IPPC Secretariat and it is a process of multiple phases, with a wide range of benefits, to help countries evaluate their phytosanitary capacities. Countries can identify gaps in their system and also identify ways to address those gaps and enhance their food security and trade.

The PCE has a number of modules that is broken down to system level, organization level and core activities. He encouraged new members of the PPPO to look at the resources available on the IPPC website as guide on PCE activities

The benefits from the PCE would include building confidence in a bilateral agreement and donors who want to target investments in this area. On the national level, it empowers NPPOs to build up their capacities through addressing the gaps identified. Provides the opportunity for NPPOs to dialogue with relevant stakeholders, promoting ownership of their system and build stronger and more confident linkages among border protection agencies.

He clarifies that the PCE is a process that is under the control of the NPPO and that it adopts for its own purpose and benefits,

Dr. Dale also provided some examples of PCE activities around the world with stakeholder (Financial institutions and UN Agencies) collaborations. PCE sessions were conducted on face to face, virtually and hybrid basis.

Discussions on PCE facilitator could be coordinated at the national and regional level. Dr. Dale also reminded the countries that the PPPO reps to the IC (Dr. Chris, Dr. Lalith and Nilesh ) are more than ready to help the countries with PCE concerns.

#### Questions and Comments

- **Fiji:** Shared their experience in conducting PCE. This is an exercise to gauge the national approach and not just the organization. It looks at how effective your country is in terms of phytosanitary capacity in order to trade confidently. Fiji had previously conducted a full PCE but recently conducted a partial PCE and looked at their strength in one of the modules in Legislation and one of the modules from both Import and Export. Each of the models has at least 100 questions and all questions have to be answered in order to determine their capacity and strength. The weaknesses identified were taken into a log frame analysis of the situation and then they had to look for solutions whether it's within the country, regional or available at international level. To work all those solutions will attract human resources and finances and using both internal and external resources to fill up the gaps identified.

- **Samoa:** enquired about the process that country needs to do if we wanted to start PCE.

**Chris:** While it takes a longer time to get resources together for a PCE to be conducted for a country, Samoa could contact Ms. Sarah Brunel at FAO to get their interest known. *(Ms. Brunel's contact information is provided in the presentation)* At the same time, the more work behind the scene that could be done to advocate the need for PCE would be better. Once the request gets to the IC, the regional IC reps would definitely support it.

- **Tonga:** PCE is addressed to some of the countries who are involved with the NZ MPI Enhance Pacific Market Access Partnership.

**Chris:** acknowledge the work by MPI. While PCE is one of the evaluation tool and experience from the Solomon Island showed that they operated independently of the PCE but managed to facilitate about 10 years of capacity development. Regional assistance such as that by NZMPI also have evaluation tools that can be use by the countries

**Australia:** Interventions made at the last SPG and CPM where Australia and NZ raise a number of issues regarding the accessibility of the PCE and its cost. There is limitation on who can actually access it. One has to be a trained facilitator and it's not really visible so we are advocating for a more transparency so the countries could know what they are requesting when the countries are seeking donor funds for that.

We also ask for a consideration for a PCE "launch" tool so that its less involved and can be self-invested that NPPO can do self-assessment. There are some other options that can used to make phytosanitary evaluation more doable. Based on the PCE map, a lot of countries around the world have not done so. Australia and NZ would like to see a greater adoption of the PCE tool however it is expensive to carry it out. Funding for a PCE can be diverted and used in other areas such as Phytosanitary capacity Building rather than just an evaluation.

**NZ:** just in support of what Australia had said. As part of the NZMPI EMAP, Dr. Stephen Butcher will review the PCE from 2016 for the countries that we will be working with for the program. So we will look at the area that needs attention and the NPPO can come up with some plan for the other countries in the region. We could work in coordination with the other regional agencies that may be able to help us deliver that plan.

**Chris:** if countries are looking at PCE to initiate broader phytosanitary capacity and capability projects or program to support your NPPO, suggestion is to actually work with SPC/ PPPO and engage with the donor directly through biosecurity agencies such as DAFF or NZMPI to engage their interest around whether funding would actually support PCE which you are seeking their support for. It may be an evaluation and not a project but it is still significant funding. So it's important to have that discussion first with the donor to see if they would support PCE.

**Chair:** there has to be funding for PCE activities but at the same time we need to look at the countries perspective. It will take time to obtain funding from donors who are willing to fund. At the same time, we need to maintain the evaluation and making sure that our systems and the gaps in the system are addressed. The question is whether we address the gaps when the funding is available?

If we are able to empower the countries to self-assess without needing much funding. We don't have the luxury of funding in the countries. So if we are able to bring that responsibility to the countries and empower them and having a system when they can manage those systems, this is where the PPPO will need agree and out in place a system.

Let's join hands, identify synergies and spend our money where it will be worth in the region.

