



Pacific
Community
Communauté
du Pacifique

Pacific Plant Protection Organisation Executive Committee Meeting (PPPO ExCo)

THEME: CONNECTED, INFORMED & PREPARED (CIP)

PPPO family where no Member is left behind

22 – 25 March 2022

MEETING REPORT

Day 01 – Tuesday, March 22

Opening Session

1.0 The Pacific Community (SPC)/Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) Secretariat Team opened the virtual link at 09.00 am Fiji Time.

2.0 Meeting started at 10.00 am Fiji Time.

The Vice Chairman of the PPPO and Specialist Adviser Pacific Imports and Horticulture Imports, New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries (MPI), Mr. Nacanieli Waqa welcomed all participants to the 2022 PPPO ExCo meeting on behalf of the PPPO Chairman who was unable to join the meeting and requested the Coordinator of the Regional ePhyto Project, Mr. Ilaisa Dakaica, to say a word of prayer.

Mr. Waqa mentioned that this is still an uneasy time in the Pacific and the globe, and we are glad to connect virtually. He added that we are thankful to be able to meet this week and welcomed Members of the PPPO ExCo to the meeting. He acknowledged Director of the Pacific Community (SPC) Land Resources Division (LRD) Ms. Karen Mapusua for her support and attendance in the meeting despite her busy schedule and stated that this is a testament of SPC's commitment to the PPPO.

Mr. Waqa also acknowledged and welcomed the South-West Pacific (SWP) Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau rep and Chief Technical Officer (CTO) MPI, Mr. Peter Thomson, joining the meeting virtually from Wellington. Mr. Waqa then further welcomed the Chief Plant Protection Officer (CPPO) of the Australian Department of Agriculture Water and the Environment (DAWE), Dr. Gabrielle-Vivian Smith as well as the Director, Pacific Engagement and International Plant Health, Dr. Sophie Peterson (DAWE) who were both present in Fiji for the meeting (but delayed in attendance due to hold up in their COVID clearance test).

Mr. Waqa then acknowledged and welcomed the PPPO Secretariat and the SPC Team headed by Dr. Visoni Timote (PPPO Secretary and SPC's Integrated Programme Advisor: Biosecurity, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Standards) as well as host country Fiji represented by head of PPPO, the acting Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Mr. Surend Pratap and CPPO Mr. Nilesh Ami Chand. He further welcomed representatives of the three PPPO sub-regions and the delegate from FAO's regional office, Mr. Tevita Keresoma, after which he invited Ms. Mapusua for her opening remarks on behalf of SPC.



Pacific
Community
Communauté
du Pacifique

3.0 Formal remarks on behalf of SPC

Ms. Karen Mapusua, Director of SPC LRD

Ms. Mapusua welcomed everyone to the PPPO ExCo Board meeting on behalf of the Director General (DG) of SPC Dr. Stuart Minchin, Deputy Director General (DDG) Dr. Paula Vivili, LRD as well as the PPPO Secretariat.

Ms. Mapusua stated that the last couple of years were extraordinarily difficult, but she was glad we all navigated our way through the challenges of the global pandemic. She recognised that a few Pacific Island countries were dealing with COVID outbreaks at the time of the meeting and hoped for a quick road to recovery and normalcy for these countries.

She highlighted that despite COVID disruptions to travel and trade, these are bound to pick up again and the increased movement of people and goods will also increase the risk of pest and disease spread. She added that we are learning more and more how climate change is influencing the occurrence as well as the movement of pests and this means we need to be extra vigilant at our borders as frontliners striving to prevent the entry, establishment and spread of foreign threats into our countries.

Ms. Mapusua stressed that the PPPO region continues to benefit from being free of many harmful pests and diseases found elsewhere in the world and that this freedom should not be taken for granted as we have recently had unfortunate incidences of devastating pest and disease introductions such as banana fusarium wilt disease, red imported fire ant (RIFA) and fall armyworm (FAW). She highlighted pests unique to our region, such as the Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle (CRB), underwent range expansion and these pest incursions and outbreaks continue to cost our governments, farmers and consumers millions of dollars.

She recognised that this meeting gives the ExCo an opportunity to discuss these critical matters of mutual interest to the PPPO region and looked forward to endorsement of the PPPO workplan for the next 5 years. Ms. Mapusua encouraged participants by stating that the important work they'd set into motion at the ExCo will ultimately become the voice of the PPPO region at the many IPPC meetings as well as the upcoming CPM-16. She mentioned that the PPPO Full Board meeting scheduled for later in the year may be held face-to-face.

Ms. Mapusua iterated that she fully supported the initiatives of the PPPO and reaffirmed SPC's continued support to the region through the PPPO Secretariat Team and that biosecurity is included as a key component of the SPC Strategic Plan 2021-2025. She also acknowledged the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) and DAWE as well as the New Zealand Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) and MPI for years of support to SPC and people of the region.

Ms. Mapusua hailed the success of the PPPO "Talanoa Sessions" that allowed the regions NPPOs to keep communicating through COVID, which she said was a true reflection of the PPPO theme: connected, informed and prepared – a PPPO family where no one is left behind. She hoped to catch up on the items presented by each country at the Talanoa Sessions ended by wishing all participants the very best for the week ahead.

Mr. Waqa thanked Ms. Mapusua for her remarks, especially SPC's commitment to PPPO and the region and mentioned that all Members looked forward to working together with SPC and PPPO in the plant health, biosecurity and safe trade space. He then invited Mr. Thomson for his keynote address.

4.0 Opening Remarks

Mr. Peter Thomson, SWP CPM Bureau rep and CTO NZMPI

Mr. Thomson acknowledged everyone's presence at the meeting, especially Director of SPC LRD, Ms. Mapusua and thanked her for the words of welcome and support to the PPPO. He mentioned that on behalf of all Member States of the PPPO, he expresses heartfelt gratitude to SPC through Director LRD as PPPO would not be where it is today from the time of its inception if not for the unwavering support and assistance from SPC. Mr. Thomson stated that we are keeping all countries in the region currently battling with COVID outbreaks in our thoughts and prayers. He thanked the PPPO Secretariat Team for organizing this meeting as this was the first time PPPO ExCo was being held virtually.

Mr. Thomson mentioned that he would like to deliver his opening remarks slightly different then how he would normally do by sharing four key reminders. Firstly, we must "*know who we are*". PPPO was founded in October 1994 by the South Pacific Conference at its 34th session in Port Villa, Vanuatu – we are 38 years old with a long history of achievements and working together! He stated that the meeting this week is adding to that history and shared the concept of "*whakapapa*" from the Māori culture and reminded participants of their obligation to leave a legacy for those that will come after us. Mr. Thomson shared IPPC's Article IX which provides for RPPO's to be established and responsibilities of RPPOs. He highlighted the coordination in participation of activities among NPPO's in order to promote and achieve the objectives of the IPPC as well as ensuring views of Pacific Members are taken into account. He mentioned that most of us hail from small countries and economies and individually think that we do not have much power or voice to change things. However, we all have a role to play in the protection of our countries and economies from foreign pest and diseases by working together and can influence decision making at the IPPC level just like any other RPPO – we have seen how effective we can be when we work together!

Mr. Thomson stated that the second reminder is we must "*know where we are*" or we're not going to be where we need to be in the future and sometimes that can have significant consequences; the PPPO workplan must address the challenges we, as Members of the PPPO, face today. Thirdly, we must "*know where we are heading*"; we must ask what's the future state that we're all trying to achieve and have a clear picture of the future we are trying to get to. Lastly, he shared that we must be prepared to "*make course corrections as needed*" to keep us on track and the same will be true with the work plan that we come up with and will recommend to the PPPO Full Board. He stated that we as members of the PPPO ExCo have this obligation to lead and to recognize those needs for course corrections.

Mr. Thomson stated that the world has changed a lot since we last revised the workplan and in a world of emerging from COVID, we must ask if our priorities have changed? Can we achieve as much, or we need to focus on fewer things or there's some more things that we need to do? Consequently, our work plans must also change to reflect our ability to deliver as it is our responsibility to provide leadership. He added that support provided by the PPPO Secretariat must also be closely looked at to ensure that the Secretariat is resourced and organized so that it can meet the demands of Member Countries.

Mr. Thomson ended by making two announcements:

- A. Highlighting Section 6 Clause 3 of the PPPO Constitution and need to relook at PPPO operational systems design, MPI in collaboration with MFAT will be funding a consultancy to review the “PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework” in order to build a business case for presentation to donors so as to secure consistent funding streams for the PPPO. This activity was endorsed in the 2020 ExCo, however, at that time funding was not finalized. The recruitment of the consultant to be engaged is expected to be completed by the end of June.
- B. Under the Enhanced Pacific Market Access Partnership (EPMAP) program, MPI in collaboration with the PPPO Secretariat will engage the services of Dr. Stephen Butcher as a consultant to develop a training program for the heads of NPPOs and biosecurity officers. The training framework and modules will be presented to the ExCo and then PPPO Full Board for endorsement.

Mr. Thomson stated that the Australian Government through DAWE will also be providing similar assistance and funding for different initiatives which the Australian Delegation will be speaking about. He requested full participation from all attendees as leaders in the region and wished everyone well.

Mr. Waqa thanked Mr. Thomson and re-iterated the importance of participants engaging in the discussions and invited a response from Director LRD. In her response, Ms. Mapusua acknowledged the opening address delivered by Mr. Thomson and recognized the ongoing support from MPI and stated that their assistance will be coming in two critical areas. She also mentioned that SPC is continuing to have dialogue with MFAT and DFAT on how to frame a cohesive program for biosecurity and SPS in the region and these initiatives are supporting an overall framework and vision.

Mr. Waqa then acknowledged presence of Dr. Vivian-Smith and Dr. Peterson (Australian Delegation) who had joined the meeting in-person. He once again thanked participants joining online, especially Standards Committee (SC) representative Mr. David Tenakenai of PNG National Agriculture and Quarantine Inspection Authority (NAQIA) and Ms. Karen Pugh from the New Zealand Delegation as well as those face-to-face in Suva and requested that all participants introduce themselves.

5.0 Introductions

Participants joining the meeting online and in-person introduced themselves. First the Melanesia sub-region (New Caledonia, PNG and Fiji), followed by Polynesia (Tokelau) and then Micronesia (Republic of Marshall Islands). See Participants List.

6.0 Confirmation of agenda and rapporteurs

Confirmation of agenda

Mr. Waqa briefly read through the 4-day programme and requested participants to review the agenda and suggest changes, if any.

