

PACIFIC PLANT PROTECTION ORGANISATION (PPPO)

**REGIONAL WORKSHOP TO REVIEW DRAFT INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR
PHYTOSANITARY STANDARDS (ISPMs) Workshop/ Meeting Report**



21 - 23 AUGUST 2023

CROWN BEACH RESORT, RAROTONGA, COOK ISLANDS

Actions Items from the 2023 Draft ISPM review workshop:

1. Vice Chair of the Focus Group for Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (Australia) to work with PPPO Members of the Focus Group to draft a paper in support of the provision of safe aid to be presented at the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) in October. The support from the PPPO Members will be needed.
2. Mr Alipate Tavo (PACER Plus) to send out survey questionnaires to the PACER Plus member countries that attended the workshop, to ensure that the outcomes of the PACER Plus are being met. This will also inform PACER Plus on how best they can provide future support to their members and the PPPO.
3. PPPO Secretariat to add to the PPPO RTB Meeting agenda the need for better coordination in the work on biosecurity legislation with other partners and the different models being socialised for further discussion.
4. Mr Hemant Nitturkar (FAO SAP) to share the Multi-Country Programming Framework with PPPO Members
5. Secretariat to include *“coordination between different organisation efforts in the Pacific to prevent duplication and ensure that NPPOs are not overloaded with projects”* in the agenda of the PPPO RTB Meeting.
6. SWP Bureau Member to raise at the next CPM Bureau meeting the issue of RPPO funding and also enquire what funding is available to support regional workshops.
7. Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia) to seek advice at the next CPM Bureau meeting on models being used to support other RPPOs.
8. PPPO Members to provide sea container data to the Sea Container FG member Mr Rama Karri (Australia).
9. PPPO Secretariat to include options for sea container cleanliness tracking as an agenda in the Full board meeting
10. PPPO Secretariat to distribute to Members the model of payment for ePhyto solutions proposed by the European & Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) once the paper has been made available. This will be an agenda item during the PPPO Talanoa on Friday 22 September to initiate discussions and help in the formulation of a paper from the PPPO to be presented during the SPG meeting in the second week of October.
11. PPPO ExCo to discuss and consider if an ePhyto contribution could be included in membership fees for the PPPO, for those countries that will pay under the agreed funding model.
12. PPPO Secretariat through the Executive Secretary to raise the issue of funding RPPO's to the TC-RPPO meeting this year in Colombia.
13. PPPO Secretariat to add to the PPPO RTB Meeting agenda a topic on prioritisation of needs for resource mobilisation for the PPPO. The topic will include:
 - a. gaps and needs of the PLD
 - b. processes related to the collection of data and capture within the PLD (i.e. pest status)
 - c. available funding and time required to conduct surveys to update data within the PLD.
14. PPPO Secretariat to explore the option of including on the PPPO webpage an area for meeting papers which should also facilitate for the collaboration between members and PPPO Secretariat to finalise papers instead of doing it via e-mail exchange.

15. PPPO Secretariat to obtain the power point presentation on emerging issues from Mr Mark Ero (designation??) and distribute to PPPO Members.
16. PPPO Members to update their Official Contact Point (OCP) details on the IPPC website.
17. 3 members (one from each subregion) to work with Mr Stephen Ogden on the SPC commissioned PPPO review. Representatives will be Mr New Testament Aue (Niue for Polynesia), Ms Tekataake Oromita (Kiribati for Micronesia), and Mr Armstrong Sam (Vanuatu for melanesia).
18. The PPPO Secretariat to upload the PPPO's comments to the IPPC's Online Commenting System (OCS) by the due date 30 September.
19. The ISPM draft report to be circulated to the PPPO Members within 2 weeks of the conclusion of the workshop.

1. Opening of the Session

As per the Cook Islands' traditional protocol, the Chief guest and PPPO members were escorted from the arrival area to the workshop room by a local traditional group.

The opening session of the workshop was officiated by the Cook Islands Ministry of Agriculture Director of Biosecurity, Mr Ngatoko Ngatoko. Mr Ngatoko warmly welcomed all Members and conveyed the support of the Government of Cook Islands to ensure that the one week engagement would be successful.

Devotion by Reverend Tinirau Soatini

Reverend Tinirau Soatini shared a bible verse, prayed, and blessed the week's engagement and safekeeping of the workshop participants.

Remarks by IPPC Secretariat representative Ms Adriana Moreira

Ms Adriana Moreira expressed her appreciation to the PPPO and Cook Islands as the host country, and that it was an honour and a privilege for her to represent the IPPC Secretariat at this workshop. She reminded the group of the IPPC mission to protect plants and the purpose behind the PPPO gathering this week which, besides the technical aspects of the ISPMs and presentations, is also to ensure international cooperation for plant health.

Remarks by IPPC Secretary Mr Osama El-Lissy

In a video, Mr Osama El-Lissy welcomed the group to the Regional Workshop and outlined the importance of plants and the challenges caused by plant pests. He outlined IPPC's role and the importance of bringing the international community together for plant protection.

Remarks by SPC Land Resources Division (LRD) Director Ms Karen Mapusua

In a video, Ms Karen Mapusua expressed her thanks to the Government of the Cook Islands, through the Ministry of Agriculture, for hosting the event. She thanked Australia's Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF) and New Zealand's Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) for their support to the PPPO Secretariat. Ms Karen Mapusua outlined the importance of PPPO's role in the development and review of the ISPMs and the opportunity for collaboration and discussions between the members at the workshop. She thanked the Southwest Pacific (SWP) representatives to the

Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau, Standards Committee (SC), and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC) for representing the region.

Opening speech by the Chief Guest; Minister for Agriculture, the Cook Islands, the Hon. Rose Toki-Brown

In her opening speech, the Hon. Toki-Brown welcomed the participants and development partner representatives on behalf of the Prime Minister, the Cabinet, and the people of the Cook Islands. She acknowledged Ms. Temarama Anguna-Kamana (Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Cook Islands), and her staff for working with the Government of the Cook Islands to host this event. She outlined the importance of ISPMs and improving the livelihoods of people in the Pacific through plant protection. She mentioned climate change and how it exacerbates the spread and establishment of plant pests and other challenges to plant health. Furthermore, she expressed the need to work together as a region, to share and learn from each other, and to enhance resilience so that our region continues to stay protected including our way of life and livelihood.

Vote of thanks by the PPPO Deputy Chair, Mr Nacanieli Waqa

Mr Nacanieli Waqa (New Zealand, Deputy Chair PPPO, hereafter referred to as 'The Chair'), represented the PPPO in expressing its sincere appreciation to the Chief Guest, the Hon. Rose Toki-Brown, for agreeing to its request and gracing the workshop with her presence as chief guest despite her busy schedule. The Chair noted that it has been few years since the PPPO last managed to come together as an organisation and a family. In the same sentiment, the Chair congratulated the Cook Islands as it was their first time to host the PPPO Regional Technical Board Meeting. On behalf of the PPPO, the Chair thanked the honourable minister and staff of the Cook Islands Ministry of Agriculture for being part of the preparations for the workshop, including their facilitation at the airport during the arrival of the members.

The Chair also acknowledged all the regional partners (MPI, DAFF, USDA, FAO, IPPC, SPREP, PACER Plus, SPC, and Protégé) that contributed financially to enable the workshop to happen. He hoped that this commitment and support would continue into the future.

A group photo was taken after the workshop was officially opened by the chief guest.

3. Meeting Arrangements

3.1 Election of Rapporteurs

Ms. Maria Ledua and are the Report writers.

The workshop confirmed for Australia and Samoa to assist Ms Maria Ledua and Ms Wendy Xiao from the PPPO Secretariat as rapporteurs for the workshop.

3.2 Adoption of the Agenda

The Chair coordinated the discussions according to the agenda for the workshop.

Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Member) suggested that agenda item 5.6 *CPM Recommendation on sea containers* to be presented by a member of the Sea Container Task Force, Mr Rama Karri (DAFF). The PPPO Members agreed for Mr Karri to run his presentations once his availability was confirmed with the Secretariat.

Ms. Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) suggested that agenda item 7.3 *New IPPC Guides and e-learning courses* be presented by Mr. Ngatoko Ngatoko in his role as SWP Representative to the Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC).

The PPPO Secretariat provided the introduction and background to the agenda item *Scanning the horizon for biosecurity threats*, which was to be presented by SPC LRD Director. The subject was to be presented for the Members information and requested the Members for their endorsement of the agenda item.

Australia and the Chair sought further detail from the PPPO Secretariat and Fiji also expressed that the allocated 45 minutes is too long, and there with no paper provided to members that they would be in the dark. The Chair decided that the ISPMs review and agenda items for the PPPO will be prioritised and hold precedence, and that only if there is time would the presentation be done, and for a maximum of 15 minutes.

Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Member) stated that agenda item 7.12 would be presented by Ms. Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia) instead of Ms. Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat).

The workshop agenda was adopted after it was moved by Fiji and supported by Australia.

4.1 Combined Updates: Governance and strategy, Standards Committee (SC) and Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)

IPPC Governance & Strategy presented by SWP representative to the CPM Bureau Ms Gabrielle-Vivian Smith

The SWP representative to the CPM Bureau, Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith presented an update on IPPC Governance and Strategy and also covered a brief history of the IPPC since its foundation in 1881. She outlined the IPPC mission, vision, objectives, core activities, governance, and the Secretariat Structure. She acknowledged the involvement of Ms. Sophie Peterson and Ms Joanne Wilson in IPPC Standards Setting as SC Members.

The CPM Bureau Member outlined some major achievements of the CPM:

- CPM-17 was held in person in 2023. Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith acknowledged the participation of Samoa and Cook Islands at CPM-17 and encouraged more representation from the PPPO at the next CPM, while acknowledging the difficulties in organising travel, though many countries of the region qualify for some level of FAO travel funding support.
 - Several key decisions were made at CPM-17, including the establishment of a new program manager position.
- Outstanding items include the establishment of the Focus Groups on global research coordination and laboratory diagnostic networking, which present another opportunity for PPPO involvement.
- The IPPC Secretariat has a strong focus on communications, such as the International Day of Plant Health, the 2022 annual report, newsletters, the new look of the IPPC website. Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) encouraged everyone to register via the website to receive the monthly newsletter.

1. A community of practice in communications is being set up. The IPPC Secretariat is calling for expressions of interest for this network which will focus on how two-way communication for those working in Plant Health can be established.

Update by Capacity & Implementation by Implementation and Capacity Development Committee (IC)
Member Mr Ngatoko Ngatoko

Mr Ngatoko Ngatoko (IC Member) presented the update for the IC. He explained that the IC looks at the implementation of the standards and provides oversight to the strategic framework development agendas, while the Standards Committee looks at the development of standards. The IC held an in-person meeting in November 2022 and May 2023. Mr. Ngatoko Ngatoko called for other issues of concern in the Pacific to be included in the 2023 call for topics.

The Chair thanked the representatives of the SWP to the CPM, SC, IC, and IPPC for their representation and ensuring the PPPO's voices and concerns are made known.

4.2 IPPC ISPMs Development, Draft Standards, and the Review Process presented by SC Chair Ms Sophie Petersen

Ms. Sophie Peterson (SC Member) presented information on processes involved in standard setting. The standard setting process is strongly supported by the Standards Setting Unit within the IPPC Secretariat, to which Ms Adriana Moreira is the Deputy Lead.

The focus of this workshop is to review the draft ISPMs, draft specifications for ISPMs, and draft specifications for implementation materials. These annual workshops allow the region to go through the documents from the IPPC, discuss from a Pacific regional perspective, and feed collective comments back to the IPPC. Many PPPO Members just provide a comment stating that they support the regional comment so that the steward managing the document understands that the regional comment has its members' support. PPPO Members have time to provide additional comments after this workshop as comments are not due until 30 September 2023.