## 7.5 National Reporting Obligations- Mr. Nilesh Chand, IC Rep.

Mr. Chand outlined the General review of the NROs, Update on NRO activities for 2021 and the NROs work plan for 2022.

He discussed the seven Public Obligations under the Public NROs and the six Bilateral Obligations under the Bilateral NROs. He encouraged all NPPOs to follow these obligations. He also reminded the NPPOs to read the NRO Guide which will describe the obligations that are stated above. This NRO Guide is available on the IPPC website.

Mr. Chand further clarified that there is only one contact point for each contracting party and NPPOs are strongly encouraged to read through the information on e-learning courses. ISPM 8 and 13 provides more detailed guidance on the NRO.

He further discussed the NROs work plan for 2022 and stated that the draft NRO activities for 2023 will be prepared and will be submitted at the end of 2022 however while the activities are currently unfunded and some 2022 activities may be placed on hold, only information on the contact point will be maintained for the time being.

### Questions & Comments

- **Australia:** There are new Heads of the NPPOs in the meeting and Australia have provided word version of the Pest Reporting Template. This is one NRO that is foundational for trade and the POARS work that has been discussed. Australia has made this template PPPO neutral and NPPOs can use and still develop their reports without going online and they can copy and paste whenever they go online.
- **Nilesh-** it is important to provide reports because it is our obligation. The only time you can provide a report is when they are trying to find out something to report. In terms of Phytosanitary, it is some kind of pest species, occurrence, interception, spread and eradication. Once we are trying to identify our normal Phytosanitary activities, it is extremely important to pay attention on surveillance. Because only through surveillance we will be able to provide that level of authentic information that can turn into a report under NRO.
- **PPPO Secretariat:** Secretariat also checks IPP for PPPO members and note that there is a great need for update of those information. The Secretariat can help the NPPOs if they have forgotten or lost their IPPC password
- **Chair:** NPPOs are reminded to read the emails send by the Secretariat and provide the information that is required within the time frame set out. We don't want to miss out on those opportunities that can be beneficial to the countries and the region. This is also a reminder for request of information that would come from the SWP Reps to the IC and SC. These are important emails and it is important that we respond on time.
- **Nilesh-** enquired to the PPPO Secretariat on their support on NROs activities and assistance to the member countries in trying to fulfill their obligation.

**PPPO Secretariat:** We have direct access to the IPP through the PPPO space. Any information that they need to update or upload for the PPPO the secretariat can do that. The 6 fact sheet will be uploaded on the IPP and countries can also get access to that. And also the French version that will be produced later on.

- **Chris:** through the NRO and the updates on new pest detection and incursions, a lot of that information get fed into the broader FAO reporting system and are useful as examples in other work on pests of concern such as FAW. Apart from that the NRO is really important for other focus groups and activities within the IPPC such as Climate Change. Information provided on the NRO will help the focus group on Climate Change work in terms of new pest interception and new host range. The NRO process will support those focus groups and also the pest outbreak alert system. These actions really depend on the NRO. The success of the activities and support of the IPPC and FAO is the result of the NRO.
- **Nilesh-** PLD is very important and NPPOs could use this to authenticate their interceptions which would lead to the NRO

#### **7.6 Emerging pests and Pest Outbreak and Alert Response System (Cases of FAW and Fusarium TR4)- Dr. Chris Dale**

Dr. Dale explained that the work by the FAO/IPPC Technical Working Group on Quarantine and Phytosanitary Measures for Global Action on FAW Control is ongoing. In the region that work is focused on the Solomon Islands.

He further reiterate that FAW isn't stopping and is still moving in the region. The recent detection in NZ demonstrates how it successfully moves over large bodies of water and prevention is an option and the method of mitigation that ultimately prevention preparedness and responses.

Dr. Dale confirmed that there are representatives from the Asian and Pacific region on the Technical Working Group(TWG) for FAW. There have been a number of Webinar series to provide technical advice and expertise around those prevention preparedness and responses activities.

He confirmed that a FAW guideline has been developed which fortunately have been finalized and it coincide with the Solomon Island having their first official FAW protection and they could use that as part of their response and management arrangement

He also explained the second work that they are concentrating on in the IC is Fusarium TR4 activities and its different from the transboundary nature of the disease however a lot of the work that they are doing is consistent to the FAW work around developing prevention preparedness and responses guideline.

Also there is a number of workshops, technical webinars series with experts from all over the world and really looking at the different capacities of countries to be able to regulate and manage the risk of Fusarium TR4 through regulated pathways, natural pathways, emergency response and managing outbreak.

Dr. Dale also stated that emerging pests is the focus of the IPPC and discussion at CPM and that has led to emerging pests being established as a concern. There is the POARS and a lot of work that is happening more at the operational and technical level through TWG.