- A. Australia – Dr. Peterson mentioned that she is happy for the agenda to go through as is, however, the presentation from Dr. Chris Dale (DFAT) on Day 03 is unconfirmed for now. Mr. Waqa stated that we will take this into account and await DAWE’s confirmation.
- B. Vice Chairman – Mr. Waqa proposed to the forum if we should devote some time on one of the days to discuss on the reminders talked about by Mr. Thomson in his opening address. Mr. Thomson added that it would be good to hear from the Pacific colleagues if we should take some time for reflection on what has changed in our operating environment and what adaptations may

be needed in the PPPO workplan. Mr. Waqa reminded participants that this platform is for every Member Country to openly share their views and should be taken as an opportunity to voice country concerns/issues as a build up to participating in bigger IPPC meetings. He then mentioned that there is a session today discussing the PPPO workplan for next 5 years plus potential funding streams and this is where the ExCo could reflect on the reminders and discuss priorities. He then posed the same question by sub-region. Fiji (Melanesia) mentioned that they agree to the proposal as this was an important aspect to discuss at the forum. This was acknowledged by Polynesia (Tokelau).

The 2022 PPPO ExCo meeting agenda was endorsed as presented.

Confirmation of rapporteurs

Dr. Timote introduced the rapporteurs for the meeting. Mr. Riten Gosai (Biosecurity and SPS Officer, SAFE Pacific project) and Mr. Ilaisa Dakaica were endorsed as rapporteurs for the meeting.

Dr. Vivian-Smith and Dr. Peterson then introduced themselves followed by Mr. Thomson and Ms. Karen Pugh (Manager Fresh Produce Imports, MPI) and the SPC/PPPO Secretariat Team in the order: Dr. Timote, Dr. Ellen Iramu (Soil Scientist, SPC LRD), Dr. Mark Ero (Project Manager, Pacific Awareness and Response to Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle (PARC) project), Mr. Fereti Atumurirava (Pest and Disease Management Adviser, SPC LRD), Dr. Viliami Kami (Programme Leader, Markets for Livelihoods, SPC LRD), Mr. Gosai, Mr. Dakaica and Mr. Naheed Hussein (Team Leader, SAFE Pacific Project).

Session 1 – Prevailing Issues of the PPPO

7.0 CPM and IPPC updates

Mr. Peter Thomson, CPM Bureau rep SWP and CTO NZMPI,

As a start, Mr. Thomson reminded the ExCo of the upcoming CPM-16 in April (05th and 07th while the 21st is mostly reserved for endorsement of the meeting report). Meeting times are 10am – 1pm and 3pm – 6pm Rome Time; he requested countries to work out the local times. He also reminded the ExCo that most Pacific Island countries are still not registered to attend and should send through their credentials to the IPPC Secretariat at the earliest in order to register. He added that a good turnout is important as the region will be raising important issues at the meeting which will require support from the Members.

Mr. Thomson then shared some CPM hot topics for this year which include:

- 8.7 Taskforce on Topics and 9.9.3 Proposal for CPM Focus Group on Safe Provision of Food and Other Humanitarian Aid (last year this was approved as a guideline and PPPO is trying again to have a focus group established to consider this as a standard whereby PPPO's focus will be having this as a standard)
- 8.8.1 CPM Focus Group on Pest Outbreaks Alert and Response Systems (to assist countries in staying aware of pests moving around the world and coordinated approach to response)
- 8.8.3 Focus Group on Climate Change (one of the strategic framework priorities dealing with impact of climate change on plant pests)
- 11.3 Sea Container Taskforce report and 8.8.6 CPM Focus Group on Sea Containers (this has been difficult to push especially noting the costs involved)

- 11.4 PCE Activities (current tools are very restrictive and expensive to use; push for more flexible system and the use of local experts – Australia has put together a strong submission for this)
- 14 Update on ePhyto activities (to ensure IPPC is supporting this work and providing assistance)

Mr. Thomson requested Members to look at the full agenda and identify topics of interest to them. He then talked about the CPM Bureau work, firstly the nomination of observers to CPM Bureau meetings; he stated we have had some observers already to some Bureau meetings, but it would be ideal to have more Members attend as this will build a base for the region to select future Bureau reps from. Mr. Thomson mentioned that the CPM Bureau is now focusing on CPM-16, functioning of the CPM Secretariat and implementation of the strategic framework.

He further updated the ExCo on the appointment of the new IPPC Secretary, Mr. Osama El-Lissy of the USDA and PPPO looks forward to working under this leadership. SC and Implementation and Capacity Building Committee (IC) work continues at pace and there have been a lot of virtual meetings to keep things moving. IPPC Secretariat moving to face to face meetings as more FAO staff get back into office. He then informed the ExCo of the International Plant Health Conference that will take place in UK from 21-23 September and that the “strategic planning” meeting planned for October this year maybe held face to face. He closed off by saying that it is our responsibility to meet in between major meetings and steer our activities or make adjustments as needed for which we must actively engage and taking on the leadership roles.

Comments, Q&A:

- A. Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith asked if there is any confirmation on the “International Day of Plant Health” through the Communications Focus Group. Mr. Thomson responded that this has been confirmed by the United Nations (UN) as an annual event to be held on the 12th of May and is a great opportunity to promote our work at the national level.
- B. Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa picked on the point where Mr. Thomson stated that not all Pacific countries have registered for the CPM. Mr. Thomson said that according to the latest information available to him, only Australia, New Zealand, Fiji and Samoa have registered and provided their credentials. He shared how registration can be done and country credentials uploaded through the IPPC website.

Mr. Thomson said that he recognizes the timing is not the best for our region and Members would have to wake up through the night to attend but encouraged countries to register and participate in the sessions that are of interest to them, it is a chance to get familiar and more comfortable.

Break for ten (10) minutes.

8.0 Matters arising from the minutes of the last PPPO ExCo Meeting and Progress

Dr. Visoni Timote, PPPO Secretary and IPA-BSPS at SPC LRD

Mr. Waqa once again encouraged Member Countries to actively participate in this ExCo meeting and contribute to the discussions. He then invited Dr. Timote to present the matters arising from the last PPPO ExCo meeting (that was held from 02 – 04 March 2020) and update the forum on what progress has been made to date against those action items.

Dr. Timote then presented the actions items with updates on the progress made to date. See the document titled “*Actions and Recommendations from The PPPO ExCo 2020_Report to the ExCo 2022*”. Captured below are discussions on each of these items.

Item No.	Discussions
1	<p>CRB management in Pacific Island Countries & Territories (PICTs)</p> <p>No questions or comments.</p>
2	<p>PPPO Website</p> <p>Australia – Dr. Peterson asked if the PPPO webpage in the SPC website will have functionality to upload/host files. Dr. Timote responded that this will be possible. She then asked if there will be capability to have a password protected section. Dr. Visoni responded that he has not gone into discussing this technicality. Dr. Peterson stated that this may be useful for uploading certain types of documents such as draft ExCo papers that could then be worked on virtually but is not something critical. Dr. Visoni responded that the Secretariat can try to pursue this functionality. Dr. Kami added that the PPPO webpage would likely be hosted under the LRD Markets for Livelihoods webpage and there will be flexibility in what functionalities are needed for the PPPO webpage. [Action Item 1]</p> <p>New Zealand – Dr. Thomson asked if there is a need to have a full time IT person to manage the PPPO website alone? This could be a small portion of the work for an already hired IT person. Dr. Visoni responded that a full time IT expert would be required if the PPPO had a website of its own, however, if hosted under the LRD Pillar 4 webpage, then this role would not be needed. Mr. Waqa then questioned if it is confirmed that the PPPO webpage will be hosted under the LRD webpage to which Dr. Kami responded that we have discussed internally, and he can confirm this in the interim as we know there is no possibility to have an independent website for the PPPO. [Action Item 1]</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa then asked by when this will be done or has the work started? Dr. Timote responded that the SPC Comms Team has started to collect information from the 4 LRD pillars and PPPO Secretariat will also be providing relevant information for inclusion in the PPPO webpage. [Action Item 2]</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if there was funding available for this work and if not, what the costs are likely to be and by when can this work be completed? Dr. Visoni stated that there will be no associated costs if the PPPO webpage is maintained by SPC IT and LRD Comms teams. The PPPO Secretariat hopes to have the PPPO webpage up by end of April 2022. [Action Item 2]</p> <p>Fiji – Mr. Pratap asked if PPPO Members will have the opportunity to review and provide inputs into development of this webpage? Dr. Visoni responded that we can share current information for the LRD website and how the PPPO webpage will be housed therein.</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that it may be worthwhile to have a better plan in terms of how the PPPO webpage will be implemented so that countries get the chance to contribute</p>

	and provide feedback, however, we will be guided by the PPPO Secretariat and note that the PPPO webpage will go live by end of April.
3	<p>Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)</p> <p>New Zealand – Ms. Pugh stated that there may be a need to shift the delivery date of the PCE consultancy (under the EPMAP) as MPI and SPC are still finalizing the grant funding agreement (GFA); while Dr. Stephen Butcher will be engaged within the next month or two, a more realistic delivery date is January 2023 which will allow Dr. Butcher time to engage with the countries and get their involvement in this program.</p>
4	<p>Awareness packages for 2020 Festival of Pacific Arts (FESTPAC2020)</p> <p>Australia – Dr. Peterson stated that now the Festival of Pacific Arts is scheduled for June 2024, this action item could be added to the work plan of the DAWE Seconded to the PPPO Secretariat. [Action Item 3] Mr. Waqa agreed and mentioned that this could be discussed further tomorrow when the information paper relating to the seconded is presented.</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked about the actual awareness package for the Festival of Pacific Arts to which Dr. Visoni responded that no work was done on this since the festival was postponed. Mr. Waqa further mentioned that the festival takes place every 2-3 years and if we needed to also consider this as one of the ongoing activities. Dr. Visoni responded that in agreeing with Dr. Peterson, this work can be added to the programme for the DAWE seconded to PPPO Secretariat. [Action item 3]</p>
5	<p>RSPM that addresses traditional gatherings and related events in the region</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if the regional standard was not developed because the festival did not happen. Dr. Visoni agreed and said that this is also linked to Item 4 and 6. Mr. Waqa then questioned if the Festival of Pacific Arts does not take place, will the standard not be looked into/developed? Dr. Visoni stated that the Hawaii Department of Agriculture (HDOA) and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) were supposed to share import permit conditions based on which the standard would have been drafted. Mr. Waqa stated that this is another item which could be added to the work plan of the DAWE Seconded to the PPPO Secretariat. [Action Item 4]</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa then asked if Dr. Chris Dale and Team were supposed to be involved in the development of the regional standard? Dr. Visoni mentioned that it was the responsibility of the Secretariat to convene a technical working group (TWG) after a SPC team had visited Hawaii to scope this work, however, due to postponement of the Festival of Pacific Arts, this was not done. If the festival was to go ahead, a TWG would have handled all work in this space.</p> <p>PNG – Mr. Tenakanai mentioned that this is timely for the region as we are constantly exposed to a lot of biosecurity threats. PNG have in the past placed biosecurity requirements for items imported for such events and non-compliances were noted. In his view, it was important to pursue this regional standard and strengthen border control activities in this area as travellers tend to neglect requirements/arrangements.</p>