The SC Chair ran through the different first and second consultation documents as listed in the agenda. The SC Chair showed how the Online Comment System (OCS) can be accessed and explained that it may be easier for Members to download the documents, make track changes on Microsoft Word, and then copy and paste into the OCS. She also noted that it is important to provide a justification of each comment, as without a justification for the change, the comment will not be accepted by the system. The Steward needs a clear justification and proposed alternative text to address comments correctly. The SC Chair stressed that while Members who are not IPPC contracting parties are not able to provide comments to the IPPC documents as individuals, they can do so through the PPPO as a region.

Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) explained that there are some documents that are not going to be covered in the workshop. The SC have approved an additional consultation period for diagnostic protocols next year commencing in January 2024 and lasting 120 days. It is anticipated that 3 draft diagnostic protocols will be released during this consultation round. Ms Adriana Moreira also noted that the SC received the first proposal for diagnostic protocols, which was from the PPPO on Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle.

The SC Chair also presented an update on the Focus Group (FG) on the safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid.

- The FG was established last year and has the largest ever proportion of SWP representation ever in a FG. The topic of safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid has been proposed by the Pacific region two times due to its importance.
- The FG discussions, including a face-to-face meeting in Nadi this year, revealed that the Pacific region faces unique challenges when it comes to the safe provision of aid.
- Aid agencies have reported that issues in the Asia and Africa regions are more related to cars and trucks bringing in aid via land, which is less relevant to the Pacific.
- The FG developed a revised specification for the ISPM. There is a proposal to extend the FG for another year. The FG will present to the Strategic Planning Group (SPG) the revised specification and a diagram showing the flow of aid.
- Unfortunately, the IPPC does not provide funding to attend the SPG as attendance is optional. Since there will be relatively low representation from the Pacific at the SPG in October 2023, SC Chair suggested that in order to send a strong message from the region, the region put in a paper in support of the proposal to extend the FG for another year considering the importance of safe aid and the unique challenges of providing aid to the Pacific.

Vanuatu commented that there has been a lot of aid coming through the Pacific and that most countries have complied with the biosecurity requirements since the most recent cyclones in Vanuatu. This was an improvement from practices followed in previous natural disaster relief efforts.

The Chair thanked the SWP Members of the FG on the Provision of Safe Aid for their contributions during the FG engagements.

PPPO Members agreed for the paper to be developed for presentation at the SPG in October.

Action: Vice Chair of the Focus Group for Safe provision of food and other humanitarian aid (Australia) to work with PPPO Members of the Focus Group to draft a paper from the Region in support of the provision of safe aid to be presented at the SPG in October. Support from PPPO Members will be needed.

5.1 Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001) presented by SC Member Ms Joanne Wilson

Ms Joanne Wilson (SC Member) presented on this draft ISPM and provided the following updates.

- The CPM decided in 2022 that the pest risk analysis (PRA) standards needed to be revised and reorganised, and an Expert Working Group (EWG) came together in May 2023.
- There are 3 standards (ISPM2, ISPM11, and draft pest risk management standards) that make up the text of this reorganised PRA standard.
- An outline of requirements describes the PRA as a tool and how it is used. The structure of the revised ISPM includes the core text and various annexes that explain the various stages of PRA, and other considerations.

- The Appendix is not part of the standard but supports the standard. The EWG consolidated a lot of the supplements that were in the original IPSM11 and put it into the annex to reduce confusion.
- The EWG had lot of discussion on the economic, social, and cultural consequences of the PRA. Pest risk management became a separate annex. Major drafting issues included level of pest risk and example of pest risk management options.

The draft ISPM includes black, blue and red text, to indicate if the text is new or from ISPM 2 or ISPM 11. It is suggested that general comments, but not revised text, is provided against text from ISPM2 and ISPM 11. The EWG considered economic consequences and how that can be described better (including social and environmental economic consequences), timeframes (how long a PRA stays relevant), and a matrix on the strength of measures. The standard does not discuss when PRA should end.

Tuvalu enquired how long it takes to review a draft standard. The SC Member explained that reviews are conducted as per request and that the text of the PRA in its entirety has never been reviewed until now, it has just been added to repeatedly over time.

Members formed subregional groups to discuss the proposed amendments to the ISPM. Comments and proposed changes are detailed in Annex 1.

5.2 Draft Annex: International movement of *Mangifera indica* fresh fruit to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) (2021-011) presented by SC Member Ms Joanne Wilson.

Ms Joanne Wilson (SC member) presented this draft annex, which is the first annex to ISPM 46. The specification was approved in 2022 by the SC, and the annex was developed from 9 information papers. The annex has the same scope as all other ISPM 46 annexes to come.

The Annex applies to:

- all mango cultivars,
- fresh whole fruit, with or without a small section of fruit stalk attached but without leaves or stem,
- fruit that has been produced for trade, and does not apply to processed fruit.

The panel came up with a list of 58 pests, which is not exhaustive. Pests were only mentioned in the standard where there is a specific measure against it, so the standard does not include pests for which there are no measures. The SC member confirmed that 30 of the pests on the list are fruit flies.

The management options include general measures that may be relevant to all pests, and pest-specific measures, which are presented as codes against each pest. The 'Systems approaches' section provides examples of independent measures but these are not well described.

Members formed subregional groups to discuss the proposed amendments to the Annex. Comments and proposed changes are detailed in Annex 1.

5.3 2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on phytosanitary terms) (1994-001); Second Consultation presented by SC Chair Ms Sophie Peterson

- The 2 proposed additions are “general surveillance” and “specific surveillance” (though these are not currently for consultation).
- There are 6 revisions, but 2 of those are not for comment as they have been recommended by the SC-7 to the SC for approval for adoption by the CPM.
- “General surveillance” is a proposed new definition: “A process whereby information on pests in an area is obtained through various sources other than surveys”. It was agreed that the term “official” be exclude from the definition.
- The proposed revision to “Phytosanitary action” will depends on our definition of “test” and “surveillance” and refers to implementation of actions a country’s own territory for someone else’s pest of concern. “Phytosanitary procedure” relates to “phytosanitary action”.
- All the definitions are interlinked. Any terms that are bolded are defined in ISPM 5, however this bolding is not reflected in all the other ISPMs. There is acknowledgement that this is a problem and there is discussion on how to reflect this in other ISPMs so that readers are aware that it is a defined term.

Members formed subregional groups to discuss the proposed amendments to the ISPM. Comments and proposed changes are detailed in Annex 1.

5.4 Draft Annex: Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood) (2015-004) presented by SC Chair Ms Sophie Peterson

- The draft annex should be read with consideration of ISPM 39.
- The Annex was drafted due to countries’ heavy reliance on treatment to manage pests in wood.
- To support reduction in the use of methyl bromide and allow for other options, system approaches are seen as able to provide an equivalent alternative to a single phytosanitary measure. A systems approach concept is described in ISPM 14, but more specific guidance is required specifically for wood.
- The definition of wood in ISPM 5 specifies that it is other than bamboo and ratan.
- The EWG examined practices at various stages: growing, prior to export, and at the border before it leaves biosecurity control.
- The annex has appendices on the major groups of pests, which are grouped according to where they live and reproduce in the wood.

The EWG considered a number of factors:

- Whether contaminating pests should be considered, even though they are excluded from ISPM 39.
- Whether the IPPC understand what a systems approach is. For example, the “Systems approach of a seed” annex demonstrated that not all of IPPC community understands what a systems approach is.
- Concern with the size of the woodchip. There was discussion whether ISPM 39 should be revised to reflect the current definition of the size of a woodchip (2.5cm)
- The annex does not specifically refer to a non-authorised entity, but recognised that not every player in the chain is necessarily authorised by the NPPO.

- Implementation issues were considered, but when the document was reviewed, no implementation issues were identified. The SC Chair asked that if the group does think of implementation issues in the annex or standard, to please include them in their comments.

Members formed subregional groups to discuss the proposed amendments to the ISPM. Comments and proposed changes are detailed in Annex 1.

5.5 Draft Annex: Criteria for evaluation of available information for determining host status of fruit-to-fruit flies to ISPM 37 Determination of host status of fruit to fruit flies (Tephritidae) (2018-011)
presented by SC Member Ms Joanne Wilson

- During general considerations 30 different terms describing host status in the literature were found.
- More guidance was needed in order to align with ISPM 37, including guidance on identifying the host, conditional host, and non-host.

PPPO Members formed subregional groups to discuss the proposed amendments to the ISPM. Comments and proposed changes are detailed in Annex 1.

6.2 Regional PACER Plus phytosanitary capacity development activities *presented virtually by Mr Alipate Tavo (PACER Plus Trade and Investment Adviser)*

Mr Alipate Tavo outlined the Pacer Plus work program from 2021 to 2025, of which SPS is one of the components.

PACER Plus commenced its work program with biosecurity legislation support to assist with the commitments that countries had made when they signed on to PACER Plus. Many countries are not members of the WTO, so more efforts were required to review their plant biosecurity legislation. Another focus was to assist countries with meeting their SPS obligations and to build the capacity of the private sector with SPS requirements, particularly given increased trade within the Pacific.

Currently, PACER Plus is working on:

- Upgrades in equipment and infrastructure to meet SPS and market access requirements.
- Building capacity of biosecurity officials, including those of IPPC standards.
- Capacity building on ePhyto certification – resources, biosecurity systems (getting everyone on the same system)
- Value chains and traceability training and equipment

Efforts are made to ensure that there is no duplication between PACER Plus implementing partners, which include PHAMA Plus, MFAT, MPI, DAFF, DFAT, and SPC.

Comments and Questions:

Tonga expressed appreciation to PACER Plus for travel funding.

Mr Hemant Nitturkar (FAO) expressed interest in opportunities for collaboration between FAO and PACER Plus.

Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) commented that the SPS Secretariat also works on SPS capacity training. She explained that it is possible for the PPPO to submit a training request to the SPS Secretariat.

Action: Mr Alipate Tavo (PACER Plus) to send out survey questionnaires to the PACER Plus member countries that attended the workshop to ensure that the outcomes of PACER Plus are met. This will also inform PACER Plus on how best they can provide future support to their members and the PPPO.

The Chair stated that Biosecurity legislation is one of the components of the work of PACER Plus, FAO, and SPC. There should be a single Biosecurity legislation model that is agreed upon by the PPPO Board. There needs to be coordination amongst PACER Plus, FAO, and SPC to ensure a single model is endorsed by the members of the PPPO. Fiji expressed that there are many entities trying to do the same thing and there needs to be more coordination for the development of biosecurity legislation.

Action: PPPO Secretariat to add to the PPPO RTB Meeting agenda the need for better coordination in the work on biosecurity legislation with other partners and the different models being socialised for further discussion.

Cook Islands expressed thanks to the PPIU and acknowledged the assistance from PACER Plus for the assistance to member countries travel to Cook Islands.

Mr Alipate Tavo (PACER Plus) thanked the Board for inviting him to speak and expressed looking forward to further collaboration. The Chair thanked PACER Plus and acknowledged its funding support to the PACER Plus members.

6.1 Regional FAO phytosanitary capacity development activities presented by Mr Hemant Nitturkar (FAO Samoa).

The Chair acknowledged the funding support from FAO for members' attendance.

Mr Hemant Nitturkar compared the aims of FAO, IPPC, Cook Islands Ministry of Agriculture, and PPPO. He reflected on situations when process becomes more important than results for an organisation, the need to determine capacity building requirements, and steps towards better production of plant commodities.

Mr Hemant Nitturkar outlined several regional FAO activities:

- FAO has a project in prevention, detection, and management of fall armyworm (FAW) infestation in Solomon Islands and neighbouring Pacific Islands (Fiji, Samoa, and Vanuatu). The project is trying to determine spread and damage of FAW in Solomon Islands and is conducting a regional workshop in Solomon Islands for other countries to understand what is happening there. There is a global action by the FAO on FAW.
- FAO has partnered with SPC to work in 5 countries in the region to promote ecologically based alternatives to highly hazardous pesticides. There is a pest registration scheme that has been signed by 3 countries and will be operational once all 5 have signed, with a plan to take the signatories to Australia to be trained on how the pest registration scheme works in Australia.
- FAO is promoting efficacy trials in various countries. For example, FAO is organising a round table conference in Samoa on how to manage Paraquat and to share learnings.