He further added that the major transboundary pest has been highlighted through FAW but there's a number of transboundary pests of consideration at the global and regional level. Regions are different and we work very closely with the APPPC and land lock countries and countries that share borders with our ocean or island geographies and much harder to contain these pests. It's a whole range of priorities in South East Asia around maize and sugarcane pests. But we do have an advantage within the region that we do have a geographical consideration that support some of our transboundary pest management obligations.

Simply all the work they are doing is focused on FAW and FTR4 but there is the opportunity to extend the scope of work with IPPC more broadly to relevant emerging pests. Dr. Dale confirms that FAW Global Action Plan has been extended which is great and rather recognizing that FAW still presents a real significant impact on production and sustainable farming practices particularly at small farm level throughout the world.

He further added that if anyone has been following the work of the Asean FAW Action Plan which is a really valuable program in the Asean countries through Alison Watson which provides supportive information around bio control management of FAW. Videos and information has been posted recently about FAW. Impact videos in Indonesia, sowing two generations of FAW impacting crops. It is a really significant issue and still a very big priority in the FAO/IPPC. Obviously we are the only region that is free from FAW for most countries but it is still a huge risk to our region

Fortunately, there are still a number of countries that are free of FAW. There are also governance and strategic documents to drive and coordinate the global action and glad that it has been extended for another year.

The TWG has done a lot of work, webinars, guides and all these resources are available on the webpage

Dr. Dale stated that a lot of work has been put into developing the guidelines and this sets the precedence for other guides within the IPPC and that its technical in nature. It's been designed specifically for NPPOs.

He also advised that If you don't have FAW in your country, then you could go through the preparedness. There are workshops, webinars that you can access online and If you get the chance to participate in those workshops the it will be encouraging.

Supporting those resources and reference materials it also beneficial for the countries. FAW is very different to TR4 in terms of surveillance and diagnostics and response. There is the ability to be able to manage, suppress and eradicate TR4 unlike FAW. This assessment is based on the ability of countries to do that.

We have some really good feedback from the region. If you are serious about TR4 preparedness and response capability, I very much encourage you to, similar to NRO, review and provide information back to IPPC. The more feedback we get the more it reflects on the potential to lead the regional project on TR4.

Briefly the review:



We have the FAW TWG- we have done a lot of work and this is an opportunity to look at the coordination of the TWG.

## 7.7 IPPC Commodity Standards: the start and some perspectives-Ms Janka Kiss

Ms. Kiss provided an update on the process of Commodity Standards. The first Commodity Standard was developed this year- 2022 and the next step is to develop the annex which will address specific commodity. These will be commodities that are being moved for trade and the purpose is to identify pests associated with these commodities. It will also provide options to be considered by contracting party. This commodity standard will only provide necessary information with regards to the commodity however no additional obligation will be imposed to importing countries.

She described Commodity Standards as a collection of scientific based information that will be used for conducting a pest risk analysis subject to technical justification.

Furthermore, Commodity Standard is part of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 and currently there is only one topic on the work program of the Technical Panel of the Commodity Standard which the International movement of mango (*Mangifera indica*) fruit which was submitted at the 2021 Call for Topics.

She added that Specification for the annex for this commodity standard is out for consultation and will be ending in August and this will be the opportunity for the region to provide comments.

Ms. Kiss confirmed that there is an open Call for Information on mango fruit that is put out by the TPCS. This is in regard to on any information such as pest risk analysis, phytosanitary measures and any other technical information that can be submitted. This is also a good opportunity for the region to put up any issues on mango that is relevant to the region. This call will close by mid-September

Finally, there will be a call for new topics in 2023 and this is a good opportunity to propose new commodities to be developed into Commodity Standards. PPPO members are encouraged to coordinate and prepare for this event which usually open around May and close in September.

### Questions & Comments

- **Secretariat:** Acknowledge the presentation and agreed that it is good to know about the Call for Topic next year.
- **Kiribati:** enquired if there has been any work done on coconut or copra to be developed in to an annex for Commodity Standard or submitted during a Call for Topics.

**Janka:** this topic has not been submitted yet. The way to progress this is to coordinate regionally to see if this topic is relevant to other countries. The website for Call for Topics contains all the templates and information required in order to propose new topics. Any CP or RPPPO can propose topics and once the templates are filled out, and

following the necessary steps it can be considered to be added in to the Work Program of the Technical Panel for Commodity Standards.

**Sophie:** After the APPPC meeting, discussion about commodity standards for Coconut might be a good target commodity that covered both the Asian and the Pacific regions. It has been raised there but if the region would like to pursue coconut into a Commodity Standards than we have a secondee coming into SPC to assist SPC in the regional standard setting. The Australian Team and the secondee will be able to assist the writing of submission for the Call for Topics similar to that which was done for Safe Aid. We can also get the support of the Asian Region. The we will have the countries of the Pacific and the Asian region support. That support demonstrate that a large proportion of the globe is interested in coconut and it is critical to get through all of the hoops to become an international standard. If the region thinks that it is a priority than we can do that.