6	<p>USDA import requirements for dissemination</p> <p>As captured above.</p>
7	<p>PPPO logo and narration</p> <p>No questions or comments.</p>
8	<p>TWG on risk analysis relating to climate change</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked why this work has not been progressed. Dr. Visoni responded that the Secretariat is short staffed (only 2 members), however, the Team has contributed to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) project proposal to FAO which is in its second drafting phase. He solicited support from Member Countries for this task and asked if there are any volunteers to assist with the formation of a working group.</p> <p>Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith stated that this is an important area and we should link with the Focus Group on Climate Change to see how they are approaching this topic and if there are any learnings for the region as getting the structure or foundation right is important; the Focus Group can provide insights and assistance. Dr. Peterson mentioned that Australia is happy to support this with Dr. Dale (DFAT) as Chair of the Focus Group. [Action Item 5]</p> <p>New Zealand – Mr. Thomson stated that if you look back at my earlier report, one of the CPM topics is the report to the CPM from the Focus Group on Climate Change. In the report, there is a section addressing the issue of how to assess the risks to plant health as a result of climate change, and so there are a number of initiatives looking at methodologies and tools for implementation between now and 2025. He encouraged Members to read the paper and if they are supportive, then express that support in the CPM. He added that it is great that our regions own Dr. Dale from Australia is heavily involved in that work and will be able to guide and be of help to us. [Action Item 5]</p>
9	<p>Standards Committee (SC) rep appointment</p> <p>No questions or comments.</p>
10	<p>Implementation and Capacity Building Committee (IC) rep appointment</p> <p>No questions or comments.</p>
11	<p>Pest information (collation and distribution to regional NPPOs)</p> <p>PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote mentioned that the latest Pest Alert on Fall Armyworm was released in Quarter 4 of 2021 and the next one on Bogia Coconut Syndrome is being reviewed. He added that the Secretariat will be working on Pest Alerts and/or Pest Information Leaflets – at least 2-4 per year – to be distributed to the PPPO network. [Action Item 6]</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa clarified if there are only 2 members in the PPPO Secretariat? Dr. Timote responded that this was the case and now we have a few more colleagues join us, however, they are project staff. He added that Team Leader for Markets for Livelihoods and colleagues from Plant Health Team also provided support to the PPPO Secretariat.</p>

	<p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that we need to factor this in the discussions on the PPPO workplan – availability of human resource to properly perform PPPO Secretariat functions as project-based staff will have their own set of priorities – there is a lot of work involved in serving all Members of the PPPO hence the Secretariat needs to be adequately resourced.</p>
12	<p>ePhyto implementation support letters</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if support letters for ePhyto implementation was received from all the countries or only some countries? Dr. Visoni responded that these were from countries included in the first phase of the project. PPPO Secretariat will solicit further support letters in the next phase. [Action Item 7]</p> <p>Tonga – Ms. Siutoni Tupou commended work of the PPPO Secretariat as well as Regional ePhyto Coordinator regarding ePhyto work in the region and virtual trainings provided. She mentioned that Tonga will be working hard towards implementation and also thanked Australia and New Zealand for their support to ePhyto.</p>
13	<p>GeNS Implementation</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa solicited comments from SWP CPM Bureau Rep, Mr. Thomson on amalgamating systems, for example, ePhyto and ASYCUDA integration as agencies such as the World Bank are exploring options to link these systems. Mr. Thomson responded that while there is interest and various agencies have looked at incorporating ePhyto (GeNS) into the single window concept, but this has not been easy – particularly due to funding obstacles. He added that from a country perspective, it is important to recognise that ePhyto is enabling exchange of a government-to-government assurance – not just exchange of commercial (trade) assurances. New Zealand have adopted the concept where all commercial information comes in through the trade single window and the government-to-government assurance of ePhyto is kept separate – but there is a connection to refer to the ePhyto number so that it can be connected to the consignment details. He further stated that we just have to be aware of the different agendas that funding agencies come with and what they are trying to achieve and make sure it's what the country wants to achieve as well. So there needs to be careful planning around this before mixing the systems up; the question is what's the best way to do that right and what is best for our countries. Furthermore, he encouraged countries to express interest in using GeNS (if not already done so) as there are donor agencies that may be willing to fund this work.</p> <p>Tonga – Ms. Tupou mentioned that while we are trialling ePhyto (GeNS) for exports, what about import consignments? Mr. Thomson responded that it only makes sense that if you are using the system for export, you use it for imports as well where you have a trading partner that can do that – the only requirement being an agreement between countries to use electronic means to exchange phytosanitary certificates. Tonga further asked about commodities that do not require a phytosanitary certificate to be issued. Mr. Thomson responded that GeNS was designed for electronically exchanging certificates where needed, if phytosanitary certificate is not required, then there is no need to use it. He added that communication is now underway with World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) and there maybe provision to exchange sanitary certificates for animal products through the GeNS hub in the future.</p>

	<p>Fiji – Mr. Pratap updated the forum that Fiji is working with the Global Alliance for Trade Facilitation (GATF) and World Bank (WB) on fully rolling out ePhyto in the country and also exploring possibility of GeNS and ASYCUDA integration in collaboration with Fiji Revenue and Customs Services (FRCS).</p> <p>Regional ePhyto Coordinator – Mr. Ilaisa Dakaica provided an update on ePhyto progress so far stating that GeNS enhancements are now enabling more functionalities which the countries can use for safe and efficient trade. He noted that Fiji is working with GATF and WB in exploring integration and this may be of interest to the ePhyto Working Group. For SPC and the PPPO Secretariat, the priority is to get more countries on board GeNS.</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa reiterated the message from Mr. Thomson and Mr. Dakaica and the importance of following the regional implementation plan as well as the need for Member Countries to communicate with the PPPO Secretariat if there are other donor agencies wanting to collaborate in this space.</p>
14	<p>List of approved and phased out pesticides in the region</p> <p>PNG – Mr. Tanekanai stated that this is an important activity which all NPPOs can contribute to including country information on readily available pesticides and use. He added that in light of the invasive pest fall army worm (FAW), regional NPPOs need to be aware of chemicals available to control such damaging pests, especially food and feed industries. He shared the experience of small to semi-commercial PNG farmers who were unknowingly using chemicals available in the country that do not actually provide good control for FAW. He stated that IPM is still important none-the-less. Mr. Waqa thanked PNG for the comments and mentioned that a list of chemicals will be provided by MPI to the PPPO Secretariat distribution to the PPPO network – this same list has been shared bilaterally with some countries where MPI had conducted pathway audits. [Action Item 8]</p>
15	<p>Nomination process for SWP representatives to the IPPC committees</p> <p>No questions or comments.</p>
16	<p>Sea Container Hygiene System (SCHS) collaboration with Pacific Horticultural and Agricultural Market Access Program Plus (PHAMA Plus)</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked the Tokelauan delegates if there were discussions for the SCHS or a similar system to be implemented in Tokelau. Unfortunately, there was no response (internet issue), however, the forum noted that this remains a priority for the atoll countries. He added that we will allow PPPO Secretariat and PHAMA Plus to continue dialogue for development of a system that would be feasible and manageable for smaller countries in the region.</p> <p>Australia – Dr. Peterson mentioned that DAWE has been working on a “sea container scheme” project and can expand this network to include the PPPO Secretariat as well – she will be in communication with Dr. Timote and the Secretariat Team on this. [Action Item 9]</p> <p>SPC (LRD) – Dr. Kami stated that PHAMA Plus is coming to the end of this phase and there is no confirmation on the next phase – this is something to keep in mind. To this, Mr. Waqa</p>

	<p>asked if this was a PHAMA Plus driven activity or a PPPO activity (in other words, request from countries was to which agency)? Dr. Timote responded that the request was from Kiribati to PPPO and there is opportunity for the SAFE Pacific project to pick up from where PHAMA Plus will leave or has left off. Mr. Waqa added that it is important to communicate with PHAMA Plus on the progress to which Dr. Timote agreed. [Action Item 10] The Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations Program Plus (PACER Plus) program is also doing some work in this area and Mr. Waqa invited Ms. Pugh to provide some comments to this end (based on her involvement in this space).</p> <p>New Zealand - Ms. Pugh updated that PACER Plus was developing awareness materials on SCHS in different languages (of the PACER Plus countries) and it would be good for the PPPO Secretariat to link up and identify what is available and where the gaps might be. [Action Item 10] Mr. Waqa mentioned that it is important to reach out to PACER Plus as well as coordinate with other agencies who would be able to assist the Member Countries in this activity; PACER Plus suggested developing a system suitable for the PICs – this is in terms of how the system will be managed so it has to be tailored to the country needs.</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa requested the PPPO Secretariat to compile information gathered from PHAMA Plus and PACER Plus communication as well as consult Members again on their needs and how best they can be assisted in this area. The Secretariat will present these to the PPPO Full Board in its next meeting scheduled for later this year. [Action Item 11]</p>
17	<p>Development of PPPO standard setting process</p> <p>No questions or comments.</p>
18	<p>Kalang Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Platform report</p> <p>New Zealand – Mr. Thomson stated that it will be good if the “<i>Kalang SPS Platform Report</i>” is circulated as a reference document. Mr. Waqa concurred with this and requested PPPO Secretariat that the Kalang report be re-circulated well before the Full Board Meeting so that new heads of NPPOs and/or their representatives can read the report and provide comments. Dr. Visoni agreed and said that the report and feedback matrix template will be forwarded to Member Countries. [Action Item 12] Mr. Waqa added that this report was the basis on which the “Centre of Excellence” (CoE) was to be established for training of regional biosecurity officers.</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa highlighted that the CoE was initially being positioned for phytosanitary components only and it was during the Kalang consultancy (much later) that sanitary aspects were added attracting some pushback from Members – hence report was circulated for comments to be tabled and discussed at the PPPO Full Board. Dr. Kami responded that in recent discussions, the STDF is interested in funding a “Biosecurity SPS approach to the CoE”.</p>
19	<p>Advancing SPS Platform project proposal with Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)</p> <p>PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote added that STDF would like the CoE to address plant health, animal health (terrestrial and aquatic) as well as food safety aspects. PPPO Secretariat will be</p>

