



Pacific  
Community  
Communauté  
du Pacifique

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

**2021 THEME: IYPH LEGACY**

**VIRTUAL**

**31<sup>ST</sup> AUGUST-3<sup>RD</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2021**

## Key Speakers

1. **Mr. Peter Thompson**. South West Pacific (SWP) Bureau Representative to the Commission of Phytosanitary Measures (CPM)
2. **Ms. Natsumi Yamada**. International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Rome, Italy
3. **Dr. Sophie Peterson**. Department of Agriculture, Water and Environment, Canberra, Australia, SC member for South West Pacific (SWP) Region.
4. **Dr. Joanne Wilson, Principal Adviser**, Animal & Plant Health Directorate, Biosecurity New Zealand - Ministry for Primary Industries - Wellington, New Zealand . SC member South West Pacific.
5. **Dr Yubak Dhoj GC**, Senior Agriculture Officer (Plant Protection). Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO)
6. **Dr. Disna Gunawardana**, Principal Scientist (Entomology) | Plant Health & Environment Laboratory, Diagnostic and Surveillance Services (DSS) | Biosecurity New Zealand - Ministry for Primary Industries - New Zealand
7. **Mr. Chris Dale Assistant Director**, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health, Australian Chief Plant Protection Office, Australian Department of Agriculture, Water and Environment
8. **Ms Aurelia Chan**, Chief Plant Protection Officer - NPPO contact point, Biosécurité department, New Caledonia
9. **Mr. Pere Kokoa**, CPPO/ NPPO – NAQIA, Papua New Guinea (PNG).
10. **Mr. Nilesh Chand**, Chief Plant Protection Officer, Biosecurity Authority of Fiji, Suva, Fiji.
11. **Dr. Visoni Timote**, Executive Secretary of the Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) / Integrated Programme Coordinator Biosecurity and SPS. Pacific Community (SPC) Land Resources Division (LRD). Suva, Fiji.

## WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO) member countries held a virtual workshop to review eight International Standards on Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs), one draft standards and a draft Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) recommendation.

The meeting was officially opened by the CPM Bureau member for South West Pacific, Mr. Pete Thompson and in his opening address reiterated and applauded the tremendous effort to stay connected despite the global pandemic. He also stressed the importance of being able to reset through embracing and fully value the PPPO history, legacy and achievements. Similarly he also urged the members to know who they are and their responsibilities nationally and regionally.

The meeting opened with updates from the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) activities including updates from the CPM Bureau, Standards Committee (SC), Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)

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

- i) Revision of ISPM 4: *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002*
- ii) Use of Specific Import Authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20- *Guidelines for a Phytosanitary import regulatory system (2008-006)*
- iii) Revision of ISPM 18: Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure(2014-007
- iv) 2021-2020 amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms- (1994-001)*
- v) *Focused Revision of ISPM 12 I relation to re-export (2015-011*
- vi) Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008).
- vii) Audits in the Phytosanitary context.

Furthermore, the meeting discussed the Fall Army Worm Status in the region, Regional Pest Surveillance (early detection) System, Understanding the Role of a Competent Authority, Discussion on the Region's Plant health priorities, International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) Legacy, National Reporting Obligations, Call for Topics, safe Food Aid and the Sea Container procedure and requirement for inspection.

## **Recommendations for Action:**

The forum agreed to the following:

- i) PPPO Secretariat is to take the lead role in the establishment of a Regional Technical Working Group on Fall Army Worm. This is to be a priority action. This action has the full support of the Land Resource Division of SPC.
- ii) The priorities list for 2019 is still relevant and request the Secretariat to continue to work on these priorities.
- iii) SC member Dr. Sophie Peterson agreed to submit request for observers and NPPOs can contact her directly or through the Secretariat.
- iv) PPPO members are also encourage to sit in as observers at the CPM meeting and NPPOs can contact the representative or the PPPO secretariat.
- v) NPPOs are invited to take up the opportunity to be an observer during the CPM meetings and could contact the PPPO Secretariat or the representatives.
- vi) PPPO members agreed that since the participants cannot view the comments put forward by members, the PPPO Secretariat is to compile all comments and send them to each NPPO enabling them to view comments put up by other NPPOs and to comment accordingly.
- vii) PPPO members also agreed that the PPPO Secretariat could put in a regional comment once individual NPPOs have sent in their approvals or comments to the Secretariat.
- viii) Secretariat is to disseminate the information shared by Dr. Yubak to the members of the PPPO.
- ix) The PPPO Secretariat is to ensure that the Work Plan also states the timelines and deliverables to ensure that all activities are monitored. The PPPO Work Plan is to be circulated for those who are not able to access it.
- x) A lot of work has been done on FAW in the region, it is therefore agreed that FAW management should also be on the regions plant health priority list.
- xi) Fiji raised that an alternative to methyl bromide treatment is the priority in the region. The PPPO members agreed to this and the Secretariat is advised to note Fiji's input and its requirement.
- xii) Broader work on Fruit fly needs to be identified as priority and members are encouraged to submit this in their priority list. Areas such as farm management or surveillance program could be raised.
- xiii) PPPO members are encouraged to submit their priority lists after the meeting through email to he Secretariat given that all priorities could not be heard,

## Table of Contents

<b>Prayer, Acknowledgement of Country and Welcome.</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Welcome Remarks:</b>	<b>7</b>
1.2.1 International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat	7
1.2.2 Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Regional Office	7
1.2.3 Chairperson- Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)- Dr.Glen Dulla	8
1.2.4 Commission on Phytosanitary Measure (CPM) Bureau Member- Mr Peter Thompson	8
1.2.5 Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) Sub-Regional Office	9
<b>Agenda 2 : Update on Governance and Strategic Issues</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 Governance and Strategy- CPM Bureau Member, South West Pacific (SWP) Mr. Peter Thompson	10
2.2 Update from Standards Committee(SC)- Dr Sophie Peterson/ Ms Joanne Wilson/ Mr David Tenakanai	10
2.3 Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) - Mr Dominique Pellier	12
<b>Agenda 3: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Revision of ISPM 4 (Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas) (2009-002)	13
3.2 Use of specific import authorizations (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006)	15
3.3 Revision of ISPM 18 (Guidelines for the use irradiation as a phytosanitary measure(2014-007).	17
3.4 2021&2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)	19
3.5 Focused Revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011)	22
3.6 Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008).	23
• Scope-Technical comment by New Zealand	23
3.7 Audits in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014)	25
3.8 CPM recommendation on contaminating pests	29
<b>Agenda 4 : Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs</b>	<b>30</b>
4.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities	30
4.2 Topics of interest for the region	30
4.2.1 FAO/IPPC AW Technical Working Group (TWG)	30
4.2.2 Regional pest surveillance (early-detection) system	31
4.2.2.1 Plant Health and Environment Laboratory (PHEL – Dr Disna	31
4.2.2.2 Regional pest surveillance (early-detection) system - Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)-PPPO Secretariat	32
4.2.3 Understanding the role of a Competent authority- CPM Bureau Member- Mr. Peter Thompson	33
4.2.4 Region's Plan Health Priorities – ensure those agreed in 2019 are still relevant.	34
<b>Agenda 5: Moving together from ideas to action</b>	<b>36</b>
5.1 International Year Plant Health (IYPH) Legacy- Natsumi Yamada	36
5.2 National Reporting Obligations(NRO)- Chris Dale	36
5.3 2021 Call for topics: Standards and Implementation- Joanne Wilson	37
5.3.1 PPPO submission on Provision of Safe Aid- Ms Aurelia Chan	38
5.3.2 Region's Plan Health Priorities- Other topics being proposed by members	38
5.4 Sea Containers- Procedures and Requirement for Inspection.- Nilesh Chand	39
5.5 Remarks on Fall Army Worm in the Solomon Islands	40

<b>Agenda 6: Conclusion of the workshop-.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Agenda 7: Online Survey of the Workshop.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Agenda 8: Adoption of the Report adoption covers agreed action items, way forward and recommendations .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Agenda 9: Closing Remarks- CPM Bureau Member SWP –Mr. Pete Thompson.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Agenda 11: Close of Meeting.....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>END OF MEETING.....</b>	<b>42</b>

## **Agenda 1: Opening of the Session**

### **Prayer, Acknowledgement of Country and Welcome.**

The Chair opened the meeting with a prayer. National Plant Protection Organisation (NPPO) Australia acknowledged and paid respects to the elders and the traditional custodian of all the land that have gathered in this meeting.

On behalf of the Chairperson for Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO), Deputy Chairperson (NPPO New Zealand) welcomed

- The country heads of each National Plant Protection Organisation (NPPO) and PPPO delegates,
- Representatives to the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC),
- Representative for the South West Pacific (SWP) to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau.
- Standard Committee (SC) members
- Implementation Capacity Development Committee (IC) members
- PPPO Secretariat

The IPPC Secretariat informed that English-French interpreters were provided for this meeting with financial support from the IPPC Secretariat, which was provided based on the future contributions of the PPPO Secretariat for interpreters.

### **Welcome Remarks:**

#### **1.2.1 International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat**

The Covid-19 pandemic has disrupted and changed the way normal life is conducted. Despite all the difficulties, the IPPC continued to make success through the protection of plant health and guarantee the right to food for everyone especially those who are suffering by the global crisis. Plant pests and disease spread widely as any other virus and the devastating effects of their spread can be quite visible. Prevention is always the key to any outbreak.

The importance of phytosanitary regulations and standards has been vitally recognised by the International community. The extension of the International Year of Plant Health, and the steps already taken to establish an International Day of Plant Health has proven the enthusiasm of the global phytosanitary community.

The new IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 has set new priority actions for plant health over the next decade and provided yet another exceptional forum for sharing of ideas, cooperation and working together.

#### **1.2.2 Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Regional Office**

Plants are under an increasing threat from pests and disease. Every year plant pests and disease leaves millions of people facing hunger and severely damages agriculture, which is the primary income source of rural communities. FAO recognizes the critical role that plant health plays in the journey to prevent hunger and malnutrition, reduce poverty, protect the environment and initiate economic development. The emphasis remains on prevention, protecting plants from pests and diseases that is far more cost effective than dealing with full blown plant health emergencies. The launch of the pioneering Global Action for Fall Army Worm Control as an urgent response to the rapid spread of the pest demonstrated how international trade and the ecological system is impacted by plant pests and diseases.

Disruption caused by Covid 19 also impacted the ability of national biosecurity agencies in the region to prepare, respond and manage current and emerging agricultural biosecurity threats. It was important that Pacific regional food security cluster identify sustainable pest management strategies, and robust functioning biosecurity systems as one of the key pillars for Food Security and Nutrition, and the Pacific Humanitarian Response Plan for COVID-19.