## 7.8 The IPPC Observatory- Mr. Nilesh Chand

Mr. Chand provided information on the IPPC Observatory explaining the purpose of this presentation, looking at the rationale, the history

The purpose of the presentation is to create the awareness among IPPC community on the transition of the Implementation Review and Support System(IRSS) to the IPPC Observatory with a clear scope, a suitable name and a sustainably resourced program.

The IRSS has many key achievements and has come a long way since its inception in 2011 with funding by the European Union.

Mr. Chand stated that the rationale for the improvement and transition for the IRSS is the need to clarify the role and the mission of the system within the IPPC community and specify other benefits of the system for the CP and also to empower itself with project based management. The transition is going to be an empowerment process towards a funding model.

He explained that the transition was launched following a request by the IC in 2020 following some of the key stages in order to be inclusive and to collect contributions and recommendations from the Bureau. There is a need for a regular funding system based on budget and donor contributions as well. This plan will also have a communication structure in built as well.

He added that the Observatory will monitor the implementation of IPPC, ISPMs and CPM recommendations. It will identify related challenges and best practices and will provide recommendation to the CPM for further actions. The Observatory is under the oversight of the IC and spearheaded by the dedicated IC sub-group.

Mr. Chand further explained that in order to improve the efficiency for Monitoring and Evaluation, innovative approaches will be implemented for the IPPC general surveys. A periodical mechanism for monitoring and implementation of IPPC and ISPMs will be developed. Any data management system and the communication or study results will be improved.

In addition, communication materials including videos, factsheets, videos identity have been developed and will continue to be improved to mark the work of the IPPC Observatory and to make a better contribution from all contracting parties..

The effectiveness of the Observatory will be closely linked to the involvement of the contracting party through responding to surveys, submitting study proposals and providing resources for the activities of the Observatory.

Mr. Chand added that the contracting party will benefit from this system through the Observatory through its focus on communication and feedbacks with NPPOs to improve their understanding of the system and share the results of the study and the surveys more effectively.

A key development is the replacement of the previous help desk with phytosanitary component pages which allows the contracting party P to have relevant technical resources in terms of ISPM, Guides and contributed resources all compiled together in one place.

Finally, he stated that the main feature of the activities is that it will have the new e-commerce study incorporated, publication of the tri-annual report of the EC Third Cycle project, Implementation of the periodical monitoring of the IPPC, ISPMs and the third general survey as well.

### **Questions & Comments**

**Australia:** IRSS has been confusing and don't understand what types of topics can be asked. When the surveys are sent out, what were the responses like and where do we go on the IRSS to find those report. Some guidance on issues or topics to put forward would be helpful and how the surveys and report are being used.

**IPPC:** The Observatory is not the same thing as the IRSS. The IRSS is starting to go in a certain direction where topics were requested from the IC, SC, the Bureau. There could have been proposals for targeted surveys. General surveys which was supposed to be surveying the level of implementation of the standards and targeted surveys could have done on the specific topics that were problematic in a certain way.

**Australia:** it looks like it's any questions. relating to a standard or a question to understand whether a certain issue on a topic would benefit from the development of a standard or something else could be asked.

**Nilesh:** The observatory is sort of replacing the help desk and you can consult the Observatory for any query and it is also a sub group within the IC. The IRSS has been seen as confusing so the Observatory is trying to resolve that. It is still in its infancy stages and there will be a couple more revisions together with very suitable comments like those that have asked in this forum in order to assist and build up the Observatory as it was addressing needs and requirements.

**Chair:** If issues are common within the region, could the submission of studies by the contracting parties be submitted through the RPPO

**Nilesh-** One of the aims of having the RPPPOs for the secretariat is the enabling mechanism. If the individual signatories (NPPOs) are not able to perform its individual activities, the Secretariat is there to facilitate for the NPPOs. So PPPO members can tap on the assistance of the Secretariat towards the IPPC Secretariat to get information and provide reports and other relevant materials.

## **7.9 Topics of interest for the region**

### **7.9.1 Biosecurity and market access enhancement of the pacific partnership program (NZ)- Dr. Disna Gunawardana**

Dr. Gunawardana made the presentation on the Enhance Pacific Biosecurity Program which is funded by the NZ Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. Plant Health & Environment Laboratory(PHEL) is one of the five (5) executing agencies of this program. She mentioned that PHEL is working with NPPOs in the Pacific- Fiji, Cook Island, Niue, Samoa, Tonga and Vanuatu.

She discussed that the planned output for the program is to enhance the functional capabilities of the countries plant health laboratories, provide support to improve their current surveillance and response systems, develop the diagnostic capacity through the diagnostics manuals, resources materials and PHELdi library, establish the Remote Microscopy Diagnostic(RMD) Systems and enhance the capability in clearance of regulated pathways.