	<p>drafting a 2 pager that will be submitted to the STDF by mid-April for consideration to develop into a concept note. Mr. Waqa requested whether PPPO Members will have input into this paper to which Dr. Timote responded that a draft will be circulated for comments and inputs before finalization and submission of the same to STDF. [Action Item 13] He added that EU had a meeting with the STDF regarding this and could potentially provide further support for the CoE.</p> <p>New Zealand – Mr. Thomson mentioned that he needs to first understand what the pros and cons were and why there was concern amongst ExCo members in relation to broadening the scope of the CoE to include sanitary components. He further highlighted that STDF is capable of funding big projects, however, we need to be clear about the type or nature of funding (short term or long term, what aspects will be funded, etc.) and who can step in if there are any gaps. Mr. Waqa re-iterated the need to circulate the Kalang report and collate comments for presentation to the PPPO Full Board. [Action Item 13]</p>
20	<p>Expression of Interest (EOI) and Terms of Reference (TOR) for consultancy on “Harmonisation of Biosecurity Legislation”</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if a TOR has been developed and consultant hired? Dr. Timote responded that this has been included as part of the SAFE Pacific project, and a draft TOR has been drafted for this work – the TOR will be circulated to the PPPO ExCo for review and comments before finalization. [Action Item 14].</p> <p>SPC (LRD) – Dr. Kami interjected with a point of clarification by highlighting issues around the legislation review: FAO route is to have three separate acts (1 each for Plant Health, Animal Health and Biosecurity) whereas there is another model that combines all the three into one. Dr. Timote shared the same sentiments and expressed concern at this scenario.</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa iterated that there was deep discussion on this in previous PPPO meeting(s) and we need to be careful on what model is suggested to us as we are aiming for harmonization in this space at the regional level and cannot afford to adopt various templates from different agencies. The Biosecurity Information Facility (BIF) project of the early 2000s helped narrow down a “model legislation” which was a product of consultation with countries. This model legislation was then to be tailored to suit the individual country. Mr. Waqa then requested comments from the PPPO Secretariat, Australia and New Zealand.</p> <p>PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote talked of the progress with TOR and plans to work on the legislation review through the SAFE Pacific project under EDF 11 (as country requests have come in again), but concern remains on the model and what is preferred by Members. He asked whether we shall agree on an option the PPPO Member Countries could adopt.</p> <p>New Zealand – Mr. Thomson added that he can understand why FAO proposes separate legislations covering Plant Health, Animal Health and Biosecurity – this may be borne from “European” models where competent authorities are split right until you get to the very top of organizations - this works in many countries. However, in New Zealand, for long a joint approach has been preferred because all the concepts and principles for plant and animal biosecurity is essentially the same. He added that in a relatively small country like New</p>

	<p>Zealand, significant costs can be incurred, and resources spent in funding two separate sets of legislations, hence one over-arching legislation can be more efficient and cost-effective.</p> <p>Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith updated that the Australian legislation is similar in approach to New Zealand; one overarching biosecurity legislation covering plants, animals and marine health which is more outcome based and efficiency is one of the many rationales. She added that Australian States and Territories that have reviewed their biosecurity legislations in the last 10 years have also moved towards a single act. Australia has no plans to change its approach and the European or FAO model does not resonate with Australia’s current view.</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked the forum what PPPO’s position is and if we will agree to a model or template in this meeting or leave it to the countries to decide? Dr. Visoni responded that the Secretariat will circulate the SAFE Pacific project legislation review TOR [Action Item 14] for countries to review by taking into consideration the FAO approach and that of Australia and New Zealand and then provide their comments as well as preferred approach for support.</p> <p>Australia – Dr. Peterson stated that if she recalls the last ExCo correctly, this discussion came from the outcomes of PCE under a FAO project and suggestion was for three separate pieces of legislation; concern was raised that this is not how biosecurity legislation is done in this region – it looks back to the PCE (who does it, if it is appropriate to the region and whether gaps found are actual gaps). She agreed with Mr. Thomson that separate legislations are difficult to maintain and review/update over time making it more difficult to implement them.</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa noted Dr. Peterson’s concerns and mentioned that many countries in the Pacific have very old legislations requiring review and update; consultations are important so that countries can decided what is best for them in the region’s context.</p> <p>FAO – M. Keresoma stated that it is important to note the needs of the region while keeping in mind how legislation in the biosecurity space has been approached historically at the global level. He further mentioned that he recognises the issue at hand and the consultancy will be important in providing direction at the regional level and also for decision making; he will relay this message to FAO senior managers for their noting.</p>
21	<p>Engaging with research institutions and priority areas for research</p> <p>PNG – Mr. Tenakanai mentioned that it is important for NPPOs to work with the private sector and other relevant institutions within the country on research activities apart from reliance on donors. He used FAW as an example, mentioning that FAW is bound to become a big issue in all PICs; private sector as well as the research arms in PNG such as the National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI) in collaboration with NAQIA have contributed towards FAW studies and efforts to control this pest. Industry has gone ahead in working with partners such as “Grow Asia” and PNG is also learning from experiences of other countries and regions. RAMU Agri Industries had initially lost around 50% of their crop/yield to FAW invasion. Having developed information, awareness and management packages, losses due to FAW infestation now only accounts to about 5%.</p>

	Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa thanked Mr. Tenakanai for sharing PNG’s experience with FAW and requested that PNG share the above information and materials that were developed with the PPPO Secretariat so that, where possible, these could be distributed to all PPPO member countries for their learning. [Action Item 15]
22	<p>BIF progress</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked Dr. Timote by when the TOR for BIF upgrade is expected. Dr. Timote responded that currently the SAFE Pacific project team is working on TORs for other consultancies under the project and the one for BIF will be worked on between end of April to June. [Action Item 16]</p>
23	<p>Improved communication/collaboration with RTMPP focal points</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if the letter to the Regional Technical Meeting of Plant Protection (RTMPP) was written. Dr. Timote updated that this was not progressed, however, PPPO Secretariat has been coordinating some research work. For example, working with RTMPP focal point at Fiji Ministry of Agriculture and BAF on High Temperature Forced Air (HTFA) treatment research (use of lugs vs bins). Mr. Waqa iterated on any progress with the letter to which Dr. Timote replied that a letter will be drafted by the PPPO Secretariat for review by the PPPO ExCo before this is sent out to RTMPP focal points. [Action Item 17]</p>
24	<p>PPPO logo and narration</p> <p>No questions or comments.</p>
25	<p>Key partners for future collaboration</p> <p>No questions or comments.</p>
26	<p>Communication package on PPPO work and achievements</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if there are any reasons why this work has not been progressed. Dr. Timote responded that the PPPO Secretariat (Biosecurity SPS Team) is small and does not have a Communications person which other pillars and teams in SPC LRD benefit from, hence this could not be worked on. Mr. Waqa asked if SPC LRD Communications Officers could assist in this regard. Dr. Timote stated that the PPPO Secretariat does work with project teams, for example, seeking assistance from SAFE Pacific project’s Communications Officer for a PR on this week’s ExCo meeting, but this assistance is limited.</p>
27	<p>Communication package on objectives and plans of the PPPO</p> <p>New Zealand – Ms. Pugh updated that through MFAT funding for the EPMAP project, MPI is developing a work program with the PPPO Secretariat; a consultant will be hired to assist with the PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework once the funding agreement between SPC and MPI NZ is signed. She added that recruitment of a consultant is expected before end of June and the work to be completed by end of January next year.</p> <p>Australia – Dr. Peterson asked if No. 26 is different from No. 27 and if the New Zealand program could consider including No. 26 under PPPO assistance as part of the EPMAP project, saying that while the audience may be different, but the baseline information is</p>

	<p>similar. Ms. Pugh responded that New Zealand will definitely explore this in the scoping work and see how this aligns as she is aware of the wider strategic work MFAT and DFAT are discussing with SPC. A lot of connecting and coordination would be required, and the teams need to ensure that all of this is covered in the conditioning and scoping documents. [Action Item 18]</p>
28	<p>Fiji national program for International Year of Plant Health (IYPH) No questions or comments.</p>
29	<p>PPPO revised workplan Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that the forum will look at the PPPO workplan in detail as part of the latter agenda item.</p>
30	<p>PPPO activities covered under EDF11 funded project No questions or comments.</p>
31	<p>Error (missed out).</p>
32	<p>PPPO annual reports Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if there are any reasons why annual reports could not be done. Dr. Timote responded that the PPPO Secretariat Team is small and not able to cover all areas, adding that the PPPO Seconded from DAWE could assist with this work and annual report can be produced for 2022.</p> <p>New Zealand – Mr. Thomson asked if the purpose and structural content of the annual report was clear or further definition was required or if non-production of the report was just a resourcing issue; he added that this is because we need to ensure the report contains information which is useful to the targeted audience. Dr. Timote mentioned that there is no structure and, if produced, is most likely to follow the SPC LRD annual report format.</p> <p>Australia – Dr. Peterson mentioned she agrees with New Zealand on being clear on who the target audience for the annual report is. She added that this item again relates to No. 26 and could be just 1-2 pages to reflect PPPO achievements throughout a year. Ms. Pugh (New Zealand) seconded this approach and stated that this could be part of the scoping work and assistance to PPPO through EPMAP project. [Action Item 19] Regarding the resource issue, Dr. Timote stated that having a simpler format plus assistance through EPMAP project may help get this work off the ground.</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa, in response to Ms. Pugh, added that clarity on the information to be contained in the annual report (what we are trying to publish) as well as the format (structure) will be part of the scoping work.</p>
33	<p>Implementation of the Australian Fumigation Accreditation Scheme (AFAS) Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if no progress on AFAS is again a resource issue? Dr. Timote stated that this has come through under EDF11 (SAFE Pacific project).</p>

	<p>Tonga – Ms. Tupou mentioned that Tonga requested assistance through PHAMA Plus program in connecting with DAWE Australia, however, AFAS work remains incomplete in Tonga due to the fallout from COVID-19 pandemic and also because trainers were not able to travel to Tonga. Mr. Waqa stated that it would be good for the PPPO Secretariat to link up with other agencies that could assist with regional implementation of AFAS. Dr. Timote responded that the PPPO Secretariat will pick up the work on AFAS as well as SCHS under the SAFE Pacific project and will also communicate with PHAMA Plus on the progress they made through their interventions.</p>
34	<p>Relooking at biosecurity legislation review options under FAO assistance No questions or comments.</p>
35	<p>PPPO Secretariat communication with countries on biosecurity legislation Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa requested PPPO Secretariat add details on the work done in this area when presenting on the SAFE Pacific project (under EDF 11).</p>
36	<p>Supporting countries with ERP and resource mobilization Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked what is meant by allocation (as a component) under EDF 11 (SAFE Pacific project)? Dr. Timote responded that this refers to assistance with actual response and will be covered in detail in the presentation on SAFE Pacific project. Mr. Waqa further asked if the countries are aware of this funding and its availability to support any emergency response? Dr. Timote replied that this was informed to the countries during SAFE Pacific project inception meeting.</p> <p>PNG – Mr. Tenakanai stated that this is important, especially for island countries, and requested PPPO Secretariat write letters to governments of all countries (through its diplomatic processes) to support ERP activities nationally and at the regional level. He used PNG as an example, mentioning that the country has recently faced pest and disease outbreaks and sourcing funds in a timely manner to deal with these biosecurity incursions was a big challenge. [Action Item 20]</p>
37	<p>Inclusion of Regional Trade Facilitation Program and Regional Fruit Fly Strategy into the PPPO work plan PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote mentioned that he hoped this work could be included under the EPMAP project.</p> <p>PNG – Mr. Tenakanai stated that we used to have this in some respect at the regional level and it would be good to initiate this again to support trade. Dr. Timote acknowledged PNG's comments and highlighted that there is opportunity to work on this through the New Zealand and Australia funded projects.</p> <p>Tonga – Ms. Tupou (though Zoom chat box) also supported the regional strategies on trade facilitation and fruit fly. Mr. Waqa mentioned that information papers will be presented at this forum, and we can then discuss further work or how to progress in this area.</p>