- The FAO pipeline includes technical assistance to Nauru on endemic and transboundary pests and diseases, technical assistance to Tuvalu on yellow crazy ants, and a new project on increasing domestic production in Fiji, Samoa, and Solomon Islands, including agribusiness incubation to promote innovation.

Questions and Comments:

Tonga thanked Mr Hemant Nitturkar for the presentation. Tonga has had a Pesticides Act since 2002 but faces challenges with implementation and enforcement. Tonga asked how FAO could assist Tonga in enforcement of the Act. Mr Hemant Nitturkar explained that FAO is looking at legislation in 3 countries, however Tonga is not part of these countries. FAO requires a request from government of Tonga to provide any assistance, and invited Tonga to submit such a request.

Tuvalu thanked Mr Hemant Nitturkar for the presentation and asked that FAO share what projects are in line with the FAO multi-country programming framework, so that countries can suggest projects to be part of FAO's work plan. Mr Nitturkar explained that FAO seeks each government's priorities and that the activities that are in the country programming framework are fed from those countries' governments. Tuvalu requested that Mr Nitturkar share the Multi-Country Programming Framework.

Action: Mr Hemant Nitturkar (FAO SAP) to share the Multi-Country Programming Framework with PPPO Members

Australia commented that there are many programs that Hemant presented on that are similar to what other organisations are doing. There is concern that the NPPOs are pulled away from their jobs in order to participate in many different projects. Australia made a request to FAO to include Australia and New Zealand when planning their projects so that there is no duplication. The Chair expressed the need to discuss duplication of projects and coordination between different organisation efforts in the Pacific.

Action: Secretariat to include "coordination between different organisation efforts in the Pacific to prevent duplication and ensure that NPPOs are not overloaded with projects" in the agenda of the PPPO RTB Meeting.

The Chair expressed that poor record-keeping of previous efforts make it difficult to determine whether there is duplication of efforts. Fiji added that at a recent workshop in Samoa, the need for central repository of projects were determined. Mr Hemant Nitturkar suggested a map of different projects in the Pacific.

The Chair asked how FAO can provide consistent funding to the PPPO. Cook Islands suggested that each country raises funding at the regional level, which can be raised with FAO in Rome. Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) explained that any country with an issue can approach FAO for something to be included in the FAO multi-country programming framework. In terms of sustainable funding, she is unsure of the process that RPPOs can go through but would suggest exploring viable options by looking at different IPPC fora. Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (CPM Bureau Member) said that she is happy to raise the issue of funding at the next bureau meeting and that Australia is happy to work different NPPOs to propose questions to the Bureau regarding financial support to the PPPO and look at different RPPOs on their funding models to explore different options.

Action: SWP Bureau Member to raise at the next CPM Bureau meeting the issue of RPPO funding funding and also enquire what funding is available to support regional workshops.

Action: Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia) to seek advice at the next CPM Bureau meeting on models being used to support other RPPOs

5.6 CPM Recommendation on sea containers presented by Rama Karri (DAFF, PPPO representative to the sea container focus group).

Mr Rama Karri explained that CPM Recommendations provide international guidance but are not standards. Currently there are 10 published CPM recommendations. This recommendation concerns reducing the risk associated with the sea container pathway for both NPPOs and organisations. The CPM Focus Group (FG) was formed in 2022 and revised the existing recommendation. Mr Rama Karri went through the list of revised content and explained the intent of the recommendation.

The purpose of the recommendation is to provide a strengthened platform for minimizing the pest risks associated with the international movements of sea containers, by all responsible parties.

Mr Rama Karri noted that some areas of the revised recommendation will be updated based on the feedback received from the international sea container workshop in Brisbane, such as regarding the material used for sea container floors.

Questions and Comments:

Niue thanked Mr Rama Karri for the presentation. Regarding the slide on communication, Niue asked whether there is a virtual network/online platform for NPPOs to monitor the movement of containers and to track containers around the Pacific so that countries can know where the container has been and how clean it is. Mr Rama Karri was not sure about any virtual platform but said that often there are discussions on the need to have access to this information and on how a Pacific strategy that focuses on movement of sea containers in the Pacific could be developed. The sea container FG wants to have a Regional Pacific workshop to discuss a strategy with NPPOs to minimise the risk of container movement in the Pacific as access to this information would be useful.

Action: PPPO Members to provide sea container data to the Sea Container FG member Mr Rama Karri.

Cook Islands suggested whether container cleanliness information could be incorporated into an enhancement of the ePhyto system since the numbering system already exists.

Australia commented that one of the points of contention is whether sea containers pose a phytosanitary risk – for some NPPOs, they are not convinced that sea containers pose a phytosanitary risk. Australia asked whether there is any data or information that PPPO countries or signatories could gather or focus on ahead of the workshop that is proposed by the Focus Group for next year. Mr Rama Karri responded that the FG has some data, particularly provided by Australia, New Zealand, and China. It will be useful to have data from the PPPO region – from a survey conducted last year with PPPO members, 16 NPPOs that responded indicated that they collect sea container data, and most respondents said that they would be happy to share their data. It would be useful to have data from the region to as evidence of the global risk. This is timely because in addition to certain NPPOs, industry groups are also providing evidence justifying global action on sea container cleanliness. The more data and evidence the FG can provide, the easier it will be to justify a global strategy for sea container cleanliness.

Samoa asked whether NPPOs have access to ASYCUDA and whether it can be used for cleanliness and location tracking. Fiji said that they are working on an interface between the systems to allow for tracking and cleanliness.

Cook Islands expressed the need for a network and system that allows regular and ad hoc communication between NPPOs regarding cleanliness. Fiji suggested that the technology for communication is already there but needs to be harnessed.

The PPPO Secretariat explained that it would be difficult to capture and upload data on the movement of sea containers onto the PLD. However, the PLD does document interceptions, which can be from sea containers.

Mr Peter Neimanis (PACER Plus) explained that commercial IT service providers track containers for their customers. Since a message can be sent back to the exporting country regarding an ePhyto, a similar system could be used for containers. Specific needs of countries need to be examined to decide what is the best system to meet the region's needs, and assistance from commercial providers may be needed to determine this. This could be examined within the scope of ePhyto processes.

The Chair sought endorsement from the Board to discuss options for season container cleanliness tracking at the PPPO board meeting.

Action: PPPO Secretariat to include options for season container cleanliness tracking as an agenda in the Full board meeting

The PPPO Secretariat thanked Mr Rama Karri for his Pacific representation to the sea container FG, thanked Australia for hosting the sea container workshop and thanked the Members who were able to attend.

PPPO Members formed subregional groups to discuss the proposed recommendation. Comments and proposed changes are detailed in Annex 1.

7.1 Regional ePhyto Project Updates (SPC and PACER Plus) presented by Mr Ilaisa Dakaica (SPC ePhyto) and Mr Peter Neimanis (PACER Plus)

- Thanks were given to DAFF and MPI for the implementation of the project.
- Most members of the PPPO are able to use the web-based GeNS and that Members are at various stages of ePhyto Implementation, from GeNS UAT Registration to GeNS production status, GeNS training, a GeNS regional workshop, and stakeholder forums.
- ePhyto improves opportunities for Pacific farmers and exporters to trade within the Pacific. The aim is to develop capacity in Pacific in the exchange of phytosanitary certificates electronically in an innovative, cost effective and globally harmonised way with all the countries connected to the Hub via GeNS.
- Benefits to participating countries of using the GeNS include exchanging phytosanitary certificates without making additional investments to develop a national system through a software provider. ePhyto allows for better alignment with countries' national biosecurity concerns and better control of biosecurity risks.
- The 2021 countries selected for ePhyto were Marshall, Cook Island, Palau, Tuvalu, Tonga and Papua New Guinea.

- The PACER Plus ePhyto Capacity Building Project was the first PACER Plus project on ePhyto.
- A key objective was to build country capacity for them to implement ePhyto.
- The scope included training and assessments for plant quarantine staff and plant product exporters, a benefits analysis of ePhyto implementation in the Pacific, and the development of a change management toolkit to support efficient and successful implementation of GeNS in PACER Plus countries.
- The aim is for countries to continue to use ePhyto instead of going back to paper certificates.
- The project did an assessment of countries' specific and general needs and assessed the level of understanding of ePhyto around the Pacific during trainings to understand the common needs of the different countries.
- The second phase of the project will develop a best practice model and make sure that countries use GeNS and document where improvements are needed.

Questions and Comments:

Tonga thanked Mr Ilaisa Dakaica and Mr Peter Neimanis for the presentation. Tonga has not started issuing ePhyto for exports but will start doing so this week to New Zealand after having trialled ePhytos to New Zealand last week. Exporters have already received training but need more since the NPPOs needed to provide additional assistance to the exporters during the trial. Mr Peter Neimanis explained that there is PACER Plus budget to visit each country again once, but that there needs to be executive support through the development of a country/NPPO implementation plan before visiting each country to make it worthwhile. He is aware that refresher training is needed for quarantine staff and exporters.

The Chair noted that New Zealand is also trying to work out their own systems to become paperless.

Cook Islands thanked Mr Ilaisa Dakaica and Mr Peter Neimanis for the presentation. Cook Islands congratulated Peter on the amount of work that has been achieved since the project commenced. Cook Islands is waiting on the introduction of the billing system within the ePhyto platform and asked if that component is not brought to the Cook Islands before the project's end in 2024, whether the project will be extended, or whether Cook Islands should be looking elsewhere for assistance. Mr Peter Neimanis responded that there should be money allocated to this next year, but it is unclear where exactly it is being allocated. Cook Islands needs to have a conversation with PACER Plus to understand what their needs are, and there needs to be someone from each NPPO who is dedicated to the use of the ePhyto system.

7.2 The IPPC ePhyto Solution Updates *presented by Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (CPM Bureau Member)*

At CPM-15 in 2021, it was decided to establish a focus group for ePhyto. The Chair of the focus group is Peter Thomson, and Lisa Winthrop is its SWP representative. The FG will be seeking an extension.

The main tasks of the FG were to deliver a sustainable funding solution for the ePhyto Solution. The FG reported back to CPM-17 in 2022, where the FG proposed either:

1. Allocation cost to user countries based on development status, or
2. Allocating costs to user countries based on the volume of transactions.

A consensus was unable to be reached, though many agreed with option 1. Contracting parties requested that FAO be asked to fund the program for ePhyto, costing approximately USD\$1.2M per year.

There is some urgency for CPM to deliberate towards an outcome, as funding will run out in 2024 unless additional funding is received. The operational costs will not allow the ePhyto Solution to continue operating if additional funding is not found.

The FG has been creating models and has developed a hybrid concept which calculates countries contribution using both their development status and usage (number of transactions).

The FG will finalise the draft proposal before mid-September, and the proposal will be tested with the CPM Bureau and with the Strategic Planning Group (SPG), in October. The Focus Group will draft an ePhyto funding mechanism and procedure for CPM-18 decision in 2024.

Issues raised include some countries requiring letters for payment, some requiring an invoice, and some countries' concerns about their ability to pay and what the consequences of not paying might be.

To move forward, NPPOs need to shape a proposal and advocate about the benefits of ePhyto so that they can budget and pay for ePhyto. Given the urgency, and the contributions of donor countries so far, the issue of sustainable funding will be elevated within the IPPC so that when they set the budget, there will be consideration of sustainable funding for ePhyto. The CPM will be advocating for the need for ePhyto funding and for the IPPC to consider funding mechanisms.

Questions and comments:

Niue raised concerns about the funding ending in 2024 while Pacific countries are still only working towards using it now in 2023, and asked how much it would cost to run the system for just the Pacific. The CPM Bureau Member responded that it costs USD\$1.2M for the system globally per year. Administratively, having a letter to each country with a varying amount requesting funds is difficult, and the CPM is trying to push for money from FAO to fund it permanently. Australia explained that the paper that was initially presented to CPM charged USD \$20K for most developed nations and then it decreased incrementally to \$10K, \$5K, and 0. The region paying the most did not like this model and have submitted revision for changes to the cost-sharing model, which will be considered by the FG in their revised paper.