Through a long-standing partnership with SPC, FAO is also committed to building national and regional capacity of biosecurity legislation and assist member countries in meeting the obligations of international agreements, including the adoption of biosecurity legislation that complies with the requirements and standards of the IPPC. Furthermore, the FAO office in the Pacific stands ready to support the countries in building a thriving agriculture sector in the region.

### **1.2.3 Chairperson- Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)- Dr. Glenn Dulla**

The Chairperson of the PPPO welcomed the distinguished guests present in this meeting, the CPM Bureau member for SWP, the SC and IC members. It has always been the experience of the PPPO that the knowledge and expertise that they bring into the workshop had seriously guided the PPPO through its objectives. Similarly, they have always had the health the Pacific in mind.

The next few days presents an opportunity to move the agenda of the PPPO forward. This will also include the continuation of the hard work that the working group has initiated in the draft standard for the provision of Safe Aid. The PPPO will also have the opportunity to discuss the Pacific outreach and education that is done though the region, and the extended year of The International Year Of Plant Health. The PPPO will once again lend collective voices to these international standards that impact our agricultural trade facilitation so greatly.

The talanoa sessions is greatly appreciated and the PPPO family fully support it as it maintains connection during these uncertain times with each session raising the bar about regional biosecurity contents. Through the talanoa sessions also come changes where colleagues moved on, retired or sadly passed away but again new faces are welcomed into the PPPO family. The drive to stay focused, connected, informed and prepared is greatly admired. It is with the same drive that the PPPO family will engage to achieve the objectives within the next few days.

In closing, the background work by the PPPO Secretariat team leading up to today's meeting is acknowledged and the Chairperson wishes everyone a wonderful and productive regional workshop.

### **1.2.4 Commission on Phytosanitary Measure (CPM) Bureau Member- Mr Peter Thompson**

The SWP representative to the CPM Bureau acknowledged the presence of the Chairperson and members of the PPPO, members of the PPPO executive committee, country participants, members of the PPPO board, Executive Secretary for the PPPO and members of the Secretariat. Members of the IPPC Secretariat, and their representatives to the Standards Committee and Implementation, Capacity and Development Committee.

The PPPO was also applauded for the tremendous effort given in order to stay connected and informed highlighting the talanoa sessions as a wonderful addition to its engagement across the region. Despite the challenges faced across the region, the PPPO has managed to be flexible in recognizing the challenges that is currently faced by all.

PPPO members were encouraged on three important points that they need to focus on during the meeting and in the coming year:



The importance of being able to reset through embracing and fully value PPPO history, legacy and achievements that were made in the past. There is a need to adapt to the new environment, continue to attempt some of the previous issues and reset to ensure better work performance in this current environment. Whether it is working as NPPOs or PPPO, there is a need to find new ways so that responses to changes and challenges can be achieved through proactive responsibility in order to stay relevant. Resetting is not easy and requires real willingness to walk forward into a bit of uncertain future.

To know who they are and their responsibilities, firstly as a competent authority in each country, as PPPO and as IPPC. Being a competent authority is one of the primary roles of the NPPO. They are not just another government agency but the only agency in the country that covers biosecurity issues and any decisions made as a competent authority can make real difference for each country. Similarly, the PPPO has a unique role that can add a unique value to the region. It will be good as part of its reset to reflect again on the unique position and the value this position brings to the region. A Secretariat that is supported by competent authorities can make a huge difference for the region both in terms of biosecurity and economic growth. Finally with all contracting parties making up the IPPC and representing the IPPC in the region, each member can make a real difference. Members can be highly influential in the IPPC setting work programs and influencing standards. Each views are just as important as any other country in the IPPC.

1. The PPPO and the SWP can continue to prove that despite being small and at the bottom of the world it is a force to be reckoned with at the world stage. This was evident at the CPM last year when the members of the Pacific family spoke up and expressed without reservation the Pacific intentions regarding safe aid, safe food which was supported by the rest of the world. That scene can happen again if the Pacific is willing to stand up as equals on that stage. The CPM adopted 8 priority development areas and some of those areas will be important to the Pacific. The PPPO needs to determine how to move forward on these development agenda and influence the rest of the world to focus on them. Additionally, the PPPO needs to figure out what is important and decide how to influence those issues.

Finally, the ISPMs that will be reviewed during the workshop were developed by the members and they provide an important leveling playing field for harmonized regulation for trade and safe trade and for biosecurity protection. This is one of those opportunities to influence those standards therefore each country situations must be reflected in this review. This is also an opportunity for the members to view the already familiar standard from a different view.

#### **1.2.5 Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) Sub-Regional Office**

The FAO Sub-Regional Office welcomed Dr Glen Dulla, Chairman of PPPO, Dr Peter Thompson the representative of the SWP to the CPM Bureau, IPPC Secretary, PPPO Secretariat, members and the participants.

In the past few years, the CPM decided to change the purposes of the IPPC regional workshops to include three (3) objectives, which will be used in this workshop:

- To learn and exchange knowledge on how to analyze draft ISPMs
- To build the phytosanitary capacity and raise awareness on activities related with the IPPC
- To exchange national experiences at the regional level.

This reorganized IPPC regional workshops is a forum for exchange of ideas and feedback. Those new ways of operating allow the IPPC secretariat to get a better understanding of the NPPOs concerned and to promote the synergies and collaborations between all interested parties.

## Agenda 2 : Update on Governance and Strategic Issues

### 2.1 Governance and Strategy- CPM Bureau Member, South West Pacific (SWP)- Mr. Peter Thompson

**There are three (3) Strategic Objectives:** Enhancing Global Food Security, Protecting the Environment, Facilitating Safe Trade for Development.

**Core Activities:** Standard Setting, Implementation and Capacity Development, Communication and International Cooperation, Trade Facilitation/ePhyto

**CPM Decisions- Governance (1)-** Two important decisions were made:

- Adoption of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030. Also referred to as the eight (8) development agenda items
- Adoption of the 11 Standards (4 ISPMs, & PTs) and 1 CPM Recommendation on Food Aid.

**CPM Decision: Governance (2) Establishment of Three (3) Focus Groups:**

- Implementation of IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030 Development Agenda
- Climate Change and Plant Pests
- Communication

There are representatives from the region in each of the focus groups.

**CPM Decision: Governance (3)**

Agreed to establish an electronic mechanism where CPM bureau can continue during this difficult time of COVID. The bureau will continue to take decisions that might usually have been taken by the CPM. Significant they will seek the agreement of members electronically

**Communication Focus Group:**

To develop a new IPPC Communications Strategy 2022-2030.

**CPM Decision: International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) Legacy**

- Agree to establish or modify the advisory body that was helping to prepare IYPH to prepare for the First International Plant Health Conference. There is a call now for countries to volunteer to be the host of the first International Health Conference, 2022.
- Support the process to establish a new International Day of Plant Health on 12 May every year and encourage contracting parties to support the proposal for the establishment however this will await the final decision by the United Nations.

**CPM Decisions: International Cooperation & Networks**

Support the request that the agenda of the next Strategic Planning Group (SPG) to include considerations of the extent of involvement of the Plant Health in the One Health Approach together with Animal Health and Human Health.

*Full Presentation on :*

### 2.2 Update from Standards Committee (SC)- Dr Sophie Peterson/ Dr Joanne Wilson/ Mr David Tenakanai

**Memberships**

- There are a total of twenty five (25) SC members with three (3) representatives from the SWP.

**Meetings**

- The SC have been meeting virtually but more frequent than the normal timetable and have provided updates to the PPPO through the talanoa sessions. Written reports are also available on the shared website for all members

- SC had allowed silent observers from NPPOs and RPPOs to sit in during these virtual meetings.

### **Decisions**

- Despite the limitation by the Covid-19 pandemic, the SC has managed to make 31 e-decisions through the SC e-decision portal.
- The SC agreed to seven (7) ISPMs and one (1) specification for the first round of consultation and also 9 ISPMs or draft documents for the second round of consultation.
- Recent work was done on addressing a list of topics for the SC as well as the Working Groups for all Technical Panels particularly for the SC since there is a call for topics this year.
- The SC added subjects to the Technical Panel for the Glossary Work Program and revised the work program to the Technical Panel for Diagnostic Protocols.
- Some draft phytosanitary treatments were removed from the Work Program with the Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatments because they were either outdated or there was insufficient information for them to proceed.

### **Draft ISPMs for First Consultation to be revised during the workshop**

- Draft Specification- *Reorganization of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)*
- Revision of ISPM 18 (*Requirement for the Use of Irradiation as a phytosanitary measure (2014-007)*), Priority 1.
- 2021 amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms (1994-001)*). Priority 1.
- Revision of ISPM 4 (*Requirements for the establishments of pest free areas (2009-002)*) Priority 4.
- Annex -*Use of specific import authorization (2006-006)* to ISPM 20 (Guidelines for the phytosanitary import regulatory system Priority 4.
- Draft Diagnostic Protocol- *Candidatus Liberibacter spp. on Citrus spp (2004-010)* Priority 2.
- Draft Phytosanitary Treatment- *Irradiation treatment for treatment for Pseudococcus jackbeardslevi (2017-027)*

### **Draft ISPMs for Second Consultation to be revised during the workshop.**

- Commodity- based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008) Priority 1.
- 2019 & 2020 Amendments of ISPM 5 (1994-001) Priority 1.
- Focused Revision of ISPM 12 ('re-export') (2015-011) Priority 2.
- Audit in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014) Priority 2.

### **Draft Phytosanitary Treatment to be revised during the workshop**

- Irradiation treatment for *Tortricidae* on fruits (207-011) Priority 1.
- Cold Treatment for *Bactrocera zonata* on *Citrus sinensis* (2017-013) Priority 1
- Irradiation treatment for *Sternonchelus frigidus* (2017-036) Priority 2.
- Irradiation treatment for *Zeugodacus tau* (2017-0256) Priority 2.
- Vapour heat- modified atmosphere treatment for *Cydia pomonella* and *Grapholita molesta* in fruit of *Malus pumila* and *Prunus persica* (2017 037/038) Priority 3.

### **Future SC Work**

The SC will continue to oversee the full technical panels that do a lot of the work in drafting diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments and glossary returns and also when the new technical panel for commodity standards is established, they will develop standards under the new concept standards.

The SC will continue to work in line with the IPPC Strategic Framework ensuring that its work supports the objectives of the framework. There will be continue collaboration with the IC and its subgroups

There will be continued revision of ISPMs via OCS and discussions and decisions electronically

*Full presentation on :*

## **2.3 Update from Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)- Mr Dominique Pellier**

### **Membership**

There are twelve (12) members of the IC consisting of seven (7) regional reps and five (5) experts. Two (2) are representatives from the SC and the RPPOs and the help with the implementation of the IPPC as well as its standards.

### **Meetings**

The IC had nine (9) regional virtual meetings over the last year and six (6) in 2021 till to date.