38	<p>Secretariat to work with PPPO TWGs in addressing project objectives and assist with write-up for GCF project</p> <p>Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if PPPO Secretariat has the report from earlier consultancy on the GCF project? Dr. Timote responded that the Secretariat has the report (consultancy was carried out with assistance from FAO regional office). The report will be provided to the ExCo for review and feedback. [Action Item 21]</p>
39	<p>Secretariat to identify costings for activities of the TWGs</p> <p>No questions or comments. PPPO Secretariat Team will work on the costings for face-to-face meetings as the COVID situation improves and travel opens.</p>

General comments on matters arising from 2020 PPPO ExCo meeting:

- A. New Zealand – Mr. Thomson thanked the PPPO Secretariat Team for the work done although many areas could not be progressed, partly due to the COVID pandemic. He mentioned that this week the ExCo should focus on areas that are still a priority.
- B. Guam – Dr. Christopher Rosario mentioned that he is new to the forum and apologized for not providing comments as he is still learning and will be more active in future discussions. Mr. Waqa welcomed Dr. Rosario again and mentioned that he has colleagues in the ExCo and PPPO Full Board; all PPPO Members as well as the Secretariat are here to help and we all looking forward to working with him and the team.
- C. PNG – Mr. Tenakanai appreciated work of the PPPO Secretariat (Dr. Timote and Team) and iterated that some work needs follow up; he mentioned that PNG volunteers to provide support to the Secretariat in any areas of work as needed.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa requested Members present in the meeting for finalization of the action items and endorsement of the 2020 PPPO ExCo Meeting report.

Australia moved the motion to endorse the 2020 PPPO ExCo Meeting Report and Matters Arising. Fiji seconded. *The 2020 PPPO ExCo Meeting Report and Matters Arising plus Secretariat updates were endorsed.* **[Endorsement 1]**

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa acknowledged all the Member Countries (participants) inclusive of the sub-regional representatives as well as the physical presence of Australia and Fiji at the meeting for a successful first day of the 2022 PPPO ExCo Meeting. He also thanked the SPC LRD Pillar 4 Lead Dr. Kami and the PPPO Secretariat Team. Dr. Ero closed off Day 01 with a word of prayer.

9.0 Proposed PPPO Work Plan for the next 5 Years

-Shifted to Day 02

10.0 Potential Funding Streams for PPPO work – European Development Fund (EDF) 11

-Shifted to Day 02

Lunch and End of Day 01 at 02.05 pm Fiji Time

Day 02 – Wednesday, March 23

11.0 The Pacific Community (SPC)/Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) Secretariat Team opened the virtual link at 09.00 am Fiji Time

12.0 At 10.00 am Fiji Time, Mr. Waqa welcomed all participants to Day 02 of the 2022 PPPO ExCo meeting followed by a word of prayer from Dr. Kami.

Dr. Timote then updated the forum on participants joining the meeting, face-to-face as well as virtually in order to establish a quorum to begin proceedings for Day 02. Mr. Waqa then proceeded to formally welcome representatives from the three sub-regions as well as representatives from Australia, New Zealand, SPC and the PPPO Secretariat.

Ms. Lisa Winthrop (Manager, Plant Health Group, MPI) introduced herself who was joining the meeting virtually as an observer.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa then asked if any of the attendees (PPPO ExCo Member Countries) had any issues, questions or clarifications concerning Day 01. There were none, hence, Mr. Waqa then recapped discussions from Day 01 and introduced agenda items for Day 02.

13.0 Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa added that the forum was to discuss on the reminders presented by Mr. Thomson in his opening remarks yesterday concerning the PPPO, however, being conscious of the time, this can be included in the consultancy on PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework (under the EPMAP project); with this approach, countries will be able to provide better feedback which will then be presented to the PPPO ExCo followed by the PPPO Full Board when it meets later in the year. He further stated that at the PPPO Full Board meeting, sub-regional groups will get another opportunity to review the proposals by the consultant and make comments before endorsement of the framework.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson agreed to the above proposal. He stated that the fourth reminder (to make course corrections as needed) was important and requested the ExCo be clear on any changes Members want to make in the workplan, especially considering what the region and the world has faced recently; he mentioned that it is easy to over commit and Members must be mindful of this saying that if we want to add things to the program, we might have to think about taking things off as well.

Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith stated that going through action items and updates from the 2020 ExCo meeting was valuable in understanding current commitment of the PPPO and seconded Mr. Thomson's proposal that the ExCo think carefully about what is already quite an extensive workplan with the Secretariat having a lot on their plates.

Fiji – on behalf of the Melanesian sub-region, Mr. Pratap stated that Fiji was in agreement with New Zealand and Australia's proposal.

Session 1 (continued)

14.0 Proposed PPPO Work Plan for the next 5 Years

Dr. Visoni Timote, PPPO Secretary and IPA-BSPS at SPC LRD

Dr. Timote presented a matrix (MS Word document titled “*PPPO workplan and components funded by Projects*”) (see Appendix ..., “*PPPO workplan dissected.2022*”) which was an extract from the PPPO workplan (formulated based on discussions in the yesteryears), highlighting those activities funded through EDF 11 (SAFE Pacific project) as well as activities to be carried out through potential future projects funded by other donors.

Dr. Timote asked if it was okay to present the extract or the ExCo preferred to revisit the initial workplan. Mr. Waqa asked what the difference was between the initial workplan and the one on “Zoom screen-share”. Dr. Timote stated that the one being presented factored in the SAFE Pacific, New Zealand and Australia funded projects as well as the expected SDTF project inputs. Upon request from Mr. Waqa, Dr. Timote shared the MS Word document titled “*Pacific Plant Protection Organization – Revised Workplan 2019-2024*” (see Appendix ..., “*Revised 6 Year Implementation Work Plan PPPO*”) discussing the outcomes, outputs, actions and progress to date.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that we may need to go through each of the outputs and then prioritize activities in line with the earlier discussions. He also asked if activities under EDF 11 funding (SAFE Pacific project) have been endorsed. Dr. Timote responded that SAFE Pacific project activities have been endorsed (inception meeting completed) and it will be easier to see the interventions when a PowerPoint on this is presented later.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson sought clarity on the years and budgets stated in the document asking if the contents of the document were all forward looking (meaning none of this has been done yet and it's for the next two years program). Dr. Timote then highlighted activities in the document that were linked to the SAFE Pacific and New Zealand/Australia funded projects (BIF/PLD upgrade, assistance with surveillance, etc.). Dr. Timote mentioned that the years do not actually correspond to activities undertaken.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson stated that it's important to understand what has already got funding and what is still waiting to have funding allocated to it; he asked if it was possible to present according to what activities were completed and those pending (by year and funding). Mr. Waqa asked if it was possible to easier visualize this in the previous document that was being presented.

New Zealand – Ms. Karen Pugh mentioned that few members were new to the meeting and asked what the purpose of this agenda item was and what the ExCo wanted achieved by the end of discussions on this item? Mr. Waqa responded that this is where the PPPO Secretariat presents the planned activities for the PPPO to the ExCo (for agreement) based on previous year's PPPO Full Board discussions as well as country priorities and what funding streams and resources are available to progress these activities. He added that no funding was available the last few years, and now that we have funding through EDF 11, Australia and New Zealand, the ExCo needs to ensure that the activities are prioritized and aligned to the PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework; if there were activities with no funding, these would also have to be acknowledged and noted under future work.

Dr. Timote then presented the workplan tagged to project funding (see document titled “*PPPO workplan dissected.2022*”) with reference to SAFE Pacific, Australia and New Zealand projects.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked who will be delivering this work, the countries or will this be delivered by the Secretariat. Dr. Timote explained about the sub-components under the PRISE program (SAFE –

SPC, SPIRIT – PIFS, IMPACT – UNCTAD and ADB) as well as SAFE activities delivery (procurement, mix of virtual plus face-to-face interventions) and with assistance from external experts, where needed. He mentioned that the presentation on SAFE Pacific project outlines this more clearly.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if the Secretariat will share an implementation plan to help members understand how the SAFE Pacific project activities will be executed. Dr. Visoni updated that this was already discussed at length with countries and presented at the SAFE Pacific inception meeting which was also attended by the EU Delegation.

Fiji – Mr. Pratap interjected and requested we have a look at the EDF11 funded SAFE Pacific project presentation first and then come back to discussion on the workplan. Mr. Waqa then asked what was contained in the presentation to which Dr. Timote responded that this details the consultation process as well as planned biosecurity and phytosanitary activities for the 15 countries covered under this project. Mr. Waqa highlighted that previously the PPPO workplan was presented in the MS Excel format (reflecting alignment with LRD workplan) but allowed Dr. Timote to present the next document.

With approval from the chair, Dr. Timote presented details of the SAFE Pacific project (see document titled “SAFE PROJECT - PPPO ExCo Meeting ppt.2022”). In his presentation, Dr. Timote covered:

- Country consultation process to prioritise SAFE interventions (activities by country)
- Major activities covered in the biosecurity and phytosanitary components plus budget:
 - Updating, strengthening and operationalization of Biosecurity legislation and Standard Operation Procedures (SOP)
 - Improving SPS human resource capacity through targeted trainings
 - Strengthening access to information and capacity building of PICTs to use the regional BIF and PLD
 - Establishing a Pacific Regional Pesticide Registration Scheme (PRPRS)
 - Strengthening and capacity building of Biosecurity Officers in the PICTs to implement early warning systems (EWS)
 - Establishing Import Risk Analysis (IRA) capacity in PICs
 - Providing EU-Pacific States Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA) implementation support

SPC – Mr. Naheed Hussein updated that the consultation process is completed and what is being presented at this meeting is endorsed activities under SAFE covering the 15 countries which links to workplan of the PPPO.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that the SAFE Pacific project team may need to share details of the implementation plan (outputs/activities by country) together with timelines and asked if it was possible to complete all activities being shown under the project. Dr. Visoni responded that SAFE is a 4-year project and it is possible to conduct all activities in the 15 project countries – focus in the first year (due to travel restrictions) is more on procurement and hiring consultants for home-based assignments.