Dr. Gunawardana deliberated on the project overview and also highlight the stakeholders involved and collaborations.

She described methods of capacity development including workshops and training sessions. Field and laboratory program, attachment training and by RMD network and development of diagnostic tools.

She also described the previous assistance given to the countries in the first phase including Fiji, Samoa, Tonga, Solomon Island and Vanuatu. From 2017-2020 Cook Island and Niue had capability development in areas such as pest and diseases diagnostics for exports and imports, surveillance, incursion investigation and resources. Fiji had assistance in Quality Management System(QMS) and also the production of a Fresh Produce Pest and Disease Recognition Manual for Export and a Fresh Produce Pest and Disease Recognition Manual for Import. These manuals can be used in other countries as well.

Dr. Gunawardana mentioned that one of the major outcomes of the program was the setting up of the Molecular laboratory in Fiji and also the training on the molecular workflow. BAF is now capable of conducting molecular diagnostic for their samples.

Between 2020-2021 training has been conducted virtually with BAF alone and factsheets were prepared for surveillance purposes.

Finally, Dr. Gunawardana discussed the project that will run for the 2021-2025 period. This will include Pacific biosecurity officers training where two (2) officers

from each country will be attached in NZ for quarantine inspection training, laboratory/PEQ upgrades, diagnostic tools development and RMD, emerging plant pest risk assessment

## Questions and Comments

- **Tuvalu:** It seems that the training package is only for a few countries but we all need that kind of training especially when we have new staff. Requesting that training can also be extended to Tuvalu.

**PHEL-** request is considered. PHEL will have more discussion and then revert.

- **Tonga:** acknowledged MPI for the assistance which includes Tonga, but did not see PACER PLUS in collaboration. Some of the projects in Tonga are supported by PACER PLUS therefore requesting collaboration to avoid duplication.

**Disna:** Agreed that donors need to be talking to each other so as not duplicate, In the presentation, that is an area that they will need to work on further. They will be looking further into the collaboration with PACER+

- **New Caledonia:** Similar to Tuvalu, New Caledonia is also interested in the training on diagnostic protocol.

**Disna:** had communication with NC already with regards to the program and it is already in the consideration for the opportunity of the project.

- **Cook Island:** acknowledge MPI and MFAT for the assistance.
- **Vanuatu:** acknowledged the team at MPI for the support and a very successful outcome. The technical team has spoken highly of the support especially with the Remote Microscopy Diagnostic tool.
- **PPPO Secretariat:** acknowledged Dr. Disna for presentation. SPC has discussed with Dr. Lalith for the Plant Health Team to take part in the program and to be part of the capacity building. That will work well with the Plant Health lab that is being built.

**Chair:** acknowledgement of the countries in terms of the support being given through the project.

## 7.9.2 Enhanced Pacific Market Access Partnership (EPMAP)- Ms. Karen Pugh

Ms. Pugh provided an overview on the program by the New Zealand Government.

She explained that the Market Access component is driven by the fact that MPI wanted to align its new systems for Import Health Standards(IHS) with Pacific trading partners and therefore aligning the export assurance systems from the trading partners with or new IHS. She said that this also lined up with the NZ government reset Initiative.

She added that the program will run for 5 years and this is still in its first year. Funding for the project comes from the (MFAT) while NZMPI is the implementing agency.

Ms Pugh described the New Pacific Team that will be handling the project and stated that NZMPI has signed a general funding arrangement with SPC. A Project Co-ordinator will be based out with SPC in Fiji who will oversee the project in the region and that will be a dedicated support.

She explained that the project aimed at strengthening the NPPOs in Fiji, Samoa, Tonga, Vanuatu and Cook Islands to help facilitate the effective management of their export assurance system and trying to align with NZMPI IHS and in particular the export plans. Other PICs will benefit from some of these activities and MPI is happy to share any materials that will be developed through this project.

Ms. Pugh further described the 5 outputs of the project as below:

Output 1: Developing a holistic system means looking at the whole value and supply chain and not just the regulatory authority to meet the requirements of importing country. While not only looking at the trade side of things but also other agencies who will be able to determine what the market wants and connect the trade with production.

Output 2: Review of the phytosanitary certificate system using the PCE. Dr Stephen Butcher will be heading this and he will be working with the countries to determine their evaluation and conducting some training and identify where the gaps are in their system, help in coming up with plans in addressing those gaps and look at ways they could obtain funding through donors.

Output 3: Establishing a robust e-operational and GIS information database using Tonga and Fiji as the target countries. Following the NZ export system but creating something similar in the Pacific that will fit into the countries own systems and way of doing things.

Output 4: e-Phyto, NZMPI is contributing towards that with Australia, providing input into that program

Output 5: Subscription into the PPPO costed work plan. There will be a number of consultants taken by SPC to undertake these activities which is part of this project as well.