Action: Secretariat to distribute to PPPO Members the model of payment for ePhyto solutions proposed by the European & Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) once the paper has been made available. This will be an agenda item during the PPPO Talanoa on Friday 22 September to initiate discussions and help in the formulation of a paper from the PPPO to be presenting during the SPG meeting in the second last week of October.

Mr Hemant Nitturkar (FAO) explained that FAO is not a funding agency, it is a technical agency, and will not be able to fund regular activities. He mentioned that at the PWA, there was very little heard about recognition of funding from the FAO and he encouraged all the NPPOs to report on FAO at the PWA, which would encourage future funding from FAO.

Tuvalu asked whether it is possible for the ePhyto contribution to be included in a membership fee for the PPPO to reduce administration. The Chair responded that the PPPO ExCo will discuss with FAO heads and find out whether this payment model is possible.

Action: PPPO ExCo to discuss and consider if an ePhyto contribution could be included in membership fees for the PPPO for those countries that will pay under the agreed funding model.

Cook Islands asked whether it would be a high or low cost for certain PICTs. The CPM Bureau Member was unsure and noted that estimates of a possible fee will be in the paper to be released in September. Australia raised that there was a discussion on whether usage should be based on ePhytos going out or coming in, and that there were discussions on striking a balance between importing and exporting countries. As more parties use the system, costs per party should decrease.

Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) explained that FAO's additional funds for the ePhyto system is sourced from the FAO's regular funds which go to the IPPC. Once the paper is released, the PPPO should gather to discuss. There is no funding available for travel from the IPPC for PPPO members to attend the SPG, so it would be recommended that the region provide a single message from the region to be communicated to the SPG.

The Chair acknowledged that Mr Piriiriki Maa (Cook Islands) is the SWP representative to the IPPC's ePhyto Steering Group.

6.3 RPPO activities presented by the PPPO Secretariat

- The Pest List Database (PLD), with funding and support from Australia and New Zealand, received a facelift. It was first built in 2003, with limited functionality, and facelift was completed in May 2023. The new PLD houses national PLDs in addition to the regional PLD, captures data offline, and supports additional software. In May 2023 there was a Regional PLD training held in Nadi for Polynesian and Melanesian Members. In November 2023 the training will be provided to Micronesian Members.
- The EU SAFE project provided support to the 15 PACPs on heavy procurement of equipment, capacity building to NPPOs on pre-border, border and post-border operations and early warning system procurement. An emergency response plan simulation exercise is to come.
- The Australian DAFF Grant Funding Agreement (GFA) supported the upgrade of the PLD, regional ePhyto work, the Pacific Export Pathway, and the secondee to the PPPO Secretariat.
- The New Zealand GFA supported the capacity building and training for the PLD, regional ePhyto work, EPMAP, and EPBP.
- The Safe Food Aid Work has included the development of 6 food aid factsheets, with support from Australia, and copies of the factsheets have been provided to all Member countries. The Secretariat has also been working with the translation team in New Caledonia to create French versions of all factsheets.
- The TC-RPPO meeting will be held in October 2023. It will include discussion on funding structure of the other RPPOs and seek support on the sea container recommendation from the RPPOs.

Action: PPPO Secretariat through the Executive Secretary to raise the issue of funding RPPO's to the TC-RPPO meeting this year in Colombia.

Questions and Comments:

Cook Islands asked whether there are maintenance costs to the Member countries for the PLD. The PPPO Secretariat responded that the PLD is house in SPC, so there will be no additional maintenance costs to the Member countries. Through SAFE, there also will be procurement of laptops for Member countries to assist with data entry.

Cook Islands asked if Australia and New Zealand's pest data can be incorporated into the PLD, considering most trade is going to Australia and New Zealand. Australia responded that if there are any enhancement to the PLD that are required, that Members let the PPPO Secretariat know as it is unclear whether all needs are being met. Currently Australia doesn't publish a regulated/quarantine pest list but is developing a list to upload into the system. The current PLD doesn't have a "status" as per ISPM8 as a data field, only presence and absence, which makes it difficult to conduct PRAs and determine whether a pest is under official control, only present in some areas, etc. More specific information fields will be needed in the PLD. Australia acknowledged that it is behind in developing its list and uploading it to the PLD, but that the PLD will need some adjustments to support upload of Australian data.

Niue asked when the list will be updated, since we now have updated the software. Niue also asked if pest and disease surveys can be done on request if the country wants to update their list, particularly for the purposes to developing market access requests. Samoa seconded Niue's questions and explained that Samoa has not had a survey for some years now but needs to update its pest list in order to open up existing and new pathways under EPMAP. Samoa queried whether it could receive assistance to carry out surveys, as it can't be currently done by Samoa's ministry.

Tonga commented that survey practices need to be improved, such as when SPC goes to Tonga to carry out surveys. For example, Tonga requested reference specimens to be taken for identification, but there were not used. There is also a lot of data that has been collected but it wasn't entered into the PLD and is still with SPC. The PPPO Secretariat explained that there is typically an SPC team that arrives on Member request to conduct surveys but at the moment, there is no project funding for conducting surveys. Through the surveys, the samples are sent for identification in New Zealand, and then sent back to countries for the NPPOs to enter the PLD. The PPPO Secretariat apologised to Tonga regarding the reference specimens.

The PPPO Secretariat mentioned that sometimes when identified specimens have been sent back to countries, there has been no feedback. The PPPO Secretariat acknowledged that there may be issues around sensitivities for certain pests, but that they can be put into the database at the national level only. SPC will only put pests into the regional database with the member's permission.

Ms Karen Mapusua (Director LRD, SPC) explained that it is important for the PPPO to identify common needs so that SPC can have a comprehensive understanding of them, to then have conversations with funding partners. The need should come through reports through heads of ministries so that funding partners are aware. Australia raised the need to capture and articulate the specific actions that need to take place given Ms Karen Mapusua's comments on identifying PPPO needs for funding and Australia's comments on gaps in the PLD.

Cook Islands commented that it has planned pest survey work that will be included in the PLD and will be starting work on 4 particular crops next month.

The Chair asked whether Members manage their data at a national and regional level. The PPPO Secretariat mentioned that survey data can be captured at a national level and housed within the PLD. The Chair questioned how we can improve the way that data is fed into the PLD as the previous PLD didn't have much information. The Chair sought Members' opinions on how officers can be assisted to make the process easier/better to prevent Members from struggling with the PLD as they did in the past. Fiji commented that at the moment it has 16 ongoing projects, and lacks the human resources to cover everything and prioritises what adds the most value. The greatest misunderstanding is that implementation of activities is about money, when actually it is about time needed cover core work. If the database becomes part of core business, then it will work, but if it is project-based, then it will be hard for Fiji to keep it updated. Papua New Guinea commented that the biggest problem is data entry; it needs someone with enough time to enter the data as it exists, but a lot remains on paper.

Cook Islands reminded the PPPO Secretariat that during the PLD workshops, Cook Islands requested reference specimens for fruit fly. The Chair commented that there is the need to develop procedures for the use of reference specimens.

Action: Secretariat to add to the PPPO RTB Meeting agenda a topic on prioritisation of needs for resource mobilisation for the PPPO. The topic will include:

- a. gaps and needs of the PLD
- b. processes related to the collection of data and capture within the PLD (i.e. pest status),
- c. funding and time required to conduct surveys to update data within the PLD.

6.4 Topics of interest for the region

Subregional groups were formed for discussion.

Melanesia:

1. Surveillance is not just for market access and preservation of pest status; it is also for tourism. The prevention of incursions of exotic pests and disease is not just about maintaining and preserving market access and pest free status, it's about tourism and food security, and socio-economic consequences.
2. French territories need support for emergency response plans and programs.
3. Surveillance is important for New Caledonia as it needs to know what pests are present to revise its biosecurity act.
4. There is a culturally significant impact of pest incursions, for example Little Fire Ants are entering Fiji and people are no longer able to sit on the grass and Talanoa.

Micronesia:

1. The pest and disease list needs to be updated.
2. Diagnostic capacity is needed – currently this can only be sourced externally and the turnaround is very long. Many islands don't have plant pathologist or entomologist.
3. Assistance is needed for the review of biosecurity legislation.

4. Emergency response and planning support.
5. Support for conducting pest risk analyses (PRAs).
6. Kiribati doesn't have the capacity to do update that PLD to feed into PRAs, and where there is capacity, they are unable to train new staff. Updating the PLD will encourage and promote regional trade. Kiribati has experienced being unable to agree on a pest list when negotiating with trade with other countries.
7. Marshall Islands identified the need to engage the younger generation on phytosanitary work and its importance.

Polynesia:

1. Pest surveys need to be conducted to update the Pest List Database
2. The eradication of fruit fly, yellow crazy ant, white footed ant, and mealybug
3. Management of yellow crazy ant
4. Budget support for technical assistance to sustain projects after they end as there is typically no continuity.
5. Capacity building in ePhyto.
6. National system updates for issuing of permits and other certificates other than ePhyto
7. Quarantine treatments.
8. Promoting one Health concept. Most countries carry out one Health but not all agencies are involved or aren't aware that countries are doing one Health work.
9. For programs that are already established, assistance provided by Australia, New Zealand, and SPC needs to be synchronise and harmonise the. Typically, whoever can provide the assistance the fastest is the donor approached by the country requesting assistance – PPPO Members are at the mercy of donors.
10. PPPO Members can only do what they can based on available resources; they need to determine whether it is realistic for them to carry out the work that they seek funding for.
11. Countries need sustainable funding and resources to implement projects.

The Chair commented that Members need to be clear on what they want and need so that the work coming from donors meets their needs. Fiji commented that Members need to be respectful of the time and resources of the donors that are willing to invest in PICTs. If Members accept, then they need to follow through. If Members are not in a position to say yes, it is a waste of the donors' resources.

7.3 New IPPC Guides and e-learning courses presented by Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) and Mr Ngatoko Ngatoko (IC Member)

IPPC Guides and training materials complement ISPMs and help NPPOs implement ISPMs and the IPPC effectively. The IPPC has a committee specifically for capacity development and the IPPC tries to connect to countries and build capacity of countries. Participants were shown to access the guides and materials via the IPPC website.

Guides

1. Regulation of wood packing material. There is an IC team working with SC members and various secretariats to support this guide. It is planned to include further elements on fumigation and heat treatments.

2. New guide published this year on Emergency Preparedness, which outlines general and pest specific contingency plans.
3. New guide published this year on TR4 Banana fusarium. The French translation is under development. Fusarium TR4 is very relevant to the region. It is an emerging disease of concern for the Pacific and is already very advanced in Central America.

E-learning courses are encouraged for all Members of the PPPO. Four were published in 2022:

1. PRA
2. Phytosanitary Export Certification System
3. Phytosanitary inspection
4. Surveillance and reporting obligations

Some of the guides are being translated, though this depends on specific funding. Ms Moreira asked if there is an opportunity for Members to contribute to translations.

A webinar on new IPPC guides and e-learning courses will take place on 19 October 2023 to raise awareness. The last survey conducted by the IPPC revealed that most countries don't know that IPPC develops these capacity development materials. The IPPC wants to help NPPOs implement the Convention.

Comments and Questions:

Marshall Islands asked if there are any fees applied to do e-learning. The IC Member responded that it is free for everyone, and Australia commented that e-learning can be done at any time. Australia added that the webinars are good but occur at time zones not suitable for the Region and suggested that webinars be recorded so that Members in the region can watch at an appropriate time, and sought support from Ms Adriana Moreira, as the IPPC representative, to advocate this to the IPPC.

Australia commented that more awareness materials will become available for TR4. A lot of emergency awareness is being conducted in Central and South America, and it is being taken very seriously. It is also being managed seriously in Australia's Northern Territory and Queensland, where it is present in a few properties. Containment of TR4 is very labour intensive and costly as it is soil borne and difficult to diagnose, and the region needs to be alert and prepared.