New Caledonia – Ms. Aurélie Chan asked about the absence of some PICTs from the SAFE Pacific project to which Dr. Visoni responded that New Caledonia was not part of the SAFE Pacific project as the country receives direct project-based funding from the EU.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson interjected proposing that, considering we are short on time, the ExCo go back to the workplan documents that the Secretary put up and just confirm whether activities are aligned with the strategic objectives, whether funding is secured, highlight those with no funding and finally discuss if certain activities are achievable or not. The second proposal was to have a small group review the PPPO workplan in special ExCo meeting few weeks from this one. Mr. Waqa reiterated the two options put forth by Mr. Thomson and mentioned that it may be clearer if a list of activities covered under EDF 11 and other projects (funding streams) was presented showing how this links to the PPPO workplan; he then solicited country comments.

New Caledonia – Ms. Chan mentioned that in the interest of time, it would be good to look at the summarized activities (PPPO workplan) linked to projects as mentioned by Mr. Waqa.

New Zealand – Ms. Pugh stated that the ExCo consider if the discussions we are having contribute to what needs to be put into the PPPO workplan and if there is connection between EDF 11 funded project and other projects; in other words, do countries know what's going to be required of them, and do they have the capacity to be able to input into these programs? She added that it may be beneficial to break down the workplan year-wise as this will be useful from New Zealand perspective in trying to plan MPI work for the next couple of years as to where MPI needs to be inputting and connecting with others.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson, in agreeing with Ms. Pugh, commented that it is currently difficult to see the connections and complementarity between the different projects/programs and what is achievable and manageable given capacity of countries and COVID restrictions. He again suggested a separate special meeting with a smaller team to relook at the PPPO workplan while we use this time for the Secretariat to share any concerns or the Members to ask questions.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa agreed with Mr. Thomson and stated that it may be better to take the discussion on the PPPO workplan to another system (offline – smaller working group) and reconvene later (perhaps at the PPPO Full Board meeting) to review/finalize as the ExCo members also need time to read through all the documents. He requested that we identify Member Countries that wish to be part of this smaller working group to finetune and align the PPPO workplan.

Australia – Dr. Peterson volunteered to be part of the group.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa requested one member per sub-region to be part of the group. Mr. Pratap (BAF, Fiji) proposed to represent Melanesia whereas Ms. Topou (Tonga) and Mr. Rosario (Guam) proposed to represent Polynesia and Micronesia, respectively. New Zealand also agreed to be part of the group. This was agreed to by the forum. [Action Item 22]

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that this smaller team is to gather after this PPPO ExCo meeting; the smaller working group must review, fine-tune and align the workplan and present it in the next PPPO ExCo meeting before the PPPO Full Board meeting to be held later this year. [Action Item 22]

SPC – Mr. Hussein provided a clarifying point on the PPPO workplan stating that the newly formed “smaller working group” consider all activities, those that have funding, those without funding, timelines as well as the beneficiaries so that we can clearly identify which countries are not benefiting at all (for example, French territories under SAFE Pacific) and then also brainstorm where projects and funding for these countries would come from. [Action Item 22]

15.0 Potential Funding Streams for PPPO work – European Development Fund (EDF) 11

Dr. Visoni Timote, PPPO Secretary and IPA-BSPS at SPC LRD

As captured above.

Break for ten (10) minutes.

PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote mentioned that during the break it was discussed that the PPPO Secretariat was accidentally missed from being included in the smaller working group on the PPPO workplan and if the Secretariat could be officially included. Mr. Waqa confirmed that the PPPO Secretariat will be part of the working group.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that we will now move to the presentation of information papers (IPs) from the countries. He added that the IPs contain key activities from country perspective that they would like the PPPO ExCo to consider as part of the PPPO workplan (more so if these help in the refining of PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework).

Session 2 – Information Papers (IPs)

15.0 Australia – Funding for PPPO programs and Standard Setting Process

Dr. Vivian-Smith, CPPO and Dr. Peterson, Director PE&IPH (both of DAWE)

Australian delegates to the meeting presented the following information papers for noting and endorsement by the PPPO ExCo:

15.1 Update on the Pacific Biosecurity Partnerships Program (PBPP), part of the DAWE Pacific Engagement Program for plant and animal biosecurity and health in the Pacific by Dr. Vivian-Smith ([see Appendix ...](#))

The Partnership facilitates the delivery of capacity development activities to support enhancements in regional biosecurity, trade and market access through implementing activities focusing primarily on Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Tonga, Samoa and Timor-Leste, but also involves other PICTs as they come into scope of broader Program activities. It aligns closely with other Australian government initiatives such as the PHAMA Plus and will play a key role in delivering Australia's commitment under the Pacific Agreement on Closer Economic Relations Program Plus (PACER Plus) to facilitate trade for, and with PICTs.

Activities include:

- Supporting exporters and National Plant Protection Organisations in the Pacific region to export plant products and promote Pacific region trade and market access opportunities
- Development and piloting of the Pacific export pathway biosecurity operations training program in collaboration with Biosecurity Authority of Fiji and PHAMA Plus
- Implementation of the GeNS to allow the exchange of phytosanitary certificates electronically. Currently working with 6 SWP countries (PNG, Cook Islands, Marshall Islands, Tuvalu, Tonga and Palau) with implementation having commenced in Solomon Islands, Nauru, Vanuatu, Niue, Tokelau and Kiribati

- Assisting SPC to enhance the functionality of the regional plant pest and biosecurity status database(s) to improve end user functionality
- Implementation of the regional trade and market access communication strategy to improve Australia's communication with PICTs and help regional exporters understand Australia's biosecurity requirements
- Supporting PHAMA Plus in the development of the "Keeping Sea Containers Clean" training and education package including the piloting of awareness material in PPPO member countries to facilitate strong biosecurity outcomes
- In collaboration with Biosecurity Solomon Islands, implementation of the Solomon Islands Biosecurity Development Program Phase 3 (SIBDP 3) to entrench learning delivered during Phase 1 & 2 and strengthen the Solomon Islands biosecurity system

*Refer to IP for way forward and recommendations.

Comments, Q&A:

- Fiji – there were no comments from Melanesia, Mr. Pratap and team supported the paper.
- Tonga (Polynesia) – Ms. Tupou acknowledged assistance from Australia DAWE for the ePhyto project and PHAMA Plus program run in Tonga and the region at large.
- Guam (Micronesia) – Mr. Rosaria provided a quick comment in relation to ePhyto work and hoped for Guam to use this facility for exchanging phytosanitary certificates. Mr. Waqa responded that ePhyto is a project for the entire region and once we advance to that point, Guam will also be added to the project/platform (for scoping and progress to testing).
- New Zealand – Mr. Thomson acknowledged Australia's support and funding for some high priorities for the PPPO work program, saying that these were things that we've talked about for a long time as being important to the region.
- PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote also acknowledged Australia DAWE for the many areas of collaboration covered under the PBPP and for involving PPPO Secretariat in the Fiji export pathway discussions, support to PLD upgrade and SCHS improvement in the region.

Fiji (Melanesia) moved the motion to endorse the paper which was seconded by Tonga and Tuvalu (Polynesia) through the Zoom chat box. *The IP and Australia's PBPP was endorsed by the PPPO ExCo.* [Endorsement 2]

15.2 Nomination Process for SWP reps to various IPPC fora by Dr. Peterson (see Appendix ...)

To progress work of the IPPC, the IPPC Secretariat often request nominees from the SWP region to various fora of the IPPC including CPM Bureau, SC, IC and other ad hoc groups formed from time-to-time. SWP nominees are expected to be agreed by the PPPO and represent the position of the SWP region in their nominated forum. The process described below provides the proposed process to identify and agree SWP representatives to these groups.

Proposed process:

1. The call for regional nominees is received from IPPC Secretariat (all contracting parties and Regional Plant Protection Organisations (RPPOs) will receive this call via email)
2. The PPPO Secretariat determines if the nominees can be drawn from non-contracting parties (e.g., non-signatories or territories)¹
3. The PPPO Secretariat then immediately circulates the call to PPPO member countries seeking nominations (2-week timeframe for response, depending on the call)
4. PPPO member countries wishing to provide a nomination on behalf of the SWP should return their proposed nominations and documentation to the PPPO Secretariat for consideration
5. The PPPO Secretariat circulates the proposed nominees and their nomination paperwork to PPPO members for endorsement
 - a. Where more than one nominee is received, PPPO members will be asked to identify their preferred candidate and the PPPO Secretariat will coordinate and act on the preferences received²
6. The PPPO Secretariat advises the PPPO members of the outcome and then works with the successful candidate to finalise and submit the required paperwork to the IPPC

¹This will require reference to the Rules of Procedure or Terms of Reference for the various fora.

²In the event the Secretariat is unable to make a determination of the preferred regional candidate (e.g., if there is one position available and two candidates receive the same number of votes, the Secretariat will defer to the PPPO ExCo for decision. Where an ExCo member is one of the nominees under consideration, they will be excluded from the discussion and decision.

*Refer to IP for way forward and recommendations.

Comments, Q&A:

- New Zealand – Mr. Thomson mentioned that this is a really good process that Australia has proposed, and it will result in a peer process where everyone will get an opportunity to be considered. He added that sometimes the timeframes for nominations are tight and requested Members to provide quick turnaround to this. He added that New Zealand supports the IP and nomination process.
- Fiji (Melanesia) – Mr. Pratap mentioned that this is an informative paper providing guidance on the nomination process and supported the IP.
- Tonga and Tuvalu (Polynesia) through Zoom chat box as well as Guam (Micronesia) (Mr. Rosaria) supported the IP.
- PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote stated that the process will greatly help SWP nomination process for candidates to various forums of the IPPC.

The IP on nomination process was endorsed by the PPPO ExCo. [Endorsement 3]

15.3 Guidance for development of Regional Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPMs) by Dr. Peterson (see Appendix ...)

The PPPO has previously drafted a standard setting process/procedure (Attachment 1), but to date it has not been widely used. The PPPO ExCo meeting held in March 2020 agreed that the standard setting

process for the PPPO be revisited.

- a. This would facilitate development of Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPMs) and Regional Implementation Guidance (RIG) to support biosecurity and safe trade outcomes for the region.
- b. Australia undertook to carry out this review of the PPPO standard setting procedure, given that:
 - i. an action had already been received by Australia from the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) to revise their standard setting process
 - ii. Australia is the Chair of the APPPC Standards Committee
 - iii. There is an opportunity to review the PPPO and APPPC standard setting procedures simultaneously to ensure that where appropriate, they are in alignment. The alignment of PPPO and APPPC processes would be beneficial given the proximity, trade linkages and dual membership of a number of PPPO and APPPC members.

Dr. Peterson briefly discussed the RSPM development process as captured in attachment 2 of this IP.