### **List of Topics**

- The IC works on the list of topics that originate from the call for topics and is maintained by the secretariat. Priority of the list is reviewed once a year to ensure that it still reflects the need of the contracting party. IC adjusts priorities and recommends deletion to the CPM. Once that list is approved by the CPM and posted on the IPP it becomes high priority to the IC.
- Six (6) specifications are still under development and undergoing country consultations while four( 4) are high priority topics which are awaiting resources and funding for it to proceed.

### **QR Codes**

This facility provides an easier way to find information drawing the attention to the Guides and Training Materials that were published last year and the ones that are under development. Similarly, it's easier to find specific items and systems where standards and capacity development material are at the same location on the IPP.

### **Updates of Program**

- **National Reporting Obligations Program (NRO)**

Updated values of pest status according to new ISPM 8 on the IPP. The team have had five (5) virtual meetings and the sub-groups have been activated.

- **Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)**

IC approved a PCE Strategy for 202-2030 and there is a dedicated webpage to provide information.

- **Sea Containers Task Force (SCTF)**

CPM adopted a more focused work program to assist the SCTF in reaching conclusions including a revision of CPM recommendation, an international workshop or maybe a ISPM

- **e-Commerce Program**

There is an ongoing informal network of e-Commerce experts and increase collaboration with key stakeholders such as World Customs Organization (WCO), Universal Postal Union (UPS) and other stakeholders involved in e-Commerce. There is an e-Commerce

that is still underdeveloped where the outline of the guide was out for consultation last year.

- **Implementation Review & Support System (IRSS)**

The IC was established to monitor the implementation of the convention, and this was done through running surveys and studies to try to understand the state of implementation or certain aspect of the convention

- **Global Plant Health Surveillance Program**

The Surveillance component page on the IPP has been completed while the Revision of the Plant Pest Surveillance Guide will be available soon.

- **Implementation & Capacity Development Home Page**

More information, additional resources and materials are available on the home page and countries are invited to look at the guides that are available on the home page. Similarly, countries are encouraged to liaise with the regional representative and make comments and queries and the IC will ensure that each voice is heard.

## **Agenda 3: Discuss substantive comments on draft standards and recommendations.**

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

#### **Introduction**

New information and guidance have become available including new ISPMs on pest free areas that resulted in the need to revise this standard. ISPM 6- *Surveillance* and ISPM 8 *Determination of pest status in an area* were recently revised and both standards are related to ISPM 4 via requirements on pest surveillance and information needed for determining pest status. The revised draft ISPM 4 describes specific requirements for establishment and maintenance of pest free areas including surveillance and pest status determination.

*Full presentation on:*

#### **-General Comment :**

**-New Zealand-** Regarding consistency of terminology used throughout the document. For instance, the use of phytosanitary measure when it is actually a system. The working group or steward should differentiate phytosanitary measures, phytosanitary procedures and activities because they have different meaning but currently it looks like they are interchangeable.

**-Australia-** For example, pest free areas is referred to as a phytosanitary measure, but then it's also phytosanitary measures combined to maintain a pest free area. This is confusing and difficult to say that a group of measures is a measure as a pest free area but then differentiate each component that might be used, whether it's legislation, surveillance, various other measures that might be included.

#### **-Para 37: Substantive comment by NZ.**

Statement around appropriate level of protection to be deleted because this is the only place that appropriate level of protection is mentioned throughout the whole document, whereas it is understood that outline of requirement should be a summary of the whole document, and

if it is not mentioned anywhere in the body of the text that it should not appear in the outline of requirements.

**-Editorial comment by NZ**

It would be better to delete the whole first paragraph because there is a repetition of requirement when it should be for outline of requirement.

**-Para 38: Technical comment by NZ**

Comment is about making recognition by contracting parties. This addition will not be aligned with the principles of ISPM noting that a recognition is occurred by contracting party.

**-Para 50: Comment by NZ**

Delete '*in conformity with this standard*'. The intention for this conformity is not clear enough. Suggest to change to following core component of the ISPM for establishing maintaining and verifying that pathway, so rewording will provide a lot more clarity on what needs to be done.

**-Para 52: Comment by NZ**

As for the reason in para 37, Suggest to change 'phytosanitary measure' to 'phytosanitary procedure' or similar relevant wording to differentiate 'phytosanitary measure' and 'phytosanitary procedures' or activities.

**-Para 59,62 and 63: Question by Australia**

This relates the feasibility of the PFA in terms of resources and it talks about economic associated resources and the availability of stable funding over the long term. Should this be a requirement in an ISPM itself or something that could be considered?

**-Para 70: Substantive comment by NZ**

Suggest to include RPPO because if the PFA is established, across several territories in the region, then the RPPO has a role in establishing and verifying and dimensioning the PFA. The mention of NPPO is not sufficient.

**-Para 72: Substantive comment by NZ**

Given that other ISPMs are referenced in this ISPM we suggest that ISPM 26- *Pest Free Area for Fruit Flies* is observed and to add ISPM 27-*Diagnostic Protocols for Regulated Pests*. Working group or the Secretariat to consider giving more clarity of guidance and guidance around, when to use ISPM 4, which is the generic pathway standard and when to use ISPM 26.

**-General Comment by Australia**

In support of the clarification about use of ISPM 4 and ISPM 26 proposing that there should be an overarching standard with ISPMs like ISPM 26 actually be an annex underneath this standard so that there would be more closely linked to the overarching work requirements for the establishment of a pest for the area.

New Zealand in support to have the ISPM 4 as a generic overarching standard,

**-Para 87; 2.2 Control on Movement of Regulated Articles- Editorial by New Zealand**

Suggest to remove the word 'movement' of regulated, articles,

**Reason:** Controlling movement itself is too limiting. This is control of some other things including movement.

**-Para 99; 3.1 Legal Framework- Editorial by New Zealand**

Using Legal framework in a standard is inappropriate therefore suggest to change from the legal framework or legal requirements to regulatory framework, regulates the requirement



**Reason:** that the requirements of framework could be legislative, legal, or could be administrative. Legal framework may not exist in some countries.

**-Para 112; Substantive Comment by NZ**

Changes proposed for this paragraph is to Add ISPM 6, -Fruit Fly PFA standard for fruit fly specific PFA.

**Reason:** if the pest that cannot be established in an area, then establishing a PFA is not necessary. In another scenario where a pest cannot be spread by infested regulated articles, then it's also not necessary to establish a PFA, for example if the pest is seasonal

**-Para 117; 3.5.2 Increased surveillance in the demarcated outbreak area – Substantive comment by Guam**

Emphasis should also be placed on surveillance at the buffer zone as this area is just as important as the outbreak area itself. Focusing too at the buffer zone will be able to track the spread of the pest or if the phytosanitary procedures used are insufficient

**-Para 130;Section 5: Documentation and record keeping- Comment by NZ**

Seek clarification from the SC as the current wording is not clear whether the wording is in regards to corrective actions, or the amendments or improvements to the documentation.

**-Para 132; Section 6: Communication and Stakeholder Engagement- Technical comment from NZ**

Seek clarification whether this includes the availability of information to the importing country through electronic means. In the scenario that the importing country wants to know more information about the PFA or wish to do an audit whether that is included in this communication engagement.

**-Para 136; Editorial Comment by Papua New Guinea**

Last line of the paragraph, to change the word 'achieve' to 'gain'. Paragraph is to read: *"National plant protection organizations are encouraged to raise public awareness about PFAs in their territory, including the framework for reporting sightings of the pest, the phytosanitary measures established, and the importance of maintaining the PFA status, to gain the support of the community"*.

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

#### **Introduction**

Special import authorization (SIA) provides official consent for import of regulated articles and phytosanitary requirement.

SIAs may be used when:

- Official consent for import necessary.
- Phytosanitary import requirements have not been established.
- Import would otherwise be prohibited.

SIAs do not replace the obligation of the NPPO of the importing country to communicate the phytosanitary import requirements.

*Full presentation on :*

#### **Substantive Comment by Fiji**

**-Para 25;** Additional sentence for last line of the paragraph to read "the exporting country NPPO should meet the for the importing country phytosanitary requirements, where a formal pathway has not yet been established."

**-Para 33; 2.2 Minimum Information Requirements- Technical Comment by New Zealand**

Propose to move identifier or authorization number from 2.3 to 2.2

**Reason:** if an import permit or import authorisation is issued it will have a number so it must be part of the minimum requirement rather than the additional information.

**-Para 39: intended use of commodity or commodities – Technical comment by New Zealand.**

Propose to move 'intended use of commodities or commodities' currently in 2.2 Minimum Information requirements to be

moved to 2.3 Additional information that may be included.

**Reason:** It is hard to control the intended use of commodity or commodities.

**Comment by Australia**

Australia questioned the proposal by New Zealand to move the intended use from a minimum information, simply because these SIAs, are developed for specific case by case situations such as for research importation of research material and that's the intended use. It is quite important to the pest risk analysis or the analysis that would have been done, and the conditions under which the important goods are to be held.

**Comment by Guam**

Guam shares the same view as Australia but could see where New Zealand was coming from in terms of the difficulty in controlling the end use of the commodity or commodities.

**Comment by New Zealand**

The change was proposed, simply because there's no framework and there will be difficulty to enforcing or implementing the minimum requirement. It is important to include that in the SIAs. New Zealand will modify this comment and submit this as a country comment and not as a regional comment.

**-Para 62 : Situation's were General Important Authorizations have not been developed – Technical comment by New Zealand.**

In instances where treatment is carried out and the treatment certificate is issued and not a phytosanitary certificate, it would be helpful to include information such as that venting of fumigant from the container has taken place. Information that centers on the health and safety of the people dealing with fumigated goods.

**Comment by SC**

The issue of health and safety has been coming up in previous workshops and the question remains whether health and safety belongs in this standard. From previous SC meetings, all issues relating to personal health and safety is omitted because health and safety is not within the scope of the IPPC. Similarly, according to the working group notes this annex should not give guidance to non-phytosanitary requirements. Based on the mentioned reasons, it is certain that personal health and safety is not under the scope of this annex.

**Comment by New Zealand**

New Zealand has agreed to delete the proposal to include personal health and safety as a country comment and also thanked the forum for the opportunity to have the discussion.

**-Para 63; Situations where it is not possible to develop general phytosanitary import requirements that can manage the relevant pest risk - Substantive comment by New Zealand.**

Examples of this situation include food and aid during emergency situation, vehicles and machinery for military and emergency use and also with articles that are not routinely imported.



## **Section 4: The NPPO of the Importing Country**

No comment

## **Section 5: General Import Authorizations.**

### **Technical Comment by New Zealand**

As an NPPO, it would be appreciated if the IPPC provide more guidance materials on how to transition from SIA to GIA. This comment is supported by the region.