7.4 Regional information sharing platforms (PLD, BIF and PPPO Webpage) presented by the PPPO Secretariat

Pacific Islands Pest List Database (PLD)

There were 3 rounds of consultations with the subregions to identify the needs and gaps of the PLD. The upgrade allows for country surveillance data to be included, with a workflow and SOPs and guides to assist NPPOs with the workflow. Any IT updates will be for both the regional and national databases. The different stages of accessing the PLD and its forms from the perspective of individual NPPOs were shown.

NPPOs are encouraged to start using the different forms of the upgraded PLD so that feedback can be received and provide suggestions to how the PLD can be improved. It would also be helpful for the PPPO Secretariat to know if there are troubleshooting issues shared by different NPPOs.

The Regional Biosecurity Information Facility (BIF)

In the previous version of the BIF, a lot of the information was incomplete or out of date. The upgraded version is integrated into the PSC LRD website. Countries can provide information for update through the PPPO Secretariat. The BIF will have continual review and updates of the site itself and its SOPs and guidelines.

The PPPO Webpage

There was previously no PPPO Webpage. Last year, the PPPO ExCo called for a webpage. After an outline from SPC of the costs involved in creating a website, it was decided that a web page would be integrated into the SPC LRD site. It includes critical PPPO information, links to other pages, links to IPPC pages, and the ability to contact the PPPO Secretariat. The Secretariat wants to know what the PPPO would like to be included in the PPPO Webpage. The NPPO pages, which include NPPO profiles, will need input from the NPPOs.

Comments and Questions:

Kiribati acknowledged the work that has been done and commented that the online platforms are very important to Members. Kiribati was not a part of the PLD training, but needs it since Kiribati comes to these platforms for information and to support trade facilitation activities. The PPPO Secretariat responded that the Micronesia region will receive in-country training later this year.

Cook Islands again raised that pest lists from Australian and New Zealand should be incorporated into the PLD. For example, Kiribati couldn't import potatoes from Australia as it needed to identify pest free areas, so pest information from Australia would be helpful.

Australia suggested that the PPPO webpage should include an area for meeting papers from previous meetings, and a work area and to allow for collaboration on papers.

Action: PPPO Secretariat to explore the option of including on the PPPO webpage an area for meeting papers which should also facilitate for the collaboration between members and PPPO Secretariat to finalise papers (instead of doing it via e-mail exchange).

7.5 Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade (new IPPC Guide to support implementation of ISPM 15) presented by Mr Ngatoko Ngatoko (IC Member)

The IC Member outlined that there are many challenges that NPPOs face in implementing ISPM15.

The guide:

1. Improves understanding of the phytosanitary requirements for the movement of wood packaging material in international trade
2. Provides practical guidance to help NPPOs apply the phytosanitary measures approved in ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade)
3. Provides guidance on authorizing entities to perform phytosanitary actions related to ISPM 15

NPPOs were encouraged to provide feedback on this guide by emailing the IPPC Secretariat.

Questions and Comments:

Cook Island thanked the IC Member for the presentation, and commented that this issue has been present for some time. In Cook Islands, the wooden pallets on the ships from New Zealand have no markings, so the pallets can't be re-exported back to New Zealand. ISPM 15 pallets are not allowed to be shipped back to New Zealand, and so Cook Islands has reverted to using plastic pallets when shipping to New Zealand. Samoa also noted the movement of pallets with no markings, or non-complaint marks between countries. This issue was separately addressed with New Zealand outside the meeting.

Vanuatu asked how non-marked pallets/non-IPSP 15-compliant pallets being received can be regulated. Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) responded that it is a matter of the exporting country needing to comply with the importing country's requirements as per the ISPMs. Vanuatu explained that their importers are held responsible for pallets that don't have markings. Tuvalu added that people will use the pallets as a timber instead of re-exporting. The PPPO Secretariat shared that from his experience with Biosecurity Authority Fiji, the pallets that are not compliant are burnt. The termite issue in Lautoka was due to untreated pallets; pallets should be treated in their containers as this is a big risk.

The Chair noted that ISPM 15 should be used to guide members decisions on how to deal with untreated pallets.

7.6 e-Commerce Guide for plants, plant products and other regulated articles in international trade presented by Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat)

Ms Adriana Moreira outlined the phytosanitary risks related to e-commerce. For example, in 2013, the IPPC published a news item on Katy Perry, who released an album which included seeds. As a result, Australia did not permit entry of these CDs exported from the US. CDs sent to Australia had to be repackaged to include seeds from Australia instead. Since COVID-19, there has been a big increase in the number of people buying small parcels online.

Key challenges:

1. The growth in e-Commerce
2. The rapid growth in digital technologies
3. Increased volume of small parcels
4. Identifying regulated articles

These challenges and the growth of e-commerce mean a lot more work for NPPOs. The IPPC has created a team to deal with e-commerce.

Desired outcomes of the guide:

1. NPPOs understand the phytosanitary risks posed by e-commerce.
2. NPPOs have appropriate legislation and authorities in place to deal with these risks.
3. Lists of regulated and prohibited articles are readily available to stakeholders.
4. Buyers, sellers and other stakeholders are aware of regulatory requirements, risks and responsibilities associated with cross-border e-commerce.
5. Risk management measures are used to screen and intercept e-commerce consignments that present a phytosanitary risk, while facilitating legitimate e-commerce trade.

6. NPPOs collaborate with trading partners, other national border agencies and other organizations involved in the e-commerce supply chain.
7. NPPOs gather data and monitor e-Commerce non-compliances and regulatory activities.
8. There is a measurable reduction in non-compliances associated with e-Commerce trade.

The IPPC is addressing this issue:

1. The IPPC e-Commerce Guide will be published soon.
2. A webinar to launch this new IPPC guide will be held in October.
3. Video and fact sheet to raise awareness about e-Commerce and the phytosanitary risks associated with buying and selling plants, plant products and other regulated articles on-line.
4. Continued collaboration with key international organizations such as the World Customs Organization (WCO) and the Universal Postal Union (UPU).

The guide developed by the IC team will include case studies about e-commerce. Ms Moreira encouraged Members to respond to IPPC requests for case studies and information. Every time the IPPC has a call for case studies, it does pose a lot of work for the NPPO, however they are important as the IPPC will use these case studies in guides. Would be great for the IPPC to have case studies and papers from the Pacific. There will be a survey on e-commerce by the end of 2023, and NPPOs are encouraged to respond.

Comments and Questions:

Tonga expressed support to Fiji for their work in ePhyto, and the need for customs and biosecurity to work together on e-commerce.

New Caledonia thanked Ms Adriana Moreira for the presentation and asked whether e-commerce only include items which are purchased, as sometimes items are sent to customers as gifts. Ms Adriana Moreira responded that e-commerce includes any items that go through the post, no just items that are purchased.

Niue commented that since lockdown, e-commerce has increased, and in particular the movement of seeds via post. Some seeds had packaging in other languages which couldn't be understood. Ms Adriana Moreira commented that an importer can request that packaging be in English, and recognised that language is a big challenge of e-commerce. Vanuatu commented that items with packaging that is in a language cannot be understood are destroyed in Vanuatu. Fiji commented that in Fiji if the packaging is not in English, it is destroyed.

7.7 Draft Specification for new IPPC guide: Audits in the phytosanitary context (2021-009) *presented by Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair)*

The purpose of the guide is to provide national plant protection organizations with practical guidance and best practices for carrying out audits and to support the harmonised implementation of ISPM 47 (Audit in the Phytosanitary Context).

NPPOs are encouraged to think about:

1. What are some of the key challenges to implementing ISPM 47 (Audit in the Phytosanitary Context) in your region?

2. What information would you like to see included in the IPPC guide to phytosanitary audits?

The PPPO should provide some input for the development of the Guide. Guides are not released for consultation and the specification stage is the only opportunity for members to provide input into the guide. This is important and relevant as all NPPOs should be conducting audit, as it is a fundamental NPPO activity.

Members formed subregional groups to discuss the proposed amendments to the Draft Specification. Comments and proposed changes are detailed in Annex 1.

7.9 Emerging Pests (Cases of FAW, Fusarium TR4 and CRB, especially CRB-G)

Unfortunately, due to IT issues and time constraints, Mr. Mark Ero was unable to present on emerging pests to the PPPO.

Action: PPPO Secretariat to obtain the power point presentation on emerging issues from Mr Mark Ero (Project Manager – Pacific Awareness and Response to the Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle (PARC) Project, LRD, SPC) and distribute to PPPO Members.

7.8 National Reporting Obligations (NROs) presented by Mr Ngatoko Ngatoko (IC Member)

NROs ensure that a minimum amount of official phytosanitary information is available for ensuring safe trade, safeguarding food security and protecting the environment from plant pests. There are 13 NROs: 7 public and 6 bilateral. Public NROs should be reported via the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP - <https://www.ippc.int>)

Official IPPC Contacts Points are used for information exchange under the IPPC between CPs, CPs & IPPC Secretariat and CPs and RPPOs.

There is a close link between Strengthening Pest Outbreak Alert and Response Systems (POARS) and NROs. Pest reports are key towards avoidance of spread and introduction of pests and for promoting safe trade.

Members were reminded to ensure that contact details of their IPPC Official Contact Point on the International Phytosanitary Portal are up to date so that they can communicate with the entire IPPC Community

Action: PPPO Members to update their Official Contact Point (OCP) details on the IPPC website.

Comments and Questions:

The Chair asked what NPPOs challenges are facing in implementing NROs. Federated States of Micronesia commented that it needs to register a new contact point through the IPPC portal; it hasn't been meeting this obligation. Australia explained that Members need to go through the IPPC Secretariat to change their IPPC focal points as there is a particular form which needs to be completed. Every Member has a page which shows the contact details of the contact point. The NPPO can elect a number of people to edit the page in order to reflect changes in information. Having a generic e-mail

address is also helpful so multiple people can access the inbox and manage the queries that are coming through and feed them to the NPPO head.

Marshall Islands asked whether different users accessing the IPPC profile can use a single username and password to make updates. Australia responded in the affirmative.

The PPPO Secretariat added that the PPPO member list in the portal is the one used to contact individuals in relation to access and use of the OCS. Individual Members must request the update through the IPPC Secretariat directly in order to access the OCS to make comments to the draft ISPMs.

7.10 2023 IPPC Call for Topics: Standards and Implementation *presented by Ms. Sophie Peterson (SC Chair)*

There is a push to develop commodity standards. At the TC-RPPO in Rome, it was proposed that a proposal for a commodity standard for Taro be submitted in collaboration with the Caribbean, and possibly Africa. Initially it was proposed to develop a commodity standard for coconut, as there are not many measures that can be implemented for coconut, it was seen as too difficult to justify the production of a whole standard for coconut. Coconut, along with other commodities with few measures, will be addressed separately. Through SPC, there has also been a submission for a diagnostic protocol for CRB, which has already been submitted.

Advertising slides and video on guides and training materials and standard setting process *presented by Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat)*

- ISPM47 is the latest ISPM, however there are only 46 adopted ISPMs There are some brochures on standard setting terminology, diagnostics proposals. 15 September is the deadline for the call for topics.
- There is a call for case studies on risk-based inspections with a deadline of 30 September for submission. This will be put into a guide that the IC is working on.
- There is a new initiative from the recently adopted communications strategy for IPPC. If there are case studies from the region, Members are encouraged to send to the IPPC for inclusion in IPPC's communications.

7.12 IDPH 2023 and Look Ahead to 2024 *presented by Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia)*

UN days are an important tool for global advocacy, action and public mobilization around priority areas that the UN and FAO promotes. IDPH is used to communicated key and consistent messages that articulate the work of the IPPC, all the NPPOs, and everyone working in plant health, and bring attention to how plant health underpins global health attributes, such as food sustainability.

The IDPH intends to convey the following messaging:

1. Plant health concerns everyone, every country and region.
2. Raise global awareness on how protecting plant health can help end hunger, reduce poverty, protect biodiversity and the environment, and boost economic development.
3. Advocate for plant health.

4. Opportunity for the global plant health community to take action.
5. Build on the success of the International Year of Plant Health 2020 to advance plant health.