Ms. Pugh also describe the expected outcome of the project as below:

The long term expected outcome for the project is that countries are able to effectively access and maintain assurance to avoid suspended pathways because of non-compliance. As systems get better and are more aligned to the NZ IHS, new markets can be opened up and maximising the existing markets.

Medium term expected outcomes is for countries to have technical expertise required and to have an effective and consistently managed export assurance system

The short term expected outcomes is to have systems been implemented to develop the export plans for the bilateral quarantine arrangements. Understanding how countries are going to meet their requirements of the IHS. Ensuring that all the parts of the supply chain understand their part in doing that and also to facilitate and improve the capacity across the whole chain. Secondly to improve regional coordination between donors and development agencies in order to have a coordinated approach.

The project also aims to empower the countries through helping with the structures so that countries could build their own system at the completion of the project.

Ms Pugh also discuss the key implementation principles of the project and highlight the work that they have done so far with four countries including Fiji, Samoa, Tonga and Vanuatu. Work with Cook Island will start this year. She also discussed the proposed activities for this year.

MPI has also initiated market research and exploration of market with PHAMA+ and MDF to identify impediments to trade.

### **7.9.3 Presentation on PEP Training Program and PLD from Australia- Ms. Jenny Dunn and Ms. Tara Konarzewski.**

Ms. Konarzewski provided an update on the Pacific Export Operational Pathway (PEP) Training program that was presented to the PPPO in March 2022 along with 6 other programs as part of the Pacific Biosecurity Partnership Program. The PPPO endorsed the continued collaboration and consultation with PPPO countries

She explained that the program is partly funded by Australian Department of Foreign Affairs (DFAT) and the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forest (DAFF)

The program will run for 4 years and this is its 1<sup>st</sup> year.

She further explained that the program was created in response to foreign policy initiative such as the Commonwealth Biosecurity 2030 Roadmap. Project is on collaboration with the BAF, SPC, PHAMA+, DAFF and DFAT and managed by the International Capacity Development Section as part of the Australia Chief Plant Protection Office.

Ms. Konarzewski identified that the significant challenge for all countries is to sustain operational capacity and capability. Project aims to create an effective ongoing training program to build capacity and capability and learn export pathway from farm to importing countries, The training packages is consistent with international and regional standards.

The PEP consist of 7 modules and has been designed in three phases. The content was designed for participants at the operational level and also for future facilitators including a training manual. The training packages is being designed to be tailored by a facilitator to match the audience and pathway requirement.

Each phase (Introductory, Technical or Management) is designed to be delivered independently.

Ms Konarzewski outlined in brief the seven projects output modules. She stated that the training package is tailored to the export pathway of countries in the Pacific and include various commodities including taro corms and leaves, fresh leafy vegetables, papaya, ginger, chillies and capsicum. The training package can focus on a single pathway or multiple commodity pathway, new pathways or a combination of new and existing pathway. The training package will focus on high risk pathways rather than low risk processed commodities such as frozen commodities.

Ms. Dunn continued the presentation describing the piloting of the project in Fiji in June 2022 with participants from different stakeholders such as Exporters, Treatment providers, Ministry of Agriculture, SPC and PHAMA Plus. The participants also took part in



practical activities and visited packing facilities. Since the practical activities were well received by the participants, practical activities and site visits will be part of the training program to reinforce whatever is learnt from the program.

Participants tried out the BICON e-learning however after the pilot activity, e-learning was deemed to be not desirable therefore e-learning will be removed.

Ms Dunn also outlined the outcomes of the pilot session stating that the pilot presented the opportunity such as collaboration with experts working on export pathways in country and build relationship through face to face interactions.

Ms. Konarzewski outlined the next steps which will include reviewing the training materials, incorporating feedbacks from the pilot and conducting the full training program in Fiji by the end of 2022.

#### **7.9.4 Pest List Database- Dr. Visoni Timote**

Dr. Timote presented a brief presentation on the upgrade of the Pest List Database. He stated this is a collaborative work with the DAFF and that a Request for Quotation(RFQ) has been sent out on the 9 of May, 2022. A total of 7 applicants were received and went through internal evaluation after which IT consultant ACTON was selected. It is expected that the upgrade will be completed by January 2023.

Dr. Timote also presented a brief Digital Transformation Proposal and project work plan snap shot by ACTON. He further discusses the 5 key milestone of this project which runs from the contract sign off date to the handing over of the final product.

As PPPO Secretariat, Dr Timote acknowledged the support of NZMPI and DAFF for the continued support through the projects.

#### **7.9.5 Regional Standard setting- Dr. Sophie Peterson**

Dr. Peterson provided a brief update on the regional standards setting. By way of background, she stated that she was asked to developed a Regional Standards Setting process for the region in the last face to face ExCo meeting in 2020. That has been developed and will go to the ExCo 2022 and finally be submitted to the full PPPO Board Meeting in late October 2022 for adoption.