### **General Comment by Australia**

In relation to implementation issues of this annex, it would be interesting to see how many NPPOs in the region uses SIAs for limited imported products. Both Australia and New Zealand implement it while a lot of European countries do not. Similarly, whether the NPPO would be able to assist an exporter to meet the requirements of the SIA. This could be something that the PPPO members could evaluate if the implementation would be an issue. Each country could consider this and raise it with the IC members as a country comment.

### **General Comment by IC**

In reference to the request by New Zealand and the region for more guidance materials on the transition from SIA into GIA, there is the opportunity to submit a new topic for the ICs to work on and to be included in the work plan. Currently the IC already have 32 topics and in order to submit a new one there needs to be strong justification not only on regional level but global level. Now that it is agreed on from a regional perspective, the IC members from the region can advocate and call for topics. This is a great opportunity as call for topics is coming out soon.

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

### **Introduction**

This topic was added as priority two (2) in 2015 and was changed to priority one (1) in 2020. The revision was required in order to update and incorporate the recent development in Radio Technology. As this is an old standard the revision will also align it with the new standards on temperature treatment, fumigation and modified atmosphere.

Some new terms have been introduced, such as operational qualification, performance qualification and a new term that is going into glossary called commodity load

*Full presentation on :*

### **Substantive Comment by New Zealand**

Firstly, New Zealand supports this standard as it provides some good guidance on irradiation.

Secondly that roles and responsibilities for each activity described in this standard are not clearly set out and difficult to work out. Once the roles and responsibilities are clearly defined it should be included in the appropriate sections including the annexes.

### **Outline of Requirements**

### **Substantive Comment by New Zealand**

As it is, this paragraph is a combination of requirement and outline. The suggestion is for the Working Group to consider removing all those specific requirements and keep the outline of requirement as outline. The specific requirements are fully described in the body

of the text.

### **Section 3: Dosimetry**

#### **Substantive Comment by New Zealand**

As reflected in general comments on roles and responsibilities, description of who's responsible for performing which role must be made clearer.

#### **5.3 Labeling-**

##### **Substantive Comment- NZ**

Similar call on clarification around roles and responsibilities, as previously raised.

#### **5.4 Monitoring and Auditing**

##### **Technical comment by New Zealand**

Similar call on clarification around roles and responsibilities, as previously raised.

### **Section 6: Documentation**

#### **6.1- Documentation of Procedures**

##### **Technical comment by- New Zealand**

Suggests adding a component of document or operational procedure, as well as 'keep appropriate record for the treatment provider'. This comment will be submitted as a country comment for New Zealand if this is not a requirement with any other countries in the region.

#### **6.2- -para 2:**

##### **Technical comment by New Zealand**

Suggest changing '*a treatment provider to keep the record for at least one year*' to be changed to two (2) years.

**Reason:** The product may be still available after one year therefore it will still be needed for the purpose of trace back. This comment will be submitted as a country comment for New Zealand if this is not a requirement with any other countries in the region.

### **Last Section- Potential Implementation Issues**

#### **Annex 1:- Substantive comment by NZ**

- Suggesting to change the title from Checklist to Summary of Irradiation Requirement.
- Propose to change the 'yes' and 'no' column in the checklist to 'comment and evaluation'. This provides better opportunity to make relevant comment about a criteria or component.
- Suggesting to revert the wording 'facility meets approval'. The facility has already been approved therefore it does not make sense to include it the approval process.

Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) showed support for this comment

#### **Comment by Guam:**

Guam suggested to retain the 'yes and 'no' column and still add the 'comment and 'evaluation' suggestion by New Zealand. This comment will be submitted as a regional comment.

### 3.4 2021&2020 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on phytosanitary terms) (1994-001)

#### Introduction

This ISPM is always changing and updated and it could be based on the development of new ISPMs or the revision of some ISPMs. Similarly it could be that some terms have become confusing in their usage throughout different ISPMs over time and so such terms needs to be made more standardized across all of the documents.

For this review, there will be three (3) additions, ten(10) revisions and one(1) deletion.

*Full presentation on:*

#### General comments by New Zealand

It has been noticed that during a review of a revised ISPM 5, the newly proposed terms or definition are often referenced to other IPPC terms. Sometimes the revised terms ends up being a collection of IPPC terms rather than explaining what the terms actually meant.

#### General comment by SC

Members of the PPPO are encouraged to indicate whether they agree with the terms or not. It is also helpful for the stewards if countries indicate their decisions because it balances those comments where people do not agree.

There are two (2) lots of ISPM 5 that are currently under review. The forum is reviewing the ISPM 5 that is on the second consultation which is the 2019-2020

### 1.0 Definitions for Addition

#### 1.1 Identity of a consignment

##### Substantive comment by New Zealand

Explanation note number 4 is contrast with what is stated in ISPM 12, which states that “distinguishing mark on packages, and conveyances identification numbers or names should be included if necessary for the identification of the consignment” therefore it is proposed to include “distinguishing marks” in the definition of identify of a consignment so that it would be aligned with ISPM 12.

#### 1.2 General surveillance

##### General Comment by Papua New Guinea

Requesting New Zealand or Australia to provide examples of various sources regarding definition other than surveys.

##### Comment by Australia

In response to the request from PNG, Australia identified the different sources described in ISPM 6 including scientific articles, the general public calling lines, industry surveillance programs that aren't necessarily official, so aren't established, authorized or conducted by an NPPO. In addition, Australia does not support the proposed addition of this term

##### Reason

The definition of general surveillance is well described in ISPM 6, and it's too broad a concept to define in a sentence.

Similarly, the definition is considered to be inconsistent with ISPM 6 and contracting parties have been using the definition of general surveillance as described in ISPM 6 for some time. Additionally, the guidance document that the IC has been working on for quite a while now and is about ready to be published, has been using the definitions in ISPM 6, which this definition (ISPM 5) is inconsistent with. So it would make all of those documents prepared

to date be out of date and inconsistent with this definition.

#### **Comment by SC**

New Zealand views general surveillance as an official process in some way and the definition in ISPM 5 could be worded better. However the definition is in contrast with the description in ISPM 6 then there needs to be alignment.

### **1.3 Specific Surveillance**

#### **General Comment by Australia**

The proposed new definition for Specific Surveillance is “an official process whereby information on pests in an area is obtained through surveys.” Regardless of what the different personal definition there are, the texts and the definition of this term must be clear enough in order to be differentiated. Once this term and its definition is in the ISPM, the definition must be used for ISPM the definition must be made clear.

#### **Comment by Guam**

Guam raised a question enquiring about other official processes that are stated in the definition.

#### **Comment by Australia**

In response to the question from Guam, an official process is anything that is conducted, authorized or established by an NPPO. Since this is the first round of consultation, the PPPO could wait to see if the term ‘detection survey’ is approved by the CPM then that will be the opportunity to look at it again. The submission from the PPPO could be that this definition should be put on hold until the final definition of ‘detection survey’ is adopted.

#### **Comment by IPPC Secretariat**

Under ISPM 6, Specific Surveillance includes detection survey, delimiting survey and monitoring survey.

#### **Comment by Guam**

Guam enquired if it was acceptable practice to re-define in ISPM 5 a term that has already been defined in another ISPM.

#### **Comment by Australia SC member**

In response to the enquiry by Guam, generally, texts are not duplicated across the ISPMs. ISPMs are updated in a way that it avoids having two definitions in two different documents, so the practice is to reference other ISPMs. In the case of ‘specific surveillance’, ISPM 5 did not reference ISPM 6 because it redefines the term using different words. This is unnecessary because ISPM 6 had described the term clearly.

#### **Comment by New Zealand SC Member**

This comment could be submitted as a country comment at this stage. While the texts is not duplicated between ISPMs, the term ‘specific surveillance’ is defined in ISPM 5 but described in ISPM 6.

#### **Comment by NZ**

While ISPM 6 describes ‘specific ‘surveillance’, it does not mention anything about having an official process. The wordings of ISPM 6 allows for information to be accessed from any source. New Zealand feels that it is important to have some sort of official verification of the information so that it does not include all the information that can be access.

#### **Comment by Australia SC Member**

The process of analysis and verification of data can be official but the collection of raw data does not have to be an official process. If the NPPO chooses to use that information,

whether it is from a scientific journal article, or an industry progress surveillance program or a pest scout program, then that decision to use that data is the official part. The data will now go through official analysis and verification.

In addition, General Surveillance narrows the scope compared to what's in ISPM 6 and wouldn't allow all of that collection to occur, because it's all captured under the one definition of general surveillance

## **2.0 Definition for Revision**

### **2.1 Surveillance**

#### **Substantive Comment by New Zealand**

This comment leads back to general comments made by New Zealand stating that a term is define with a series of other ISPM terms. The proposed definition of surveillance is general surveillance, or specific surveillance, or a combination of both. New Zealand rejects the proposed revision and would like to keep the current definition.

#### **Comment by IC Member**

No countries has raised or had an issue with the interpretation of the definitions. The expert working group undertook comprehensive review of both the ISPM 6 and the Surveillance Guideline over the past 12 months with experts from all over the region. Changing the definitions now will have a very significant impact on the current e-learning material that have been developed and the surveillance guideline which in process of being translated into multiple languages and also released in October.

#### **Substantive Comment by Australia**

Australia is proposing the deletion of two terms' general surveillance and specific surveillance and further proposed to have just a process that accommodate general surveillance, which may be not necessarily being official, which collects and records data and information on pest presence or absence"

The deletion of two proposed terms have been proposed and it was proposed to just have a "process that can be official to accommodate the general surveillance, not necessarily being official, which collects and records data and information on pest presence or absence"

#### **Comment by Papua New Guinea**

PNG confirms that ISPM 6 has always been used for specific survey, delimiting survey, detection survey and it is normal understanding that the data that is collected from surveillance can be either from official or unofficial survey.

This comment will be submitted as a country comment.

### **2.2 Integrity of a consignment**

#### **Technical comment by New Zealand**

The proposed revised definition is "*state of a consignment when its identity is unchanged, and any seals or packaging are undamaged*". NZ proposes to change the word '*undamaged to unchanged*'.

**Reason:** The term undamaged is limiting and it doesn't cover unchanged. If the seals or packaging are changed but not damaged that it still affects the integrity of consignment. The definition is now to read 'state of a consignment when its identity, seals or packaging are unchanged'.

### **2.3 Phytosanitary Security over consignment**

### **Comment by New Zealand**

New Zealand wishes to support the current definition and reject the proposed definition.

#### **Reason:**

Phytosanitary security is not considered to be a state but rather it is a series of activities or processes leading to the consignment being secure from a phytosanitary perspective.

Given that a specific specification of Phytosanitary Security is out for consultation this year, it is suggested that perhaps the definition of phytosanitary security should also align with the specification for the phytosanitary security procedure, which will be developed by the IC.