The 2023 IDPH was the second IDPH. There were 40 countries around the world that organised events. 34M people were reached, and 26K people interacted with the IDPH content online. A hybrid high-level event was organized in FAO HQ.

Australia held a science exchange which highlighted important work that is occurring in plant health across the country and held a morning tea which celebrated healthy plants by eating plant based products. There was a lot of buy-in – a lot of industries featured their products through the morning tea. There was good social media coverage, and there was a photography competition that resulted in a lot of participation from children and adults.

Members are encouraged to go to the FAO website for ideas on how to celebrate IDPH next year, which includes examples of how different countries conducted events.

Additional item: Priority pests of different Members

New Zealand started creating a list of priority needs for each Member in the Polynesian subregion. The list is a starting point for discussion for the region to determine how to prioritise its needs. The proposed tool for prioritising projects proposes various criteria for determining prioritisation:

- Alignment with regional strategic objectives – ensuring that the project meets with one or more the 7 strategic objectives of the PPPO.
- Regional benefit (environmental, economic, social)
- Practicality (are there people, expertise, can they be sourced internally or externally)
- Costs and sustainability (would require thorough planning to determine the cost, and funding for continuation)
- Risks (of taking, or not undertaking the project)
- Other e.g. scoping. Is the project something new, or existing? Is it a priority to continue it? Can we create a repository to document all existing projects to determine which projects should be continued?

Comments and Questions:

Ms Karen Mapusua (SPC Director LRD) commented that it is worthwhile linking the criteria “alignment with regional strategic objectives” with the objectives of other projects and initiatives that would be relevant to donors, such as the 2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent. Cook Islands agreed with Ms Karen Mapusua. If projects can be aligned to One Health, there a higher likelihood that the project receives support from donors.

Niue commented that there was a discussion when meeting in Suva 3 weeks ago regarding gender equality and gender recognition. This is a large component of trade from a WTO perspective. The link between biosecurity, trade, and women needs to be recognised.

Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) asked whether the 7 strategic objectives of the PPPO are linked to the UN Strategic Development Goals (SDGs). They are, and there is also the link to SDGs regarding gender equality. There is a large FAO project on improving gender equality for rural women.

Australia commented that it is important to add climate resilience when considering the 7 strategic objectives of the PPPO. Maintaining and building the plant health community within the Pacific to encourage collaboration is a priority as collaboration is important from the perspective of sustainability and sharing of information.

The SPC-commissioned review of the PPPO

As an introduction, the Chair explained to Members about the review of the PPPO that has been commissioned by the SPC. The ExCo are aware and have been discussing the review RFQ that was developed and released by SPC. There are areas of concern that had been identified by the ExCo which had also been communicated to Director LRD by the Chair. The purpose and motivation of the review will be presented by Ms Karen Mapusua (Director LRD, SPC) for discussion by the members of the PPPO.

The Director LRD opened her presentation by asking Members to think about the sustainability of the PPPO and biosecurity services for the region. It is a challenge, and countries are having to work with multiple projects. This is unsustainable, and complex. The Director LRD has had conversations with key development partners who are able to provide good, flexible funding. The struggle for SPC LRD is understanding the role of the PPPO and how it fits in with other biosecurity work in the region. Ms Mapusua was unable to articulate this to development partners, even when referring to the Constitution and after speaking with the PPPO Secretariat team. This is the reasoning behind the review of the PPPO – to get a better understanding of the PPPO’s role, how it fits in with other existing initiatives, and how it contributes to the work of the region.

The Director LRD ran through the history of the PPPO. Previously, the PPPO was established as an auxiliary body of SPC. SPC provided some core funding to the PPPO until 2016. In 2016 there was a cut in funding, and the financial structures of SPC were not covering costs, so there were cuts – including the support to the PPPO (specifically, to host PPPO meetings). Between 2016 and 2021, 3 auxiliary bodies were recognised at an SPC conference, though these did not include the PPPO. The legal status of the PPPO is being considered by SPC legal.

LRD needs to ensure that key results from the PPPO are reaching the Council of Representatives of Governments and Administrations (CRGA). There is the need to determine whether current governance arrangements are useful for the PPPO, and whether there should be alternative governance mechanisms, such as reporting to the Agricultural Ministers offices in the region. A discussion between SPC and the PPPO needs to happen to find a solution.

Currently there are no dedicated PPPO staff provided by SPC - the staff that serve the PPPO have other jobs, and this has caused the grey area about what is and is not PPPO work. DFAT has provided funding to SPC to support networks, which support a biosecurity staff member for the PPPO Secretariat.

There are no information management systems within SPC used by the Secretariat, so it is difficult to find historical information, such as previous minutes. SPC is looking at how such documents can be accessible via the PPPO webpage.

Governance and legal risk management structures of SPC have evolved, and this impacts how the PPPO is able to function within SPC. The mandated role of the PPPO is clear from the IPPC, but it is unclear on the practical role of the PPPO Secretariat with SPC.

80% of the budget of SPC's as a whole comes from projects – it faces the same challenges as many Members in terms of sustainability. There is the need to create partnerships with funding parties to ensure continuity of PPPO work.

To have conversations within SPC and with external donors for funding, SPC LRD would like clarity on:

- The PPPO Secretariat's role.
- A fit for purpose governance structure for the PPPO
- Supporting technical services required by the PPPO from SPC biosecurity.
- The PPPOs' pole in an integrated biosecurity program.
- The PPPO's links with regional research agenda.

SPC consider that a business case for the PPPO to provide to potential donors will need to be formed based on long term investment in biosecurity. This is considered to need to include:

- Economic argument – quantifying the cost of biosecurity.
- Cost of investment – what is need on an ongoing basis for service delivery?
- Investment plan.
- Presentation to heads of agriculture for endorsement. The PPPO is now a standing item with the heads of agriculture. If it is a priority for heads of agriculture, then donors will respond.

The Director LRD apologised for not writing to the ExCo regarding the review. There is an opportunity to link the PPPO to the 2050 Strategy for the Blue Pacific Continent. Australia and New Zealand have both set bars for ensuring their funding goes towards GEDSI and climate change, and the PPPO's plan can be strategized to meet these requirements. The Director LRD recognised that there have not been enough conversations between SPC and the PPPO ExCo. She was thankful for the opportunity to join the PPPO meetings this week, noting that invitations to past and current Directors of LRD have been routinely made.

Comments and Questions:

Tonga acknowledged the presentation from the Director LRD and the opportunity to consider it.

Cook Islands commented that the presentation provides clarity on what is happening with PPPO from an SPC perspective, and what has been presented in terms of the PPPO going forward is a good framework. Cook Islands asked about whether the investment plan is the second phase of the review, and who will fund the investment plan. The Director LRD responded that the review is just an information gathering exercise, and looking at options for governance, which must be clear in order to structure funding. The Chair commented that if the PPPO had gone through the review process beforehand, that would have helped. Members need to be involved, be a part of the journey, and have a say. The Chair thanked the Director LRD for the presentation and requested SPC follow due process to ensure the PPPO is involved. The Director LRD affirmed that the steps following the review need to be conducted hand in hand with the PPPO. Since SPC is often being asked to fund activities and positions, the investment plan is just a proposed possibility following the review.

Tuvalu thanked the Director LRD for providing the perspective from SPC and added that he was not aware of the history of the PPPO.

Samoa commented that the presentation provided perspective on the status of the PPPO, such as here being no dedicated PPPO staff provision. Samoa asked about the timeline and how long current PPPO funding will last. The Director LRD responded that DFAT have provided money to support networks which will allow for continuity for the next 3 years. The PPPO Executive Secretary's role is secured until the end of 2024. The review will take a few months and provide information for future thinking, and it could take a year to develop a plan that will engage partners.

The Chair explained that Mr. Stephen Ogden is the consultant for the review. Mr. Ogden's request to consult with the Members has been declined. The PPPO needs to send a united message and understand SPC's request before endorsing the consultancy. The Chair asked that the Director LRD note the concerns of the PPPO. The Chair commented that it would be critical for Mr. Ogden to work with one or 2 members of the ExCo to provide confidence and assurance to the PPPO, so that the PPPO is aware of the discussions being had. Cook Islands seconded Mr. Waqa's comments and expressed disappointment about how this had come about, without proper consultation and that some Members knew about the review before this PPPO meeting, and that others did not. The Director LRD agreed to PPPO Member representatives working with Mr. Ogden. The lack of a comprehensive information system within SPC to support the PPPO means that it is difficult to disseminate information, and that SPC and the PPPO need to decide what is the most fit-for-purpose structure going forward. The Chair acknowledged Cook Islands comments regarding the PPPO being unaware of the review being undertaken. The decision of the PPPO's stance on the review will be determined during the Full Board Meeting.

Australia commented that the presentation was useful to provide reassurance regarding the review and why it is happening. It was felt that the review was occurring without involvement from the PPPO member (i.e. SPC member) countries and territories. The PPPO needs to understand what the options are. Australia suggested that benchmarking with other existing PPPO models could be useful. Australia wants to see the PPPO continue and see a positive outcome from the review.

The Chair commented that the ExCo was very under-informed by SPC on this review as SPC had not communicated its intentions to the PPPO regarding the review.

Mr. Hemant Nitturkar (FAO) reflected that this happens to many organisations. There are two ways to move forward – how we can move forward incrementally, or looking at where we want to be in 10 years' time and building towards it. There are 4 steps to consider: what we should do more of, less of, stop doing, and start doing.

The Director LRD assured that there has never been a consideration that the PPPO should not exist; only to clarify its structure. SPC has not been providing sufficient support to the PPPO and wants to ensure that it is providing the appropriate Secretariat services to the PPPO.

Australia, SC Chair asked who the donors in relations to the development of an investment plan are. The investors that SPC receives interest from/gets may not be investors that the PPPO members desire; SPC investors are Australian and NZ governments but putting an investment plan out to non-government investors may cause discomfort amongst Members and may impact the PPPO's integrity

in the context of the IPPC and elsewhere. The Director LRD responded that SPC is developing a tool to determine which partners are those that SPC would want to partner with; she does not imagine that philanthropists would be interested in the PPPO. The investment plan would likely look at the traditional partners (Australia, New Zealand, maybe the US), but look at different funding modalities, and seek funding in a programmatic, not project way. SPC does not have a political agenda and has safeguards for working with partners to ensure that the funding is not diverted inappropriately.

The Chair commented that the RFQ looks at a review of the constitution, and asked what has triggered the review of the constitution and governance, given the PPPO views the 2016 revision of the constitution as appropriate. The Director LRD responded that the function and operations of CRGA has evolved considerably and the way the PPPO is constituted no longer works in this new context. The review of the constitution will ensure that the PPPO fits in with how SPC functions, since the PPPO sits under SPC. The Chair further commented that according to the constitution, the SPC is the Secretariat for the PPPO, and asked whether this would change. The Director LRD responded that legally, the PPPO exists as an auxiliary body of SPC, but that the PPPO operates with its own mandate. SPC wants to ensure that the structure enables PPPO can carry out its mandate effectively and maintain its identity within the structure. The Chair stated the PPPO Members need assurance that the PPPO will continue to operate with its own goals.

The Director LRD requested that Mr Stephen Ogden be able to speak to PPPO Members. PPPO Members agreed. The Chair stated that the PPPO will provide the names of 3 member representatives (one from each sub-region) to work with Mr Stephen Ogden. The Chair asked that SPC does not do this again and respects the processes of the PPPO. The Chair asked that Mr Stephen Ogden liaise with the Secretariat to link in with the heads of the NPPOs.

Action: 3 members (one from each subregion) to work with Mr Stephen Ogden on the SPC-commissioned PPPO review. Representatives will be Mr. New Testament Aue (Niue for Polynesia), Ms Tekataake Oromita (Kiribati for Micronesia), and Mr. Armstrong Sam (Vanuatu for Melanesia)

Conclusion of the workshop/ Date and Venue of the Next Meeting

Dates

The PPPO Secretariat presented two date options: 19-22 August 2024, or 26-29 August 2024.

Australia proposed 5 days for the ISPM workshop as there will be many specifications and ISPMs to go through and indicated that the week of the 19th is preferred.