She explained the way forward that countries need to be thinking about after the adoption is to start developing regional standards and that would mean having a PPPO Standards Committee.

She added that there are two (2) requests as below:

1. Think about what topics might be important or relevant to the region as opposed to international, that may be addressed in a regional standard. Countries are requested to identify any staff who would be nominated for the PPPO Standards Committee.
2. There are already three (3) topics that will be discussed by the Regional Standard Setting Committee and NPPOs are encouraged to think of other topics. The three (3) topics include:



- the Provision of Safe Aid-noting that we are trying to get an ISPM for that but that would be steps away
- the movement of sand and gravel: there is a draft document for this.
- the movement of handicraft through the region.

## Question & Comments

- **Kiribati:** enquired if there is a limit to the topics that can be submitted.

**Sophie:** there is no limit to the topic but the committee will have to prioritise. Some topics may be of higher priority or may have more information available to develop a standard more quickly. The standards setting committee will have to decide on how to make that list. Some topics can even be combined therefore countries are encouraged to come up with the topics,

- **Chair:** this is a big step forward for the PPPO to be able to set our own standards and have ownership of it. The PPPO constitution stipulated this and although this has been discussed over the years, we have not managed to do that. This is also a good time for new Heads of NPPOs who are joining us and will take the PPPO forward to be part of PPPO milestones like this. Similarly, the PPPO had made that commitment in the last PPPO ExCo meeting. 7.9 CPM Focus group on Safe Aid- Dr. Sophie Peterson

Dr. Peterson provided a brief update on Safe Aid. A proposal was submitted to the SC and IC during the 2022 CPM to have a focus group on the Provision of Safe Aid since the proposal for an ISPM to be developed was not approved.

A call was put out for members of the focus group and three members who answered the call from the region were all approved. The regional member of the focus group consists of 2 from Vanuatu and 1 from Samoa. In addition to that Dr. Chris Dale represents the IC while Dr. Sophie Peterson represents the SC therefore the region is strongly represented in this focus group.

While there would be virtual meetings, a workshop is also being earmarked for next year and countries are requested to provide any information, issues, concerns or example of introduced diseases to the region that could help the focus group.

## Questions & Comment

- **Fiji:** Biosecurity Authority of Fiji was invited to a regional meeting organized by the International Red Cross Society. One of the topics of discussion was Aid During an Emergency. It was noted that representatives who came from the region all came from the National Disaster Management Offices therefore it would be a perfect forum to introduce the proposal on the Provision of Safe Aid that is being made so that each NDMO is aware of this requirement.

**Sophie:** suggested that Fiji is to be the link to this forum and in creating the awareness with regards to the Provision of Safe Aid.

- **Tuvalu:** asked as to why the proposal for an ISPM was not approved enquiring whether there was something wrong with the proposal.

**Sophie:** There was nothing wrong with our submission. The issue was that the Task Force for Topics determined that a standard was either easy to produce or the way that the topic should be through the IPPC. The proposal was put for a standard but the taskforce transferred it to be a CPM recommendation and that was developed and adopted 2 years ago. The proposal was put in again during the next Call for Topics stressing that the region feels that it should be developed in to a standard. This was supported by other RPPOs such as the Asian, Caribbean, a couple of African nations. It may be a difficult topic but that doesn't mean that the PPPO stops. That's why we have the focus group to gather information. It is not a failure on the submission but it is just a big topic that covers, plant health, animal health and human health and trying to maintain the scope of the IPPC but providing the support for the countries need is a bit difficult to manage.

**Australia:** the focus group has to look at what the impediments are on this complex topic and see what the solutions are. The focus group will provide a vehicle to build further interesting awareness on the topic. With so many focus groups, it will be difficult to get sufficient interest to have focus groups participants but the topic has the focus group now. Suggested to have an international workshop with donor agencies to help build awareness and support for the topic regardless of whether the standard will be progressed or not.

- **Chair:** if we do have those opportunities in the countries to attend those workshops or awareness program that we share the message with them and to align them with the work of the focus group at the region and international level and also provide that information to the PPPO and those that representing us at the IPPC space.
- **Chris:** this is an important topic personally to me. One of the biggest biosecurity issue that is impacting the production and provision of safe food aid across the district of Timor is khapra beetle (*Trogoderma granarium*) and it is also impacting on trade and market access opportunities and will do for a long time. There is a lot of relevant case studies around the provision of safe food aid. We also talk about contaminated pests and hitchhiker pest associated with containers and regulated items.

The relief work done in Tonga was also a good example of coordinated effort and keeping in mind the risks of safe food and humanitarian aid. DFAT has done a lot of work on humanitarian aid across the region with inputs by our IC reps but hoping that there will be consideration later on for biosecurity risks. Suggesting that information could be passed on to other donor agencies such as USAiD and further on to STDF when the opportunity arises.