## **2.4 Germplasm**

### **Technical comment by SC**

In ISPM 5 seeds are included in the definition of 'plants for planting'. It was proposed to include the text "including seeds" for ease of understanding. In the definition of plants, it states 'including seeds and germplasm'. The proposal is one way to resolve confusion in the definition and to make it clear.

### **Comment by New Zealand**

It is understood that germplasm also includes pollen and protoplasm which are not suitable for planting therefore NZ do not consider the revision inappropriate and proposes to retain the current definition.

## **2.5 Emergency Measure**

No comment

## **2.6 Provisional measure**

No comment

## **2.7 Inspection**

No comment

## **2.8 Test**

Editorial comment by NZ is not going to be discussed.

## **2.9 Compliance Procedure (for a consignment)**

No comment

## **2.10 Release of Consignment**

No comment

## **3.0 Definitions for Deletion**

## **3.1 Clearance of a consignment**

No comment

## **3.5 Focused Revision of ISPM 12 in relation to re-export (2015-011)**

### **Introduction**

This is the second consultation for this ISPM after 217 comments were received after the first consultation. There were 3 major comments and changes in this revision including:- Commodities not processed to change its nature, electronic phytosanitary certificates and consideration for issuing a phytosanitary certificates for export in certain re-export cases. Other minor changes have been incorporated in response to first consultation comments to clarify the text parts of ISPM 12 dealing with re-export and make them more consistent.

*Full presentation on:*

### **Substantive comment by Australia**

Australia is satisfied with this version.

### **General Comment by New Zealand**

All the comments by New Zealand for this ISPM are editorial and discussion on them will not be necessary however ISPM 12 is a complicated multiple scenario ISPM and could have been written with more clarity by specifying scenarios and solutions.

Similarly, requesting the SC if there is a possibility to consider this ISPM as overarching standard like the PFA and like the diagnostic or treatment standard, with annexes covering each of the specific scenario, since most countries are now using e-Certs it is suggested that e-Certs should also be covered in this standard.

### **General Comment by Australia**

Australia that agrees to a full revision of the standard.

[Other parts of this comment could not be heard due to outside interference]

### **General Consensus**

This ISPM needs to go for a full review, and this will be submitted as a regional comment. This will also be included as a Call for Topics from the region.

## **3.6 Commodity-based standards for phytosanitary measures (2019-008).**

### **Introduction**

This is the second country consultation for this standard and it was proposed in the IPPC strategic framework. The objective of this was to simplify trade, expedite market access negotiations. The main concerns raised were about the sovereign rights of the country. While most countries thought that there was an obligation to use the standard, texts have been added to clarify that the obligation is to consider the standard.

The categorization of phytosanitary measures raised a lot of comments. Many contracting parties thought that the confidence and measures been described as high, medium or low was not very objective or very meaningful. So the category is now being removed and now refers to the 'evaluation of confidence'.

*Full presentation on :*

- **Scope-Technical comment by New Zealand**

This technical comment is based on the editorial comment that was made earlier about changing the title of the standard from Commodity Based to Commodity Specific. This point was raised during the SC seven meeting where it was seen that commodity specific might be a better description. New Zealand changed the wording to make it a little bit clearer.

- **Outline of requirements- Substantive comment from New Zealand**



In regards to the original version, NZ proposed to remove the reference to confidence and measures.

#### **Reason**

If the measure meets the minimum criteria, then there is a high level of confidence that the measure can manage the pest. Anything that has a lower level of confidence should not be included in annex.

- **Impacts on Biodiversity Principles in relation to commodity standards.**

#### **Editorial Comment by New Zealand**

If reference is added to an IPPC article or different IPPC articles to support the principles outlined in this section and we cite those IPPC articles, it would give a stronger support on those principles.

- **List of host associated with the pest-**

#### **Technical comment by New Zealand**

New Zealand has proposed deleting the section because there was not a lot of distinction between the section and what was already in the scope. Other commodity standards such as the ISPM 38,39,40, and 41, do not have a separate section for description of the quantity and intend to incorporate that into the scope. New Zealand is proposing the same for this standard just to make it a bit a bit tighter.

### **2.3. Technical comment by NZ**

Suggest to delete the second sentence of paragraph one,

**Reason:** because it is not necessarily or relevant to include this sentence. Paragraph explains this one more clearly.

Secondly, New Zealand's next comment is that the list of pest is not intended to be exhaustive. The list is not clear whether is for major pest, common pests found in most countries or whether the pests are commonly restricted to trade and have been found on phytosanitary requirement of a number of countries. It would be better to specify this paragraph that the list of pest is not intended to be exhausted.

### **2.4 Options for phytosanitary measures**

#### **Technical comment by Australia**

Australia stressed that the measures still need to be technically justified.

### **2.5 References sections of commodity standards.**

Editorial comment by NZ

### **3.0 Criteria for inclusion of Measures in Commodity Standard**

#### **Substantive comment by New Zealand.**

There's a lot of overlap between section three (3) and section four (4) - Confidence in the Measures. New Zealand proposes that the parts of section four (4) that do not overlap or where there seems to be a lot of repetition are to be added to section three (3).



Furthermore, there's perhaps a little bit more specificity around this section that says 'quantitative and qualitative evidence' therefore it is suggested that the text should expand from experimental evidence to be qualitative evidence, as well.

#### **4. Confidence in Measures-**

##### **Comment by NZ**

Discussions for this section have been covered in section three (3).

#### **5. Publication of commodity statements.**

No comments.

#### **6. Potential Implementation View.**

##### **Substantive comment by NZ**

The footnote states that the inclusion of a 'measure in the annexes to this ISPM does not create any obligation for a contracting party to approve it, register it or adopted for use in his territory.' This sentence contradicts the basic understanding of having a commodity specific standard in that it does not place an obligation on the contracting party.

It is suggested that the foot note should state in the body of the text that an NPPO is obliged to consider the standard in their phytosanitary importing requirements.

### **3.7 Audits in the Phytosanitary context (2015-014)**

#### **Introduction**

This is the second time it's been up for country consultation. This standard relies heavily on ISPM 45, or the Authorization Of Entities Standard. It includes reference to authorization for the purposes of audit. There were some comments relating to some of the terms used in the draft that came out through the previous round of country consultation related to the term 'finding and its relationship with conformity and nonconformity. Similarly, how auditors are selected to ensure the impartiality and transparency of the audit. The financial constraints for conducting audits have also been highlighted and finally the issue of conducting audits in other countries and obviously other languages has been raised.

*Full presentation on:*

#### **General Comment by New Zealand**

This ISPM will provide a very useful foundation for common understanding of the audit process for between countries and also for NPPO's and their authorized entities however there were inconsistency in the use of terminologies was highlighted in the introduction.

#### **Substantive comment by Australia**

The word 'observation' has been removed to be replaced by the word 'findings' however the word findings may have a different meaning in some regions therefore it is raised again during this round of consultation.

#### **Substantive comment by New Zealand**

*Audio was turned off, could not get this comment.*

#### **Substantive comment by Australia**

The NPPO is always responsible for the audit even though it has authorized another entity

to conduct the audit.

## **1. Requirements and Purpose of an audit**

### **Editorial comment by New Zealand**

The word evaluation or evaluate should be placed in front of verification to point out that audit is not just a verification process but it is also an evaluation

### **Substantive comment by New Zealand**

In purpose of an audit, New Zealand proposes to add a new bullet point to state the effectiveness of the system.

## **2. Types of Audit.**

### **Technical Comment by Australia**

Audit is not considered to be a system but a test to determine whether the system is achieving its design regardless of its design therefore the term 'designed to achieve' has been removed.

## **3. Circumstances That May Initiate Audit,**

### **Technical Comment by Australia**

This is a similar comment in relation to changing the term "observation" to 'findings'.

## **4. Roles**

### **4.3 Responsibilities of the auditor**

#### **Technical comment from New Zealand.**

Firstly, New Zealand commented on the terms audit criteria and audit requirements that needs to be defined and consistently used throughout the document. Clarification is required for the term criteria, whether it is a purpose, an objective of an audit, a process or is it a phytosanitary requirement.

Secondly, the comment is with regards to the auditor and the NPPO. If the auditor is an authorized entity, it is proposed to change auditor to auditee, based on the context of this document.

Substantive comments from Australia.

Conflict of interest has been coming up in the PPPO meeting and it was always discussed that in many small especially in our region it is often difficult to have no conflict of interest or to be totally free from. ISPM 45- *Authorization of Entities* successfully change the language from 'be free from conflict' to 'manage conflict of interest'. The concern now is that 'be free from conflict' was placed back in the text.

It is now proposed to change it back, or at least make it consistent with ISPM 45, to be the identifying manager for any conflict of interest, noting that it still says in that sentence 'maintaining impartiality and independence from the entities being audited'.

#### **Technical comment from NZ**

Commenting on the last second bullet point of 4.3, the comment is around the publication. Audit report is always published or accessed by any parties therefore it is proposed to delete published and to change audit report to audit findings.

### **4.3.1- Technical comment by NZ**

Comment about the last bullet point of this section 4.3.1, it is proposed to add 'critical' to

the sentence. The consideration is that the authorizing NPPO must be immediately notified of any critical nonconformities not just any non-conformities. For instance, in the case of New Zealand, the authorized entity is obliged to inform the NPPO of any critical non-conformities within 15 minutes of the finding. This is important because critical non-conformity could compromise the integrity of the phytosanitary system. Normal non-conformities could be reported within the specified time frame.

#### **4.4 Technical comment by New Zealand.**

##### **New Zealand**

This comment is about the statement '*confirm with the audit requirement*'. The word 'confirm' is usually used in audit findings therefore the use of the word in this context is confusing. The suggestion should now read 'confirm with our audit requirement to follow the agreed audit process'.

#### **5. Selection of Auditors.**

No comments

#### **6. Frequency of Audits**

**No comment**

#### **7. Conflicts of Interest.**

##### **Technical comment by New Zealand,**

Some new wordings were added in front of the paragraph just to specify that when an audit is conducted in country or by an NPPO or authorized entity the conflict of interest is more applicable then when an audit is conducted between countries.

Similar changes were made to highlight that if there is no conflict of interest, there is no need for declaration of conflict of interest. For the purpose of implementation, guiding material on how to identify and manage conflict of interest will be very much needed by NPPOs

#### **8. Confidentiality.**

No comments

#### **9. Financial arrangements,**

Editorial. Comment

#### **10. Settlement of disputes-**

##### **Comment by Australia**

The settlement of dispute process should be established and agreed prior to the audits being conducted. If a dispute takes place neither party would be able to agree to a process therefore it is critical to establish a dispute settlement process prior to the audit. It is therefore proposed that the 'may making it optional,' should be changed to 'should make it a requirement.' **Section 11: Steps In The Audit Process.**

No comments,

#### **11.1 Planning an audit.**

No comment.