Members agreed that the next meeting is to be held from 19-23 August 2024.

Venue

Tuvalu proposed the meeting to be held Nadi, Fiji.

Tonga commented that meetings in Fiji will enable Members to bring two people each as it is cheaper.

Kiribati proposed Canberra, Australia as the venue.

Members agreed that the next meeting is to be held in Suva, Fiji.

Other Meetings

Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) stated that all contracting parties and RPPOs are invited to attend the CPM-18. There is funding available from IPPC, and the criteria for funding for next year will be the same as those for this year. Australia commented that there is a separate meeting at CPM-18 for the RPPOs. There is also an induction workshop/session for new attendees on the first morning of CPM, which explains what to expect, how to participate, and formalities of the CPM. The Chair commented that the PPPO Secretariat should also be attending CPM-18.

Action: The PPPO Secretariat to upload the PPPO's comments to the IPPC's Online Commenting System (OCS) by the due date 30 September.

Action: The ISPM draft report to be circulated to the PPPO Members within 2 weeks of the conclusion of the workshop.

The Report was adopted in principle by the PPPO Members subject to review of the draft. This was moved by Vanuatu and seconded by Federated States of Micronesia.

Australia thanked everyone for their attention and participation, and thanked the hosts, Cook Islands, for their welcome. She thanked the Deputy Chair for guiding the workshop, particular through difficult conversations. She thanked the PPPO Secretariat.

Ms. Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) thanked the participants for their work and contributions. She encouraged the PPPO to continue their good work in the region and encouraged their participation in the IPPC. Thanked the hosts Cook Islands and its Ministry of Agriculture.

Ms Karen Mapusua (SPC Director LRD) thanked the PPPO for the opportunity to speak and thanked the government of Cook Islands for hosting.

The Chair acknowledged Australia's funding of the Northern Members to attend the meeting and acknowledged support from MPI, SAFE, FAO, and SPC. He commented that participation has been strong this year. He thanked all Members for their participation and support to the PPPO. He expressed that it has been an honour and a privilege to work with and for the PPPO.

Fiji thanked The Chair for his Chairmanship and Ms Anguna-Kamana (Cook Islands) for her department's hospitality and hosting the meeting.

Annex 1: Comments and Proposed Changes to Draft ISPMs, Draft ISPM annexes, and Draft Specifications

Reorganization and revision of pest risk analysis standards (2020-001)

Paragraph	Comment	Justification
-	<p>Polynesia: recommends that the flow chart at the back of the document (Appendix 1) could be moved to the front page in the document to provide an overview of the process at the start of the document</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): It is a good idea to move it forward to make it clear, however the SC have a history of moving such items to the end of the document as an appendix. Acknowledged the importance of the comment from Polynesia as it allowed the SC Members to support such changes.</p> <p>Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): If it is moved further forward, does it become binding because it is no longer an annex, and does it cause issues for the SC?</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): If it is before the requirements, it has a different status and will have a lower status. So if it is before 'requirements' section, it should be acceptable.</p> <p>Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat): We often hear from developing countries that such diagrams are helpful, and it is a divisive topic. Can refer to ISPM6 as precedent.</p> <p>Members agreed for this comment to be included.</p>	<p>As it is a long document, it would be more useful for the flow chart to be at the start of the document to guide readers. Please see ISPM 6 for precedence for this change.</p>
61	Polynesia: It would be better for the references to be at the end of the document	To make the body of the standard shorter and more concise
79	<p>Micronesia:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. After 'transparency', insert “,” 4. after “cooperation”, insert “modification”. 5. After equivalence, add “of phytosanitary measures” <p>Ms Joanne Wilson (SC Member): Confirm if modification is mentioned in ISPM1. This was confirmed.</p>	Including modification more accurately reflects ISPM 1
88	Micronesia: Delete “The PRA process is initiated in” and add “(initiation)” after “Stage 1”	Consistency of phrasing with the following two bullet points
89	Micronesia: after “consequences”, add “to determine whether the pest risk is acceptable or not”.	Provides a boundary for the reduction of risk

	Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): the rationale was to provide a boundary of the reduction. As opposite to reducing the risk to zero, that there is an acceptable level of risk.	
90	Micronesia: after “Stage 2”, add “to an acceptable level of risk.”	Provides a boundary for the reduction of Risk
120	Polynesia: (seconding comments from Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat)): If the PRA process does not need to be long and complex, it would be good to have a more concise standard, therefore the standard as a whole needs to be reviewed.	More concise
243	Polynesia: (seconding comments from Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat)): Proposed for this section to be moved after 2.4 so that it makes more logical sense. Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair). The specification for the working group was very conservative and did allow for the reduction in size of the document. Propose making a comment at the start of the section regarding it length.	The current document is not user friendly. The entire document needs to be more accessible and usable to its contracting parties.
272	Polynesia: The definition of a pest should be removed.	The IPPC already has a glossary of terms at the start of the document; this does not need to be redefined
607	Micronesia: before “pest”, add “quarantine”. Temarama Anguna-Kamana (Cook Islands): What is the definition of quarantine pest? The Chair: The definition is in ISPM 5. Sophie Peterson (SC Chair). At this stage of the PRA (Stage 3), the country has decided that is a quarantine pest.	For clarity; at this stage of the PRA (Stage 3), the country has decided that is a quarantine pest.
619	Melanesia: after “history of use” add “of the phytosanitary measure in trade”	Clarity of the term “history of use”
623	Melanesia: Delete “potential” and replace with “critical”	Consistent use of the term across documents
629 and 630	Polynesia: Remove all of 4.1	Already covered in ISPM1
645	Micronesia: after “consignment”, add “to reduce, remove or treat the pest”	Consistency with the two dot points preceding
661	Sanitation should be included in 4.5.1 pre-planting and 4.5.3 options at harvest and not only at 4.5.2 pre-harvest options	Consistency; sanitation should be included at all stages

670	Melanesia: before “reduce” add “eliminate or”	Expand the scope as certain post-harvest options can eliminate pests as well
672	Melanesia: delete “fruit” and replace with “commodity”	Consistency with head paragraph (670)
674	<p>Melanesia: after “stems”, add “,” delete “or” and after “bark”, add “or other material that is not part of the traded commodity.”</p> <p>Definition of contaminating pest*: A pest that is carried by a commodity, packaging, conveyance or container, or present in a storage place and that, in the case of plants and plant products, does not infest them [CEPM, 1996; revised CEPM, 1999; CPM, 2018]</p> <p>Polynesia: after “bark” add “or other material or contaminants that are not part of the traded commodity.”</p>	To include other materials that might be moved with a commodity such as packaging or pests
688	<p>Micronesia: Delete this dot point on brushing and washing as a treatment.</p> <p>Ms Nafanua Malele (Samoa): Since it is mentioned as an example, then it should be considered a treatment.</p> <p>The Chair: it can be considered as a post-harvest option <i>and</i> a treatment</p> <p>Ms Siutoni Tupou (Tonga): Is this allowed to be a treatment? Is there an ISPM on this treatment?</p> <p>Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat): ‘treatment’ as a phytosanitary measure is defined in ISPM5 as: Official procedure for the killing, inactivation or removal of pests, or for rendering pests infertile or for devitalization [FAO, 1990, revised FAO, 1995; ISPM 15, 2002; ISPM 18, 2003; ICPM, 2005]”</p> <p>This comment will be excluded since brushing and washing are considered as a form of treatment</p>	Already covered by 4.5.4 (paragraph 671)
703	<p>Micronesia: Add dot point after 707 “Inclusion of additional declarations on phytosanitary certification”</p> <p>Ms Temarama Anguna-Kamana (Cook Islands): Suggested the above be after 703</p> <p>Micronesia: suggested it be at the end, after 707, as 703 (certification) is referring to certification schemes, which are at the beginning of production, as opposed to phytosanitary declarations, which are at the end of the process.</p>	Widen scope of measures

	<p>Ms Nafanua Malele (Samoa): What is a certification scheme?</p> <p>Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): We have certification schemes for plants for planting, just for propagative material.</p> <p>Ms Joanne Wilson (New Zealand): There are schemes around the world for clean plants. For examples, the EU has a plant passport scheme; knowing that a plant is grown in the same way with the same assurances, it is certified in the same way. Not the same as phytosanitary certification.</p> <p>Ms Siutoni Tupou (Tonga): Since there is ePhyto now, you don't have to have certification at the end of the process. Additional declarations don't need to be added.</p> <p>Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): Additional declarations are an assurance.</p>	
705	<p>Micronesia: Add dot point after 705</p> <p>6. "Registered or approved treatment facilities or sites"</p>	Widen scope of measures
735	<p>Micronesia: After "ISPM 36", add "ISPM 34"</p>	ISPM 36 covers pre-entry only, adding ISPM 34 will include post-entry measures
738	<p>Polynesia: after "efficacy" add "unless the effectiveness has been proven in trade"</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia): after "efficacy" add "unless the effectiveness has been proven in domestic trade"</p> <p>Polynesia: for example, new commodity standard for mango includes measure that don't have efficacy data, but have been used in trade for 20 years. Want to capture that you don't always need efficacy.</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia): delete "international" from "international trade" from the previous suggested for 619 for consistency</p>	Efficacy data not always required
756 and 757	<p>Polynesia: delete second sentence of 756, and all of 757</p>	Confusing, repetitious and adds more uncertainty
758	<p>Polynesia: After "measures", add ", which may be needed,"</p>	Clarification due to confusion about provisional measures and why they would be needed

758	<p>After 758, consider adding “Prohibition may be an option when there is too much uncertainty”</p> <p>Sophie Peterson (Australia): provides justification for prohibition as a measure</p>	Need to have a justification for prohibiting entry of commodities
-----	---	---

Draft Annex: International movement of *Mangifera indica* fresh fruit to ISPM 46 (Commodity-specific standards for phytosanitary measures) (2021-011)

Paragraph	Comment	Justification
General	Polynesia: Referencing style is appropriate	-
30	Polynesia: Sought clarity on the meaning of the phrase “when relevant”	-
37 and 33	<p>Mr Pere Kokoa (Papua New Guinea): Will all importing countries regulate all pests on the list? Will there be the common names for the fruit flies?</p> <p>Ms Joanna Wilson (New Zealand, SC Member): any country regulating those pests have to conduct an assessment and have a justification for regulating that pest. Just because the pest is on the list, does not mean that the country can regulate the pest. Common names are purposely excluded in favour of the botanical name to reduce ambiguity.</p> <p>Ms Ludivine Sariman (New Caledonia): There is a list of pests associated with the mango fruit, but are there pests associated with the seeds of the fruit? Are they different or the same?</p> <p>Ms Joanna Wilson (SC Member): Not aware that the seeds of the mango have been taken into account. The scope doesn’t include seeds for planting.</p> <p>Ms Siutoni Tupou (Tonga): If the mango is for consumption, it does not mean that the seed will not be used for planting after consumption.</p> <p>Ms Joanna Wilson (New Zealand, SC Member): It is hard to regulate diversion from intended use. Can include a sentence relating to diversion of intended use.</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): At the end of the paragraph 33, add the following, adapted from ISPM46: “This annex does not include contamination or diversion from intended use of commodities.”</p>	<p>-</p> <p>Clarification of exclusions</p>
228	Ms Ludivine Sariman (New Caledonia): Delete “hygiene” and replace with “sanitation”	Align with the PRA standard
233 and 234	Ms Ludivine Sariman (New Caledonia): Move “(e.g. use of insect-proof packaging)” from 234 to 233.	Example is more related to the

		previous dot point.
535	The Chair: Need to include references to HTFA commercial confirmatory testings on papaya conducted and published by the Cook Islands	Completeness of references

2022 Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary on phytosanitary terms) (1994-001); Second Consultation