- **Tonga:** had issues when the rules are coming from PM's office rather than biosecurity office and overstep the protection that Biosecurity is trying to do. Requesting that meetings such as these create the awareness to higher level on the importance of safe aid. The political decisions always overrule biosecurity reasoning.
- **Chair:** the PPPO will take note of Tonga's experience to help us moving forward on how to implement the Provision of Safe Aid,

#### 7.9.6 Closing Remarks- Mr. Peter Thompson, SWP CPM Rep.

Mr. Thompson acknowledged the participants of the hard work during 3 days meeting and hoped that the aims of the meeting have been achieved.

He stated that he will be reporting on the meeting and the issues achieved so far during CPM meeting next week and. The CPM Bureau have a real strong interest in knowing that all CP have a good understanding of the activities that are happening in the IPPC, the activities that are being carried by Secretariat, the activities being done through the IC and SC. Not only that they understand the activities but can also make inputs into guides and steer the work done so it can benefit us all as CP. We have the mantra- We are the IPPC- for so many year and it will be more true if we stand up and be a part of it. The basis for my gratitude that you have made the time to be in the meeting and have your voice heard.

He encouraged members to bring in their issues and raise them during the meeting so that it can be heard and addressed. He looks forward to the issues raised during this meeting.

#### Questions & Comments

- **Chair:** acknowledged the leadership by Mr. Thompson for PPPO and stated that there are new Heads of NPPPO in the meeting who will be part of PPPO.
- **Fiji-** on behalf of the PPPO members acknowledged Mr. Thompson for his guidance leadership and support and managed to discuss issues,
- **SWP CPM Rep:** it is a privilege to be PPPO representative. He is honored to be able to receive a comment or question specific for the region. In the last few years the PPPO has reached new heights in the level influence and to those who have been participating in the different meetings have been speaking up for issues that matter to us. The PCE tool have been supported by other countries because you have all spoken up and for that he is grateful.

#### 7.9.7 Climate change (including seeking advice/input from members for Visoni Timote's presentation to the IPHC on climate change in the region.

Dr. Visoni presented a draft presentation that he will be presenting at the upcoming International Plant Health Conference in London on the 21-23 Sept 2022. The presentation will be on the Climate Change and its Impact on Plant Health.

The presentation portrays examples from the region however he is still waiting for more example from the region to be part of the presentation. Countries are requested to send in inputs if they have not submitted their examples to the Secretariat.

#### Questions & Comments

- **Vanuatu:** impact of climate change contributes to pest re-emergence or virulence. Although there is no report in Vanuatu to confirm this finding but visually it is evident and a good example is *Oryctis centaurus*, a CRB species that was recorded so many years ago. There has never been any sign or symptoms of its damage however, recently it re-emerges with clear aggressive symptoms (not as destructive or damaging as CRB-S and CRB-G though).

Another example is *Phytophthora* root rot on citrus (oranges) on Aniwa Island - an island close to Tanna. Oranges is the main source of income for this island and it's a flat island with low water table. During heavy rain as with recent climate change impact, *Phytophthora* activity rises since *Phytophthora* is an Oomycete and it needs water to swim and infect roots.

It has been noted also that after Vanuatu experiences a cyclone there would be an increase of established pest.

- **Chris:** there is a great opportunity from the region to provide a really provide leadership and good case study in the IPHC and the plenary session. There has been good regional coordination with Secretariat and the focus group. The role of chair of the focus group is to bring together the technical experts across the IPPC and the region to coordinate and facilitate activities that have been identified under the action plan. This presentation is a real opportunity to highlight some of the immediate and force risk around climate change.

It's not only the movement of transboundary pest that are affected by climate change such as FAW and other pest of that nature but also on IPM on biocontrol like parasitoid and host range. So the region has a really good opportunity to showcase the work that is happening in the region but also to provide that opportunity for potential donors at the conference noting that the Pacific region is very vocal about climate change.

Some of those donor will support the PPPO in implementing a number of climate change research through Research, Development & Extension or supporting NPPOs or the region directly.

- **Tuvalu:** suggested to add tidal waves damage to plants and salinity of water on the topic of effects climate change on atoll islands.

## **Agenda 8: Conclusion of the workshop/ Date and Venue of the Next Meeting**

Next meeting venue will be **Cook Islands** and the backup venue will be **Samoa**.

The next meeting will be for 5 days on the 23-27 August 2023.

## **Agenda 9 Online survey of the workshop**

## **Agenda 10: Adoption of the Report (Procedure to be decided)**

Samoa moved that the draft report be adopted and seconded by Vanuatu.

1<sup>st</sup> draft to be submitted on the **10<sup>th</sup> September, 2022**

## Question & Comment

- **New Caledonia**- enquiring whether the report will be translated to French.

**Secretariat:** the report will be given to their office in New Caledonia for translation and the report can be available in French as well.

..... END .....