##### **11.1.1.Scheduling of audits**

##### **Technical comment from Australia,**

Australia is proposing to add history of non-conformities. Some auditees have a history of

compliance and others have a history of non-compliance resulting in frequent audits therefore it is also based on the history of nonconformities not just the non conformities.

### **11.3 Undertaking an Audit- No comment**

#### **11.3.1 Initiation**

##### **Technical comment by NZ on the last bullet point.**

New Zealand proposes to delete 'legal' from this sentence, for example, "an auditing NPPO do not have legal right in another territory when they conduct an audit."

#### **11.3.2 Performing an evaluation**

##### **Substantive comment from Australia**

Australia proposes to use conducting and evaluation instead of performing an evaluation as this is really the doing of the audit.

#### **11.3.3 Closing and Reporting**

##### **Technical comment by New Zealand.**

To ensure that audit reports are made available, New Zealand proposes to add a new sentence to read 'ensure that the final audit report should be provided to the NPPO upon request'. This is the same for audits undertaken by an authorized entity or other NPPOs.

##### **Technical comment by NZ – last paragraph**

This word 'addition' is proposed in order to clarify that the auditor should incorporate in comments feedback from not just the auditee, but also from the NPPO.

##### **Technical comment by NZ – last paragraph, last sentence**

New Zealand proposes to add 'an unresolved dispute'

**Reason:** it is not appropriate to detail every dispute between the auditor and auditee through the audit therefore only the unresolved disputes must be documented in the report.

##### **Comment by Australia- last para.**

Parallel to NZ's comment with regards to unresolved disputes, additional text has been added and will now read 'unresolved disputes related to audit findings'

### **12. Types of conformities**

#### **Technical comment by Australia.**

This is referring back to previous discussion on critical non-conformities in part 4.3.1 ..

#### **Section 13: Implementation of non-conformity**

##### **Editorial by NZ**

##### **Technical Comment by Australia**

Implementation issues that were identified through the review have been listed for other

members to consider and also add to.

### 3.8 CPM recommendation on contaminating pests

#### Introduction

Recommendations have a different purpose. They are made to address other important plant health related issues where a standard might not be required yet, or it's not clear yet how to address that issue in the standard.

This recommendation is to help reduce the incidence of contaminating pests associated with regulated articles and unregulated goods, protect plant health and facilitate trade.

The language used in recommendation is a bit different and it provides more guidance. The audiences of these recommendations are broader and it's asking or seeking NPPO's to reach out to those other audiences to try and address this issue.

**Technical comment from New Zealand- First paragraph on the second page.**

The changes were proposed to emphasize the aspect of contaminating pest. A lot of examples were added, so that NPPO's or other agencies, can have a better idea on what is meant by contaminated pest.

#### Purpose of the CPM recommendation

##### Technical comment by New Zealand

New Zealand proposes to change 'phytosanitary risk' in this document to 'pest risk'.

#### Reason

Pest risk is more appropriate in this context and the difference between regulated article, and other normal plant pests needs to be distinguished.

##### Comment by Guam

With reference to the audience of the CPM recommendation being broader and NPPO's are required to reach out to this audience, this would be in line with creating awareness with other with other stakeholders beyond government agencies. Stakeholders such as community members or private stakeholders that are involved in of e-commerce. Noting that during this pandemic people could be buying regulated items and are not aware of the pest risk involved. Suggesting to change or integrate wording to include private business that facilitate e-commerce.

##### Comment by CPM Bureau Member/New Zealand

Contracting parties are encouraged to ensure that their legislation or mandate is in place. This will enable NPPOs to intervene on non- plants products such as vehicles and to manage incoming risks and meeting the import country's and outgoing risks. This comment is submitted as a country comment.

##### Comment by Australia

Australia supports the comment by New Zealand and raised the example about the Red Imported Fire Ant (*Solenopsis invicta*) in Australia. Even though the ants are found in shipping containers and may not be regarded as and agricultural pest, Australia still have the mandate to manage this risk.

## **Comment by Papua New Guinea**

For small island countries the issue of incoming or returning diplomats is a difficult one to enforce and requesting guidance on how to handle diplomats.

## **Comment by New Zealand**

The issue of diplomats is still a difficult one. Diplomatic status provides them privileges that close the NPPO of the residing country from having the right to inspect the home and the property.

In the case of New Zealand information is provided to embassies and to diplomats, so that they are fully aware of the biosecurity requirements and risks. They are further encouraged to do their own checks for anything that may be a biosecurity risk, and to report those to the NPPO.

## **Agenda 4 : Implementing and raising awareness in the framework of FAO/ RPPOs**

### **4.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities**

In October 2020 as the 27th session of FAO Committee on Agriculture endorsed the resolution champion by Zambia for International Day of Plant Health on 12 May.

The proposal was led and validated by the EU Council and the conference. The UN General Assembly would now consider the proposal for final endorsement and the first international day of plant health was expected to be celebrated on 12th of May, 2022.

For the past few years, FAO has been implementing some key activities in the region in relation to capacity development, one of which is the control, and the management of trans-boundary plant pests and diseases, mainly Fall Army Worm (FAW) and desert locust, and some of the phytosanitary activities were conducted with some good success in this region.

In December 2019, FAO launched the pioneering Global Action for FAW control, as an immediate response for the rapid spread of FAW throughout the globe, and in this region. The three year global initiative was well implemented radically in a coordinated measures to strengthen prevention, and the sustainable pest control strategies at the global level. The FAO has been coordinating this program in the region. There are some ongoing FAW activities in the Asia Pacific region, which is within the broader framework of the global action and this action is led by the FAO Director General.

Within this global framework there are three(3) demonstration countries, China, India and the Philippines. All the activities are being launched in fifteen (15) other pilot countries, including some of the Pacific countries. The major activities under this program, includes:

- Capacity building,
- Monitoring
- Early warning and the
- IPM application of biological control
- IPM packages.

Besides the FAW activities, Desert Locus Control programs have also been coordinated and plant protection activities are ongoing.

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

#### **4.2.1 FAO/IPPC AW Technical Working Group (TWG)**

The mandate of the TWG is to focus on prevention, preparedness and response. FAW, can

be moved through regular trading pathways therefore pest risk analysis process and strong biosecurity measures need to be implemented to be able to manage that. In the natural pathway, it's very hard to regulate and prevent

FAW is now being officially reported from the Solomon Islands and assistance has been given to the Solomon Islands to manage FAW. New Caledonia had an interception in December and reported through the NRO in January. FAW has been found also in Norfolk Island and in Tasmania, Australia. It is important to note that the FAW seems to thrive in a broad climatic range. A technical working group has been created within the IC delivering similar functions as the IC and have developed materials and other resources for the management of FAW.

*This is the only part in this presentation that is audible.*

*Full presentation found on:*

#### **Comment by Guam**

Given the number of materials and resources that the technical working group has produced, it will be interesting to know whether the Solomon Islands has accessed and utilized any of these resources in their FAW management program.

#### **Comment by Chris Dale.**

FAW Management work in the Solomon Islands is carried out collectively through various programs and projects such as the Solomon Islands Biosecurity Development Program. A lot of support is being provided in-country and through PHAMA Plus. A guideline is designed for the Chief Plant Protection officers in the NPPO to essentially go step by step through a series of engagement, resource mobilization, surveillance, delimiting surveillance, monitoring surveillance, integrated pest management or bio control programs, even down to the engagement at the village level.

Using the experience from the CRB-G Management Program, it is hoped that this will be replicated for FAW in terms of country response capability.

#### **Comment by PPPO Secretariat**

In a similar collective approach, the PPPO Secretariat has also been working with the NPPO Solomon Islands through the procurement of traps and lures for Fruit flies, CRB-G and now FAW.

#### **Comment by Chair**

The Chair enquired about the setting up of the FAW regional technical arm as one of the action plans that was moved and agreed in the PPPO previous meeting.

#### **Comment by PPPO Secretariat**

In response to the enquiry by the Chair, the FAW regional technical arm has not been set up yet.

#### **Comment by Chair**

The Chair reminded the PPPO Secretariat of its mandate and that the FAW regional technical arm is a priority and needs to be set up so that the countries can be assisted in the management of the pest.

### **4.2.2 Regional pest surveillance (early-detection) system**

#### **4.2.2.1 Plant Health and Environment Laboratory (PHEL – Dr Disna Gunawardana**

The New Zealand Plant Health and Environment Laboratory (PHEL) in Auckland, New Zealand has been supporting PPPO member countries in plant health biosecurity activities.



Through the partnership with NZAID PHEL has been able to conduct numerous trainings in areas of:

- Pest and Disease Diagnostic
- Pest surveillance trainings
- Incursion Investigations and Responses
- Quality management system
- Pest and Disease Symptoms recognition training for quarantine inspectors
- Diagnostic Tools development

PHEL recently signed an MOU with New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) for a two-step program called Enhance Biosecurity Partnership Program that is proposed to run for four (4) years. The Inception Phase is currently underway while the Implementation Phase will run from this year 2021-2025 and will be assisting six (6) countries in the region namely Fiji, Vanuatu, Tonga, Cook Islands, Niue and Samoa. Current project activities include continuous enhancement for the biosecurity component in Fiji, PHEL online image library diagnostic tools, Fresh Produce Inspection manuals, Entomology Diagnostic Manual and the Mycology Diagnostic Manual. More trainings and capacity development is proposed for the upcoming project.

*Full presentation on link.*

#### **Comment by New Caledonia.**

**This comment was not audible.**

#### **Comment by PHEL**

PHEL is happy to share the diagnostic tools with other members. There has been previous requests if the materials could be translated to French and PHEL will discuss this further with the PPPO Secretariat.

PHEL is looking forward to working with the countries in the next four(4) and will use virtual meet if lock downs continues.

#### **4.2.2.2 Regional pest surveillance (early-detection) system -Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (PPPO)-PPPO Secretariat**

The PPPO Secretariat works collaboratively with the biosecurity and plant health team, entomology, virology as well as the pathology team. Support for the countries is based on each NPPOs request. There is also collaboration work between Extension Officers and the NPPOs.

Field samples are sent to CABI or PHEL for identification and verification. To avoid possible detention of specimen at the border, the PPPO Secretariat ensures that all documentations required are in order before the specimen is sent. The Biosecurity Team vets the identification result before it is relayed back to the NPPO concern and only then it can now be updated on the Pest List Database.

For early detection and response, SPC offers technical help and advice, awareness material on pest incursions and exotic pests and provide early warning systems through traps for Fruit flies, CRB-G and FAW.

Support for the region is continuing as follows:

- NZMPI Biosecurity and Plant Health trainings for the member countries.
- SPC developing of a network of laboratories with compatible quality systems.
- Collaboration on the development of a field based surveillance and recording platforms.
- Collaboration to develop a Pacific food plant health network.