Paragraph	Comment	Justification
45 and 47	Melanesia: delete 45 Polynesia and Micronesia: agreed	"General surveillance" is already described in ISPM6
77	Melanesia: remove "official"	If the definition of general surveillance is retained, this is an unofficial process. To allow general surveillance to be defined in this context, "official" needs to be removed. Specific surveillance has 'surveys' in its definition, which is defined as official.
105	Polynesia: keep the current definition as per 105 and after "measures," add "procedures and enable certification" (withdrawn) Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): if we want to shorten the definition, we can remove the examples from 108 Ms Joanna Wilson (New Zealand, SC Member): Australia's proposal will influence the following definition, "phytosanitary procedure"; if we make this change we need to change them together. Ms Nafanua Malele (Samoa): Keep the current definition as per 105 and after "measures," add "procedures or to enable certification" Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): Keep proposed definition on 108, delete the examples, and retain the reference to "phytosanitary procedure" to keep the link to that definition. If we don't have the reference to "phytosanitary procedure", it disconnects the definition of "phytosanitary action" and "phytosanitary procedure".	The current proposed revision in 108 is longer than necessary

	<p>Polynesia withdrew their original comment, but notes that while use of the word “phytosanitary” is repetitious, it is unavoidable</p> <p>Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia) seconded Polynesia.</p>	
108	<p>Micronesia: delete “with reference” and replace with “in accordance” (withdrawn)</p> <p>Sophie Peterson (Australia): expressed concern with the change - “in accordance” is strong, whereas “with reference” allows for flexibility. We need to remember that if it is a stronger requirement, we would also have to do it.</p> <p>Consensus was to keep the original wording.</p>	-
175-179	<p>Polynesia: retain the current definition as the new definition is too long, and the current definition is sufficient. (withdrawn)</p> <p>Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): A questions for the Chair of the SC: Visual inspection is sometimes needed; can you please explain the use of “visual inspection” in the definition?</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): last year the definition of inspection was visual examination, and the definition of test was non-visual examination. The question was what about visual examination of a test? The term visual is not defined. Intrinsically, many tests are visual. Having ‘other than visual’ is not correct. The proposed revisions have multiple examples to show that a test includes multiple steps and can also be visual.</p> <p>Melanesia: Keep the proposed revision</p> <p>Polynesia withdrew their original comment.</p> <p>General consensus to keep the proposed revision.</p>	-

Draft Annex: Use of systems approaches in managing the pest risks associated with the movement of wood to ISPM 39 (International movement of wood) (2015-004)

Paragraph	Comment	Justification
-----------	---------	---------------

28	Melanesia: Sought clarification from IPPC on what documents cover bamboo and bamboo products	-
30	Melanesia: Remove the brackets around “Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures” and replace with commas	The double brackets make it unclear
113-114	<p>Polynesia: Where would chemical treatments that treat both fungus and bacteria fall? (withdrawn)</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): Could delete “Anti-fungal sap-stain” from 113</p> <p>Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): 132 and 133 (topical pesticides) may cover Polynesia’s concerns?</p> <p>Polynesia withdrew their initial comment</p>	-
71	<p>Mr Michael Bartlett (Fiji): Concerned that Post-Harvest doesn’t include surveillance.</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): 56 and 57 do mention surveillance</p>	-
70	<p>Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): There is no assessment of fallen trees</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): 74 and 75 address examination of fallen trees</p>	-
58	<p>Melanesia: is ‘semiochemicals’ correct?</p> <p>The Chair: SC members confirmed this is correct</p>	-

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

Paragraph	Comment	Justification
-	Mr Michael Bartlett (Fiji): Fiji has made individual comments, and these will not be included as regional comments	-
32	Mr Ngatoko Ngatoko (Cook Islands): What does “harmonization” refer to? Is it used in other ISPMs and how is it interpreted?	-

	<p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): The purpose of the annex is to harmonize the terminology used in the ISPM.</p> <p>Ms Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat): The main goal of ISPMs is harmonisation of phytosanitary measures, using the IPPC understanding of harmonisation.</p> <p>Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): Is “harmonisation” broader than “consistency”? It seems that in this case, we are trying to promote consistency rather than harmonisation. Harmonisation is a principle that underpins many ISPMs, but is it necessary to include it in this introduction if it applies to all ISPMs?</p> <p>Consensus: delete “harmonization” and replace with “consistency”</p>	
34	Micronesia: add a reference to appendix 2 table which helps map out terminology. Create Appendix 2 with a simple table describing alternative terms describing host status of fruit to fruit fly.	Assists with comprehension of terms and assists with NPPO using the correct host categories both in application and interpretation of literature
38	<p>Micronesia: after “or cultivar”, add “, if relevant,”</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): After “or cultivar”, add “ (if relevant)”</p>	Identifying the cultivar is only necessary some of the time
44	Polynesia: Delete “condition” and replace with “characteristic”	The example, “rind thickness” is not a condition. Characteristic is more accurate terminology
95	Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat): If appendix 2 is not included, there may be implementation issues.	-

CPM Recommendation on sea containers

Paragraph	Comment	Justification
-	Micronesia: don’t have specific comments as we expect them to be captured in the next version of the recommendation such as container design, ensuring gaps are sealed, using light colours, etc. This is an important recommendation of the region. There is concern that if there isn’t enough support, that it won’t get supported at CPM-18. It’s important that the region gets behind the recommendation for it to move forward.	-

	Melanesia: Second Micronesia and expressed that they expect the comments from the workshop to be reflected in the next version and that it change from 'ISPM language' to 'recommendation language'	
102	Polynesia: Recommend that tracking and networking be an important part of the movement of sea containers and want a harmonised system for all the containers moving across the Pacific.	-
General and 102	<p>Comment from the region: The PPPO and the 20 Member Countries and Territories present at the 2023 regional workshop strongly support the need for the recommendation and other longer-term guidance to keep the idea of an ISPM alive. The PPPO expects the revised version to take into account the discussion and outcomes of the 2023 sea container workshop.</p> <p>Add the following after 102:</p> <p>"Recommendation: Methods to Track Containers The IPPC encourages all parties involved in the container supply chain to contribute to and participate in the development of systems to trace containers and provide information regarding pests risks of containers to importing countries"</p>	-
-	Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair) expressed that it would be great to have more participation/attendance at IPPC fora from the region next year	-
-	<p>Mr Ngatoko Ngatoko (Cook Islands) asked whether the PPPO's strong support is sufficient to provide weight to support the recommendation?</p> <p>Ms Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair) suggested that the PPPO should communicate its strong and meaningful support of the recommendation by pointing out the number of members who support it.</p> <p>Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): Second Sophie's comment. Other topics of relevance for our region at CPM will be climate change and phytosanitary issues. Ngatoko gave an excellent presentation at the London Symposium in 2022; it was one of the best and strongest presentations of the conference. The Pacific voice is an important one. Banana fusarium wilt will also be an important topic, and also very relevant to central and south America – they are currently leading on this issue, but it could be an important future issue for the Pacific region.</p> <p>Adriana Moreira (IPPC Secretariat) explained that from the IPPC side, unfortunately IPPC cannot fund participants to the SPG, but it can fund participants to the CPM. The requirements for funding will be the same as the current one. For the countries which are entitled to receive funding, they are strongly encouraged to seek funding from the IPPC and to attend the CPM. It is important for there to be Pacific presence of the region at the CPM in 2024.</p>	-

Paragraph	Comment	Justification
44	Micronesia: Insert comma after “territory” Polynesia: After “audit”, insert “,” and delete “and the”	The sentence is too long
44	Micronesia: Add a dot point after 44: “Provide guidance for NPPOs with limited audit capacity on how to prioritise, design and conduct an audit program.”	Some NPPOs required additional support.
50	Micronesia: Add a dot point after 50: “Provide guidance on objective evidence to be obtained during audits to support any audit findings.” Polynesia: Support Micronesia suggestion. This would be helpful considering lack of staff to conduct internal audits. ISPM47 already allowed for a third party to provide audit support. Melanesia: Agree with Polynesia and Micronesia.	NPPOs may have limited capacity or experience in audit. Guidance on areas that NPPOs should focus on, and options for third party or remote auditors would be helpful
52	Melanesia: after “and”, add “develop”, delete “provide an example that may be used as”, and after “template” add “for an audit checklist, SOPs, and an audit report (that are efficiently written and actionable by the NPPO or the auditee)” Ms Gabrielle Vivian-Smith (Australia): The template would provide a structure for the recommendations. Ms Temarama Anguna-Kamana (Cook Islands): There is some repetition of the work. It should be assumed that the audit report is effective – does it need to specified in this guide? Ms Nafanua Malele (Samoa): Suggest separating the phrase. First mention the checklist, and then describe the following elements. Ms. Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): Agreed with Samoa. Make it two different bullet points, but describe the elements first, and then the checklist. After 52, add the point: “Develop a template for an audit checklist, SOPs and an audit report (that are efficiently written and actionable by the NPPO or the auditee)” Ms. Siutoni Tupou (Tonga): The auditor is required to provide a template for the report	Audit reports are often very large, and difficult or impractical for NPPOs to access and implement.

	Ms. Sophie Peterson (Australia, SC Chair): the NPPO needs to tell the auditor what the NPPOs wants, and this would provide guidance to the auditor	
--	--	--



Annex 2: Participant List

Nos:	First name	Surname	Country or Organisation Represented	Email Contact:
1	Mathew	Tuia	American Samoa	mathewtuia1005@gmail.com
2	Gabrielle	Vivian-Smith	Australia	Gabrielle.Vivian-Smith@aff.gov.au
3	Sophie	Peterson	Australia	Sophie.Peterson@aff.gov.au
4	Lauren	Madden	Australia	Lauren.Madden@aff.gov.au
5	Temarama	Anguna - Kamana	Cook Islands	temarama.anguna@cookislands.gov.ck
6	Ngatoko	Ngatoko	Cook Islands	ngatoko.ngatoko@cookislands.gov.ck
7	Pavai	Taramai	Cook Islands	pavai.taramai@cookislands.gov.ck
8	Piriariki	Maa	Cook Islands	piriariki.maa@cookislands.gov.ck
9	John	Wichep	Federated States of Micronesia	jwichep@rd.gov.fm
10	Michael	Mcdonald Bartlett	Fiji	michael.bartlett@baf.com.fj
11	Laura	Hartmann	French Polynesia	laura.hartmann@administration.gov.pf
12	Christopher	Ada Rosario	Guam	Christopher.Rosario@doag.guam.gov
13	Tekataake	Oromita	Kiribati	t.oromita@melad.gov.ki
14	Byrelson	Jacklick	Marshall Is	byrelsonj4@gmail.com
15	Sheba	Hubert	Nauru	sheba.hubert@gmail.com
16	Ludivine	Sariman	New Caledonia	ludivine.sariman@gouv.nc
17	Stephen	Ogden	New Zealand	Stephen@solutionz.co.nz
18	Nacanieli	Waq	New Zealand	Nacanieli.Waq@mpi.govt.nz
19	Lisa	Winthrop	New Zealand	lisa.winthrop@mpi.govt.nz
20	Joanne	Wilson	New Zealand	Joanne.Wilson@mpi.govt.nz
21	New	Aue	Niue	New.Aue@mail.gov.nu
22	Pere	Kokoa	Papua New Guinea	pkokoa@naqia.gov.pg
23	Nafanua	Malele	Samoa	nafanua.malele@maf.gov.ws
24	Francis	Tsatsia	Solomon Islands	ftsatsia@biosecurity.gov.sb
25	Christian	Perez	Tokelau	pereztokecjh@gmail.com
26	Siutoni	Tupou	Tonga	siutonit@gmail.com
27	Matio	Lonalona	Tuvalu	mlonalona@gov.tv
28	Armstrong	Sam	Vanuatu	asam@vanuatu.gov.vu
29	Adriana	Moreira	IPPC Rome	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org
30	Hemant	Nitturkar	FAO Samoa	Hemant.Nitturkar@fao.org
31	Visoni	Timote	PPPO Secretariat	visonit@spc.int
32	Riten	Gosai	PPPO Secretariat	riteng@spc.int
33	Maria	Ledua	PPPO Secretariat	marial@spc.int
34	Ilaisa	Dakaica	PPPO Secretariat	ilaisad@spc.int
35	Wendy	Xiao	PPPO Secretariat	wendyx@spc.int