Despite the COVID19 restrictions, regional support is continuing through the PPPO Talanoa Session, which is held monthly to capture the priorities, success and way forward on collaboration. The MOU with NZ MPI on the identification and authentication of field samples from the member countries is expected to be extended for four (4) more years. The plant health team is using an app known as Kobo toolbox, which can be used offline for pest and disease pest and disease monitoring.

*Full presentation on:*

#### **Comment by IC Rep**

The IPPC through the IC and the technical working groups have developed resources and materials that are being used to strengthen the outbreak and alert system. It is enquired whether these resources are useful for the region in terms of the regions preparation and strengthening of the outbreak and alert system.

#### **Comment by PPPO Secretariat.**

The materials, resources and engagement with the technical working group provided clear guidance on the details for FAW. This platform of discussions will be useful in helping the region to be aware of other exotic pests and diseases that are spreading towards the region. It provides the opportunity for the region to have an early response systems and the opportunity to respond, should they be an invasion.

#### **Comment from Papua New Guinea.**

PNG requests support from the PPPO Secretariat with regards to the pest list database adding that NPPO PNG would first needs to input their authenticated pest list into the database.

#### **Comment from the Secretariat**

The PPPO Secretariat agreed to assist PNG and will await the PNG authenticated pest list.

#### **Comment by New Zealand**

PHL has offered to initiate collaboration with the regional FAW technical working group given that PHEL has a four (4) years project in the region. Part of PHEL's project will be incursion investigation and response planning for Pacific countries and this collaboration would be beneficial for the region.

### **4.2.3 Understanding the role of a Competent authority- CPM Bureau Member- Mr. Peter Thompson**

A competent authority it's any person or organization that has the legally delegated or invested authority, capacity or power to perform a designated function. It's somebody who is able or allowed to make a legal decision for everyone. In SPS the context a competent authority is a government body and that government body will be appointed, authorized by the government of the day to perform the function and to be the body that can make the decision.

The role of the competent authority can only be performed by the competent authority. However, this can only happen if the competent authority either officially delegate some powers or decision making to another body. For instance, NPPO New Zealand, delegates authority to independent verification agencies to conduct export inspections however, the full responsibility still lies with the NPPO.

A competent authority needs to have the right skills and resources to appropriately to perform your function and this can be build overtime. The Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation

(PCE) tool is a really helpful tool now, where the gaps can be identified and also identify the resources required to fill in those gaps.

A strong high performing competent authority can deliver real benefits to the country because the level of trust and integrity in the assurances that you provide become stronger, and countries trust your assurances, and you get more freedom to operate.

The IPPC recognizes the NPPO as the competent authority. The fundamental role of the NPPO is protect plant resources through implementation of appropriate phytosanitary measures, support food security through pest exclusion and facilitate trade thorough phytosanitary certifications and systems.

*Full presentation on:*

#### **Comment by PNG**

PNG enquired as to how the arrangement between the NPPO and independent verification agencies is strengthen.

#### **Comment from NZ**

When delegating roles, it must be clear from the beginning as to what roles is being delegated. The NPPO will audit the independent verification agencies and then an agreement is signed after audit has been passed. The agreement will include certain requirements such as requirement for reporting and requirement for ongoing audits.

The New Zealand's version of the standard that support the delegation of authority is available online and countries are welcome to have a look at them.

#### **4.2.4 Region's Plan Health Priorities – ensure those agreed in 2019 are still relevant.**

The purpose of this presentation is to present the plan health term priority that was agreed in 2019 and to see if the priorities have changed.

- **Training Program by New Zealand MPI's Plant Health and Environment Laboratory.**  
The member countries are asked to please contact if they seek some help in regards to the diagnostic training and the laboratory work that the currently doing with the current six countries.
- **More information on CRB-G needs to be distributed in the region so that the Pacific Island countries and territories were well informed.**  
This work is being handled by SPC with the inclusion of a new staff member. This team was formed specifically for CRB-G issues in the region.
- **Member countries are to effectively manage the National Export systems so the confidence of trading partners can be maintained.**  
The current ongoing work with New Zealand MPI is acknowledged. This will be covered under national export systems on the PCE as well as the PCS.
- **SPC to maintain stockpile of appropriate news for imagery response on fruit flies and CRB.**  
While consideration is requested for the delay in delivering these items due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the PPPO Secretariat is still procuring lures and traps for Fruit Flies and CRB-G.
- **An IPC topics proposal to develop a guidance document on post disaster donations or aid.**  
It has been presented in the last CPM And currently, the team is working with members to put it through as a call for topics.
- **Launching of generic information on biosecurity to be made available on SPC**

**website to help countries.**

This has not been done. The EDF11 project has just been approved and this work will be tagged into the EDF11 funding.

- **The PPPO board endorses and recommended the revival of the PCE training and encourages member to initiate requests for this training**  
As mentioned, the ongoing work in this space is a New Zealand MPI on the possibility of engaging a consultant to work with a member of countries on the PCE.
- **e-Phyto support for the region**  
A Regional e-Phyto Coordinator has been appointed to oversee this work in the region.
- **The board endorsed that the standard operation procedures (SOP) to be formulated and finalized by the next ExCom meeting,**  
The SOP will be finalized by the next ExCo Meeting.
- **PPPO Technical working group for Safe Food Aid**  
A technical working group for safe food aid has been formed.
- **The new strategic framework is to include a communication plan, and the monitoring and evaluation component.**  
This work is being stalled due to the pandemic however there is an opportunity to revive this virtually.
- **PPPO Secretariat to provide Emergency Response Plan (ERP) support at the regional level and provide an update on ERP for the region.**  
Member countries need to provide this update to the Secretariat as most are managing their own response plans. The EDF11 project to fund his work in the region

**Comment by Guam**

Guam enquired about the type of information that will be on the generic information facility.

**Comment by Secretariat**

The Biosecurity Information Facility will house information on import permit requirements, conditions for the particular export of fresh fruits and vegetables. This will include on plants, animals, aquatic and terrestrials and their products. This project will also come under the EDF 11.

**Comment by New Zealand**

New Zealand acknowledged the work done by the PPPO Secretariat and requested if the Secretariat has a work plan that the members can see. A work plan that has milestones, timelines and deliverables can greatly keep track of the progress of all the required tasks. It can also help in identifying resources requirement. It is suggested that a work plan to be quickly developed if there isn't one available.

**Comment by Secretariat.**

The work plan created by the PPPO secretariat has no timelines and deliverables given that the availability of funding determines which activity is carried out. Activities are tied to the current projects by the Land Resource Division.

**Comment by Chair**

Delivering in a timely manner and meeting the needs of the countries is important. The PPPO Secretariat should be able to produce a complete work plan now given that new funding is available.

**Comment by IC Member**

One of the focus groups created by the CPM looks at Climate Change In Phytosanitary

Issues. A lot of the work has been done on climate change, which is one of the developmental agenda items out of the IPPC and it is worth noting that the focus group will actually be running until 2025. The priority for the group is to develop an action plan based on feedback and input from the regions to then provide prioritization of resources, person and the like based on these feedbacks. Given the nature of this region and the sensitivities around those pests that have particular vulnerability to climate change, or the impact of climate change, FAW and fruit flies could be flagged as one of the priorities for our region. This region already has representative in this focus group and this is a really good opportunity to get resources, raise awareness and advocate for member countries.

## **Agenda 5: Moving together from ideas to action**

### **5.1 International Year Plant Health (IYPH) Legacy- Natsumi Yamada**

The IYPH was launched in December 2019 by the FAO Director General Mr Qu Dongyu with the three(3) main objectives to:

- Raise public awareness of the importance of plant health to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals
- Increase resources dedicated to plant health
- Promote good practice and partnership, knowledge, research and partnership

Due the COVID 19 global pandemic, the IYPH was extended until July 2021.

Key initiatives of the IYPH included the :

- Plant Health and Right to Food
- CPM-15
- Plant Health & Climate Change Review
- IYPH Webinars
- IYPH Closing Ceremony

IYPH National and Regional Initiatives included

- Niagara Falls lighting up in green
- Raising of the IYPH Flag in South Korea
- Train with the IYPH logo and color spotted in Milan, Italy.

In December 2020, the FAO Council endorsed a proposal by Zambia to proclaim 12 May as the International Day of Plant Health. The first International Plant Health Conference will be held on the same week and the host country is still being identified.

*Full presentation on:*

### **5.2 National Reporting Obligations(NRO)- Chris Dale**

The purpose of the NRO that through the reporting it may control the international spread of pests of plants and plant products. It is the obligations of all IPPC contracting parties to oblige to meet the reporting obligations. This is necessary to ensure that phytosanitary information of the new pest report is communicated to neighboring countries and also trading partners from a market access point of view ensuring safe trade.

FAW is a good example globally where contracting parties were reporting and some were not reporting on the NRO. More information on FAW have been posted on CABI and other reference points that makes it mandatory for countries to report on the NRO as soon as the new detection is confirmed.

There is one designated IPPC point of contact for each country. It is important to change the information on the NRO as soon as there is a change of point of contact because all official correspondence goes to that point of contact.

The number of pest reports in the region has decreased significantly and the number of reporting contracting parties has also decreased since 2017. With the spread of FAW, a number of countries in the region have detected FAW but this detection has not been reported on the NRO. Special mention goes to New Caledonia for reporting on the NRO the detection of FAW as quickly as possible.

There is a lot of resources and guide available with step-by-step process on how to access and update the NRO. The resources are for both technical and administrative perspectives. There is also e-learning training course, that's been developed to compliment the guide. A web page has also been developed for NROs and any significant pest detection is published on the webpage.

An IC working group on NRO has been developed where there are three representatives from contracting parties, a representative from CPM Bureau, which provides that higher level governance, two representatives from the IC and a representative from the Standards Committee. This is also an opportunity for the region to be represented

*Full presentation on:*

### 5.3 2021 Call for topics: Standards and Implementation- Joanne Wilson

The purpose of the call for topics is to identify a phytosanitary problems of global relevance, address the gaps in phytosanitary system and to shape the standards and implementation work of the CPM to align with our strategic objectives in the strategic framework 2020-2030. The call for topics happens every 2 years and 2021 is call for topics year.

During the call for topics, contracting parties, regional organizations are invited to submit their proposals.

All the proposal are done online and the Secretariat has developed a very user friendly system The taskforce for topics will review the proposal with inputs from the SC and the IC and would then prepare a final recommendation to the CPM for adoption. Once the CPM adopts the topics and adds them to the list of topics, the topics go through the standards sitting process and the implementation materials go through the guides in training materials development process with the IC.

The two challenges identified in the call for topics process are:

- lack of global relevance and the clarity on issues
- lack of draft specification of standards or draft outline for implementation resources

If other contracting parties or regions support a submission, it shows that the submission has global impact.

A topic submission is considered complete when:

- for proposed standards, both the “Submission form for topics for Standards and Implementation” and the “Draft specification form for proposed standards” are submitted.
- for proposed implementation resources, both the “Submission form for topics for Standards and Implementation” and the “Draft specification form for proposed IPPC guides and training materials” are submitted.

*Full presentation on:*

#### **Comment from IC member**

With the IC, it's very important that implementation resources, guides or learning materials go through this call for topics. The IC is currently working on 32 topics, which is a big workload but with the call for topic year, it is anticipated that the list will double. As a region, the topics need to be prioritized and get the region represented in a work that gets done

and resourced as well.

Implementation resources generally require financial resources or funding for the Secretariat to support for publication or for translation. When submitting a topic for the IC, there should be resources available to utilise. Most of the 32 submissions are still waiting to be progressed because there are no financial contributions to support it.

The IC members are more than willing to assist and encourages the NPPOs and PPPO to contact them.

### 5.3.1 PPPO submission on Provision of Safe Aid- Ms Aurelia Chan

After the endorsement of CPM 15, the PPPO working group on Safe Aid drafted a call for topics. The submission by PPPO is a call for a stand-alone ISPM on 'Safe Aid' and also informing IPPC that PPPO will also develop its own regional standard. The draft version was also circulated to other RPPOs for their support. With the inclusion of comments and suggestions from other RPPOs, the standards is now being finalized by the Working Group. The final draft of the submission will be presented to the PPPO ExCo for review before submission and endorsement by the full PPPO Board.

PPPO ExCo and full board members are requested to note the dates. Any comments and suggestion are to be received within the time frame

*Full presentation on:*

### 5.3.2 Region's Plan Health Priorities- Other topics being proposed by members.

All the priorities raised in 2019 are still relevant. Listed below are the other priorities identified by the countries in this meeting. Those countries that could not raise their priorities during this meeting are encouraged to email their priorities directly to the PPPO Secretariat who will finalise the priority list to be presented to the Executive Committee upcoming meeting.

#### **Proposal by New Zealand**

1. A lot of work has been done on FAW but it is not appearing on the priority list of the region. It is proposed that FAW should be added on the PPPO's priority list so that all the work done on FAW is captured.
2. As often discussed in the talanoa sessions, the region and NPPOs must take full advantage of the opportunity of having an observer at the CPM Bureau meetings. It is proposed that this issue is placed on the work plan so it will easy to keep track and to be followed up on.
3. The procurement and supply of fruit fly traps and lure to the countries is acknowledged however there seems to be little work on the broader aspect of fruit flies. It is proposed that broader work on fruit flies should be added to the priority list for the region. This could include management of fruit flies, farm management or surveillance programs and other components of fruit flies management.

#### **Proposal by Australia**

1. Similarly, to having an observer at the CPM Bureau meeting, the opportunity is also available for an observer at the SC meetings. The SC Member has agreed to facilitate this.
2. The forum will be hearing more priorities from the countries in this session and also in the future. From a more procedural perspective, the PPPO will need to identify and



progress standards that would fill some of the priorities or gaps raised. The Sand and Gravel draft is still there and has been reviewed recently. The food aid and handicraft has been raised and it shows that these are priorities for the region. This could be fixed through that regional kind of standard setting process.

### **Proposal by Fiji**

1. With regards to climate change, there has been a lot of discussion on the phasing out of methyl bromide. This will have a direct impact on quarantine treatments and trade in the region. The priority of identifying an alternative quarantine treatment could not be more serious at this time. There has been limited literature on alternative quarantine treatment and the alternative treatment identified is not practical to be used in this current time and trading environment. More research is needed for other treatments that can be used for phytosanitary treatment.

## **5.4 Sea Containers- Procedures and Requirement for Inspection.- Nilesh Chand**

The purpose of this standard is to coordinate the global effort to reduce the introduction of pests through the sea container pathway. Some of the risks that are carried across by sea container are of very high importance to our Pacific region and once these pests are introduced, it's quite difficult to manage them. Different stakeholders are involved in this pathway and when the pests that are introduced are in large numbers or are being introduced on a more frequent way there is a very highly likely chance that these exotic pests can find their way into our Pacific region and become established.

The Sea Container Task Force (SCTF) is an IC sub-group and its purpose is to supervise and directly implement the Sea Container Complimentary Action plan that was endorsed by the CPM 12. The SCTF will operate for a temporary period, at least the latest December 2021 and expect to submit a report with the CPM16 in 2022.

The original key tasks of the SCTF are to measure the impact of the Cargo Transport Unit(CTU) code and increase awareness of pest risks of the sea container pathway. Over the five (5) years the SCTF has-

- Increased awareness of the pest risks through different publications.
- Provided information on pest risk of sea containers and its management.
- Coordinate with relevant stakeholders
- Ensure the mechanism for contracting parties to report to the CPM on progress and achievement.
- Provide advice on updating CTU codes
- Encourage NPPOs to create internal awareness on the risk presented by the sea container pathway and the management of risk.
- Strengthen communication
- Donor agency support pilot for developing countries.

The SCFT has also produce output to help address the pest risks associated with the CTU. The final work plan of the SCFT is to conduct an NPPO Survey, Coordination with CPs, RPPOs, industry and other organizations, communication and awareness raising and recommendation to CPM.

The decisions that are expected from CPM 16 includes;

- Create CPM focus group on sea containers,
- Consider value of an international workshop that could be held late 2022 with the outcome to be presented in CPM 17
- Having the option of potential revision of CPM Recommendation No.6 on Sea Containers or a potential ISPM for Sea Containers.

Full presentation on:

## 5.5 Remarks on Fall Army Worm in the Solomon Islands

With the presence of FAW in the region and its continuing spread, the PPPO awaits the guidance of the Secretariat, the Entomologists and the experts on the work that is currently being carried out in the Solomon Islands. The big questions for the region in terms of preparedness and response are:

- How prepared is the region?
- What need to be done?
- What are the threats?

### **Comment by Chris Dale**

There has been a lot of preparatory work done across a number of agencies including the Depart of Foreign Affairs who had coordinated the Biosecurity Solomon Island program in Honiara.

The work of PHAMA Plus with National Agriculture and Quarantine Inspection Authority (NAQIA) in Papua New Guinea has also assisted the work leading into Solomon Islands. For almost twelve (12) months, the Solomon Island has been conducting early warning, or early detection and trapping. The detection was found in both traps and from the cropping area through larvae.

The work currently underway in the Solomon Islands is to look at the distribution of FAW and how it went through the provinces between Bouganville, and Guadalcanal given that there is natural pathway movement.

A series of response communication and advocacy activities has been planned. This has been coordinated in a collaborative approach using the experience of the CRB-G where Extension Officers take a significant role in the communication.

Realistically, the response and management is looking at an integrated pest management approach. A lot of materials are available with FAO through the IPPC and also with the Association of South East Nations (ASEAN) FAW web control program. This is probably the most comprehensive and most relevant and useful FAW resources for the region, a lot of it is designed around Southeast Asia and Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC). It would also be useful to learn from PNG's direct experience in detecting and then conducting delimiting surveys and managing or responding to the pest.

### **Comment from PNG**

Having an early warning system like the Solomon Island is very useful. For PNG, FAW has only been found on corn and has not attacked other vegetables. A lot of semi commercial farmers have been using chemical and it is now determined that the commonly used contact chemical brand name Karate is not effective on FAW. Major commercial enterprises in PNG have management strategies in place through the proper use of insecticide to also manage any natural enemies.

Surveillance activities are ongoing and at the same time continue to develop the readiness package through all the information sources mentioned in the earlier presentation. In addition PNG has been attending the webinar with FAO now that the pest is in the country and there needs to be a lot of risk communication to the community that they are aware and informed.

### **Comment by Chair**

This topic affects all the countries in the region and the region needs to be organized. The regional technical team that was agreed to be established would be the team that needs to be on the ground and help mobilize and work with everyone in the region to prepare. This would mean that the public awareness information is organized as well.



The PPPO members are in agreement and reinforce the request to the PPPO secretariat to take the lead and organize the regional technical team and begin the process within the region in terms of information awareness and management control that needs to be in place and also work on the PPPO framework. PPPO members also acknowledge the other experts present.

Dr Viliami Kami of the Land Resource Division (LRD), SPC has also shown the commitment for the technical team. As this is a critical issue in the region, PPPO members supports the idea that this team immediately after the workshop.

## **Agenda 6: Conclusion of the workshop-**

## **Agenda 7: Online Survey of the Workshop**

IPPC Secretariat, Ms Natsumi Yamada facilitated the Online Survey. PPPO members who could not complete the survey within the given time could do so after the meeting.

## **Agenda 8: Adoption of the Report adoption covers agreed action items, way forward and recommendations**

### **Comment by the PPPO Secretariat**

Given the current situation, the secretariat requests to use the recording of the last four (4) days to compile the report and request the understanding of the forum in this regard. The Secretariat further request of the forum could adopt that as of now until the 1<sup>st</sup> draft is produced within two (2) weeks.

### **Comment by Australia**

Proposed to adopt the report and the 1<sup>st</sup> draft to be circulated within 3 weeks of the meeting.

This proposal was adopted by the forum.

## **Agenda 9: Closing Remarks- CPM Bureau Member SWP –Mr. Peter Thompson**

On behalf of all the PPPO members, Mr. Thompson offered appreciation to the following for the tremendous work done in organizing the meeting.

- PPPO Chair,
- Meeting Chair
- Members of the organizing committee,
- IPPC Secretariat

The South West Pacific (SWP) can now tick off the 2021 Draft ISPM review workshop and declare it complete. PPPO members are encouraged to take the things that have been learned and the ideas that have come to mind from this workshop and discuss them quickly among country teams and sub regional groups. Similarly, to make an action list and make a start before things are forgotten.

There is a transition in the PPPO leadership with long serving members retiring and in some ways the future activities will miss the contributions by them. At the same time, continuing members can build on that and ensure that the PPPO can continue to grow and advance the work, operate in the best way possible and have a continuing positive impact for the region. This can be done through good leadership and through good people who are willing to step up to lead. Leadership can be a

real catalyst for change and organizational leadership is really critical at a national and regional level. When there are strong leaders, people that are willing to step forward and speak up, everything around them gets strengthened and prepares well for the future. Looking back now, it is certain that the future is always uncertain but strong leaders are needed to lead the way through those uncertain times, on a national level and at the regional level as well. When the time comes for those leaders to leave, they provide strength to those around them.

Everyone can make great contribution and it was through good leadership that the meeting turned out to be a success and really valuable comments were submitted for the ISPM. Be proactive leaders always asking members how they can be better served.

The CPM Bureau Member wishes all the countries success in their national program endeavors and operations.

### **Agenda 11: Close of Meeting.**

Meeting Chair acknowledge the CPM Bureau Member, all the SC and IC members for their valuable contribution and support during the week and wished them every success as they attend other virtual meets.

**END OF MEETING**