Attachments (see Appendix ...)

Attachment 1 – regional standard setting procedural guidelines for the PPPO (historical)

Attachment 2 – Draft PPPO standard setting procedure (revised)

*Refer to IP for way forward and recommendations.

Comments, Q&A:

- Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that a lot of information was attached to the IP. He added that this was a follow on from what was discussed at the last ExCo meeting and Australia has taken the lead in preparing the paper.
- SPC – Dr. Kami stressed on the need for the regional NPPOs to better understand what “call for topics” means as it is usually the bigger countries that provide topics. He stated that training and awareness around this would be beneficial for the NPPOs. Dr. Peterson responded that training is definitely needed, however, countries must understand what standards are from international and regional perspective and recently PPPO Members have worked on standards for safe aid and movement of wooden handicrafts and cultural items, and it would help if the process was adopted first; Australia is happy to support, and trials would help to revise and finalize the process.
- Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked whether Australia was suggesting some decision-making components in relation to this IP sit with the ExCo considering the PPPO Full Board meets every three years and if so, this would have to be reflected in the PPPO Constitution as well. Dr. Peterson responded that she hasn’t checked whether ExCo can play the decision-making role, but the Australian proposal (IP) is suggesting for the ExCo to assess the topic and determine whether it meets the requirements to be developed into a standard.
- New Zealand – Mr. Thomson acknowledged Australia for the IP and stated that while the PPPO ExCo will have some decision-making authority during the process, the actual act of approving or adopting the regional standard will rest with the PPPO Full Board (unless there was an unforeseen urgency to adopt a standard out of Full Board session). Dr. Peterson responded that

the ExCo would not be adopting, rather making decisions to allow the work to continue (just approving a topic for further consideration) and present this to the Full Board.

- PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Visoni “screen-shared” the PPPO constitution and clarified that the ExCo can take interim decisions, but it was agreed by the ExCo that the final decision will be taken by the Full Board.
- Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa then shed light on the Expert Working Group (EWG) and how this system will be implemented in the Pacific adding that more involvement from the Members will be good as this will be part of capacity building as well as the need to consider staff turnover. Dr. Peterson responded that the EWG will be operational for a short period of time and their purpose would be to draft specific documents and hand these over to the SC which is more likely to be affected by staff turnover. She added that the EWG will be able to function and training/mentoring new members will be useful.
- Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa suggested that the IP be adopted in principle allowing time for Members of the ExCo to read through the IP/attachments and provide comments. Once the comments have been factored into the document and agreed to by the ExCo, then the IP can be endorsed.
- PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote proposed that the Members have a look at this IP individually and then the forum comes back to this on Friday for further discussions and full endorsement.

New Zealand (Mr. Thomson) agreed to the above. Tonga (Polynesia) moved the motion to endorse the IP in principle, seconded by New Caledonia, PNG (Melanesia) and Guam (Micronesia). *The IP on guidelines for development of PPPO RSPMs was endorsed in principle by the PPPO ExCo pending review of RSPMs adoption procedure and final discussions on Friday (March 25, 2022).* Dr. Peterson reminded Members to read the attachments (especially attachment 2) that are tagged with this IP. [Endorsement in Principle 1]

16.0 PNG – Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE)

Mr. David Tenakanai, General Manager – Technical and Advisory Division and Mr. Pere Kokoa, CPPO (both of NAQIA PNG)

Papua New Guinea delegates to the meeting presented the following information paper for noting and endorsement by the PPPO ExCo:

16.1 Support for Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) for Members by Mr. Tenakanai (see Appendix ...)

The IPPC has guidelines on how NPPOs can seek funding assistance to update or conduct PCE of their countries. However, PNG proposed that SPC and PPPO are in a better position to assist countries in the Pacific to update or develop PCE tools, particularly seek funding assistance from donor countries or institutions to support this activity in the PICTs as currently the PCE remains difficult, both in terms of accessibility and affordability.

*Refer to IP for way forward and recommendations.

Comments, Q&A:

- Australia – Dr. Peterson thanked PNG for their support to the Australia and New Zealand paper to CPM-16 as well as this paper to the ExCo.
- Tonga (Polynesia), seconded by Guam (Micronesia) supported the IP through Zoom chat box followed by New Caledonia (Melanesia).

The IP on PCE was endorsed by the PPPO ExCo. [Endorsement 4]

17.0 New Zealand – Research in the Pacific and PPPO system

Ms. Karen Pugh, Manager Fresh Produce Imports and Mr. Peter Thomson, CTO (both of NZMPI)

New Zealand delegates to the meeting presented the following information paper for noting and endorsement by the PPPO ExCo:

17.1 Renewed research vision in the Pacific by Ms. Pugh (see Appendix ...)

Research to support new and improved market access is not being conducted and coordinated in the same manner as it was in the past. Importing countries continue to use science from the 1990s, which, for some, no longer provides the confidence needed to meet their appropriate level of protection (ALOP). Consequently, import approvals are being delayed, and importing countries are requiring additional measures, adding costs that exporting countries may find difficult to meet.

Without suitable support and a regional strategy:

- smaller countries are at risk of being left behind
- potential for lack of regional coordination for research
- duplication or missed opportunities for critical research
- absence of data for effective evidence-based policy making in the region

In recognition of the importance of this issue, under the EPMAP, the New Zealand MPI is:

- Collaborating with the project countries' NPPOs to establish in-country scientific forums. The forums will ensure that research capabilities are maintained and that research activities that are needed in each country are prioritised and addressed. This would set the platform in the countries to then connect with a regional research strategy once in place.
- Collaborating with the PPPO Secretariat to collate all market access-related research that has been completed in the project countries but is yet to be written and published. This will allow the reports to be finalised and presented in the in-country scientific forums and then made available to support market access negotiations and import requests.

*Refer to IP for way forward and recommendations.

Comments, Q&A:

- Fiji (Melanesia) – Mr. Pratap thanked New Zealand for the IP as well as the EPMAP and mentioned that recommendations are fully supported.
- PNG (Melanesia) – Mr. Tenakanai thanked New Zealand for the presentation and asked to look at the paper in detail. He also asked if interventions through EPMAP duplicate efforts of programs such as PHAMA Plus or these are strategically different. Ms. Pugh responded that the

first year was spent on scoping and preparing for a longer-term program and that they are coordinating with other donors in the region (such as DAWE, PHAMA Plus and PACER Plus) through frequent meetings so that MPI is working in complementarity or supplementing other efforts and not duplicating interventions. Mr. Waqa stated that a sequencing workshop will be conducted at the end of June with all the regional development partners to identify synergies and bring about a highly coordinated approach to assistance provided in the region; this is where research work will also be discussed.

- SPC – Dr. Kami stated the ExCo is purely for NPPOs whereas the regional research arm, RTMPP, partakes in the Full Board – RTMPP will also need to have the same exposure to these discussions so that the reach is beyond regional counterparts and down to national level. Mr. Waqa responded that all project countries were properly consulted including relevant agencies in the context of establishment of in-country scientific forums and they have all given their endorsement; unfortunately the RTMPP does not have an executive board (only join the PPPO Full Board meeting) – information on this IP shall be sent to the RTMPP reps before the Full Board meeting for circulation within their network and adequate preparation to participate in the PPPO Full Board meeting. Ms. Pugh stated that this will be included as part of the recommendations in the IP (No. 7 under Way Forward section of the IP).
- Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith asked which 4 countries were included in the first year to which Ms. Pugh responded Tonga, Samoa, Fiji and Vanuatu with Cook Islands to be included in the second year.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa (with support from Ms. Pugh) suggested that members take time until Friday (March 25, 2022) to read through the IP and provide comments to the Secretariat.

Fiji and PNG (Melanesia), Guam (Micronesia), Tonga (Polynesia) as well as Australia supported the endorsement of the IP in principle. Dr. Timote thanked New Zealand for the IP as well their support to the PPPO through EPMAP and addressing the gap on research and publications in the region.

The IP on renewed research vision in the Pacific was endorsed in principle by the PPPO ExCo pending inclusion of statements recognising the RTMPP and final discussions on Friday (March 25, 2022).

[Endorsement in Principle 2]

- Strengthening the PPPO system by Ms. Pugh (see Appendix ...)

Countries' needs for biosecurity and trade facilitation from the PPPO remain, and the funding provided and coordinated by the PPPO to address country needs still needs to be utilised as contracted. Responsibility and accountability are the PPPO's secretarial brand of confidence. Continuity is critical for the PPPO to continue to demonstrate this to donors, regional development partners and, most importantly, member countries.

The ExCo shall consider:

- Prioritising improving our PPPO system, including improving its adaptability and responsiveness to any changes from disruptions of pandemics, natural disasters and other events.

- Combining the PPPO system review with the MPI/MFAT-funded consultancy review of the PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework.

Improvements to the PPPO system should also consider:

- Empowering country NPPOs so that they can lead the implementation and monitoring of in-country activities in the PPPO workplan when travel is restricted.
- Providing financial support from the Secretariat to country NPPOs for the implementation of in-country activities to avoid delay. The PPPO Secretariat will still need to have oversight and provide monitoring and evaluation of activities, including the spending and utilisation of funds.

*Refer to IP for way forward and recommendations.

Comments, Q&A:

- Australia – Dr. Peterson mentioned that she was unsure what the “PPPO system” was and if the “PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework” previously existed (since the paper talks about a review) or is this something new to be drafted. Mr. Naca responded that the PPPO system refers to how priorities for the countries and the PPPO workplan is going to be delivered (in reference to SPC system) and how PPPO can support this as well as how this process can be improved (in summary, how PPPO conducts its business and then how this can be supported). The PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework (to be developed by a consultant – business case) is needed for presentation to donor partners to attract a consistent funding stream for the PPPO. Therefore, the IP is asking for endorsement from ExCo to include review of PPPO through consultancy support under the EPMAP project.
- New Zealand – Ms. Pugh asked if the PPPO has a “Business Continuity Plan” which identifies risk areas and mitigation measures (critical pieces of work to be done and how we resource them) concerning the functions and sustainability of the PPPO – is there one or are we starting from scratch? If there is one, how does PPPO Secretariat feel it’s working and where the gaps are? Dr. Visoni responded that PPPO Secretariat relies on overall SPC systems and infrastructure (for example, virtual engagements). In light of travel restrictions and need for continuous capacity building, PPPO is developing biosecurity training videos to be shared with NPPOs. He added that Member Countries always convened in Fiji for annual meetings, however, this is now at risk due to COVID and closing of borders. Mr. Waqa asked if there are documents in relation to this to which Dr. Timote mentioned that he will be able to share SPC contingency documentation.
- Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith mentioned that all NPPOs at the organization level have (or should have) some form of business continuity plan as this seems more of an organization responsibility than something that PPPO drives so we may need to examine how we handle our own business continuity to assist the PPPO (this is because we all have different organizational obligations to business continuity and different arrangements in different regions/areas of the country). Talanoa sessions have been extremely valuable, and this is something we could share with the IPPC and other regions as model. She added that it would be great to have a bit more information about what the terms of reference might be for this review of the PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework. She further stated that we consider learnings from recent times, but also look forward to what's coming in the future where food security is probably going to be a global issue. Ms. Pugh responded that she understands Australia’s viewpoints and that DFAT and MFAT were

working with SPC on a larger biosecurity strategy – this work hasn't commenced yet and is part of New Zealand's support package. Mr. Waqa added that the PPPO Strategic and Implementation Framework was discussed at the 2020 ExCo and funding was identified as a major obstacle to development of the framework and how PPPO will deliver activities captured therein. The notion was to develop a business case for consistent funding and MPI decided to include this as part of the EPMAP and to support a consultancy for this work. However, New Zealand may need to include more information on this in the IP so that it comes out clearer. He further stated that while organizations will have their own business continuity plans and learnings from past experiences, the idea is to have a PPPO system that is flexible, adoptable and able to respond to situations.

- Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith requested more time to review the IP. PNG and Fiji (Melanesia) requested the same. Ms. Pugh mentioned that New Zealand will provide more information on the scope of this IP and what it plans to achieve. [Action Item 23] Mr. Waqa acknowledged the response from New Zealand to work on the document further and requested participants to read through the IP and provide comments to the PPPO Secretariat for consideration.
- PNG – Mr. Tenakanai requested if Members could be allowed more time than reconvening discussions on the paper on Friday (March 25, 2022). Mr. Waqa requested PNG to provide comments in two weeks' time (by April 08, 2022). [Action Item 24]

The IP on Strengthening the PPPO system was deferred by the PPPO ExCo subject to review. Although Guam (Micronesia) and New Caledonia (Melanesia) were okay for Friday March 25, members were given time to provide comments – the IP will be re-discussed at the special ExCo meeting to be held at a later date (before PPPO Full Board meeting). [Deferred 1] [Action Item 25]

18.0 Open discussion

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that we will use the next 30 minutes before lunch/end of Day 02 to discuss support mechanisms within the PPPO and if there is a need to further enhance the capacity of the Secretariat Team by providing additional resources and funding. If yes, how shall this be approached? He added that having briefly gone through the PPPO workplan this morning, there is a lot of work for Dr. Timote and the Secretariat Team; how can this be supported? In addition to that, the PPPO Secretariat Team hired under the SAFE Pacific Project also need to serve project countries as well. He mentioned that we need to approach this discussion constructively and identify strengths in the secretariat and if there's room for improvement.

PNG – Mr. Tenakanai asked, in his capacity as Chair, would Mr. Waqa be able to get support for the Secretariat in terms of manpower as he feels the Secretariat Team is overworked. Mr. Waqa responded that the ExCo and PPPO Secretariat first be allowed to discuss if support is indeed needed.

Australia – Dr. Peterson reiterated that support will be provided to PPPO by Australia through a secondeed who will focus on key pieces of work such as RSPMs, but this is for a specific period and will not solve the long-term human resource capacity issues of the PPPO Secretariat.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson stated that the PPPO has been around for a long time. Other PPPOs around the world are very well resourced and provide various services and functions for their regions, however, there are others not so well resourced and unable to do much. He thanked Dr. Timote for his commitment

to the Secretariat and mentioned that there is a lot of expectations on the current team. He stated that we need to get a good handle on what are the broad functions of the PPPO Secretariat, collate activities and build a business case for long-term funding. The Secretariat role spans from communication to coordination and administrative roles which are bound to grow over time, hence, we need to get a structured understanding of these. He added that we additionally need to look at the extent of resources PPPO Secretariat draws from SPC – understanding this may help us know how much support there is and then we can determine what more should be provided to the PPPO Secretariat.

Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith supported comments from Mr. Thomson and added that we should also consider what other functions need to be supported for PPPO Secretariat to well-deliver its role of an RPPO. Mr. Thomson (in the Zoom chat box) responded that we need a secure baseline of PPPO secretariat capability, and then grow or shrink it according to the projects that are funded.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa stated that as a summary of prior discussions, we need to collate broad functions of the PPPO, saying that the PPPO Secretariat shall be given time to prepare this and present to the ExCo on Friday, March 22.

SPC – Mr. Atumurirava strongly emphasized that from a plant health perspective, PPPO is the overarching body for biosecurity and plant health work as well as coordination in the region – all the work of these teams at SPC are aligned to the workplan of PPPO. He added that, in view of the aforementioned, this needs to be recognized in LRD at the strategic level, also in terms of allocation of resources. Currently work of the PPPO Secretariat is supported through project-based funding, hence there will always be gaps in the PPPO workplan as seen over the last 5-10 years. He supported a review of the PPPO workplan (biosecurity and plant health work) as well as the bigger picture of having consistent funding. Mr. Waqa mentioned that in the past, SPC used to have thematic teams and it was easier to see from outside how biosecurity SPS and plant health work fitted into the PPPO workplan adding that comments from Mr. Atumurirava were well taken onboard.

PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote iterated the same and provided an example that his role as well that of Mr. Gosai are fully paid by the SAFE Pacific project, therefore, the commitment is shared. He stated that the current modus operandi is to look at the PPPO workplan/country priorities and try to marry this with various SPC projects (tag projects or components of projects into the PPPO workplan).

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa expressed concern at the current status and division of roles between the projects and PPPO Secretariat function giving an example of the situation whereby Dr. Timote may need to travel for project activities to a remote location with limited to no internet access – who will then man the Secretariat and perform communication and coordination role for that time frame. He then again requested Dr. Timote to provide a short PowerPoint presentation on Friday, March 25 (Day 04) on broad functions of the PPPO, core activities, support from SPC through LRD and for the ExCo to have more discussions based on this.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson agreed on this and stated that this looks like a study for which a small TOR may need to be developed as ultimately it will need to result in a decision to seek funding support for a more sustainable PPPO (rather than stealing project time to perform PPPO Secretariat role). Dr. Timote mentioned that he could also share what the Secretariat role entails as provided in the PPPO Constitution.

Guam (Micronesia) – Mr. Rosario mentioned that he is content with the discussions and can see direction and purpose in how the meeting was progressing. No comments and all good from Melanesia (PNG, Fiji) and Polynesia (Tonga, Tuvalu).

Mr. Waqa then quickly recapped discussions and highlighted agenda items for Day 03 and 04. He thanked all Member Countries once again for their participation. Mr. Atumurirava closed off the second day with a word of prayer.

Lunch and end of Day 02 at 2.00 pm Fiji Time.

Day 03 – Thursday, March 24

19.0 The Pacific Community (SPC)/Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) Secretariat Team opened the virtual link at 09.00 am Fiji Time.

20.0 Meeting started at 10.00 am Fiji Time. Mr. Waqa welcomed all participants to Day 03 of the ExCo and after which Mr. Thomson said a word of prayer.

Mr. Waqa acknowledged presence of representatives from all the three sub-regions and delegations from Australia, New Zealand and Tonga as well as the SPC/PPPO Secretariat Team. Dr. Timote then requested all speakers to send their PowerPoint presentations to the PPPO Secretariat for inclusion in the meeting report.

Mr. Waqa then invited Mr. Dakaica to provide an overview and progress on the regional ePhyto project while acknowledging the contributions of Dr. Peter Neimanis (DAWE) in coordinating this work for the region.

21.0 Overview and update on the regional ePhyto program (see Appendix...)

Mr. Ilaisa Dakaica, Regional ePhyto Project Coordinator at SPC-LRD

Mr. Dakaica firstly provided a background on ePhyto work in the region; it was in the 2019 IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop where PICTs agreed on the implementation of ePhyto/GeNS. The “*Regional ePhyto Implementation Plan 2020-2022*” was also developed in 2019. He then discussed the purpose and objectives of the ePhyto Project and provided an explanation of the implementation plan consisting of 4 key areas: GeNS UAT registration, training, training register and testing phase. Mr. Dakaica also highlighted that the COVID19 global pandemic affected many activities, and the implementation plan was tweaked to reflect the same. He acknowledged cooperation from New Zealand, Fiji and Samoa for assistance in the initial set-up and all testing phases. The ePhyto Working Group agreed to introduce 6 PICs to GeNS in each year of the project. Cook Islands, Marshall Islands and Tonga were the first new countries to be brought onboard into GeNS. Palau, PNG and Tuvalu are in the training and testing phase to build confidence in using GeNS. Nauru, Kiribati, Tokelau, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Niue are now registered and will begin GeNS training and testing in 2022.

Mr. Dakaica also discussed the adoptive approach developed for the countries to assist in the transition from testing to full GeNS (production) use. He advised that the PPPO Regional ePhyto Workshop is planned for June 2022 and to be held in Nadi, Fiji – this is expected to be a face-to-face event which will allow greater interaction and hands-on training for participants. He further discussed recent GeNS

developments (enhancements and fixes by United Nations International Computing Centre, UNICC) and also informed the PPPO ExCo that there is work underway in developing a French version of GeNS. In conclusion, Mr. Dakaica acknowledged Australia DAWE as well as NZ MPI funding towards the project.

Comments, Q&A:

- A. PNG – Mr. Tenakanai thanked Mr. Dakaica for the presentation and asked if the GeNS is a stand-alone site or dependent on the NPPO's website to function (based on the fact that PNG NPPO does not have its own website) which NAQIA IT specialists are working towards including online payment functionality. Mr. Dakaica responded that GeNS is a web-based system developed by UNICC and not dependent on the NPPO website; it only requires internet connection to function. He is aware that PNG wants to integrate their own national system with GeNS, and this is work in progress.
- B. Tonga – Ms. Tupou thanked the ePhyto Team, acknowledged Australia and New Zealand assistance and asked if the training in June to be held in Fiji will be a train-the-trainers (TOT) format. Mr. Dakaica responded that yes, the ePhyto Team will use the TOT approach whereby key personnel from the NPPOs will be invited for the training.
- C. New Caledonia – Ms. Chan stated that she could not see the support to be provided to French Territories and was also not able to fully understand parts of the presentation as it was delivered in English. Mr. Dakaica responded that UNICC is working on a French version of the GeNS for use by French speaking countries which will be deployed soon.
- D. Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa appreciated that the implementation plan was adjusted during peak COVID which has allowed the ePhyto project to continue to deliver on its objectives.
- E. New Zealand – Mr. Thomson thanked Mr. Dakaica for the progress made so far noting he started in the role during a global pandemic. He mentioned that the implementation plan looks good in bringing countries on board (to GeNS), however, he would like to share a point to note (a small step) before going into full production/exchange – New Zealand would like to go into an agreement with countries on what will happen if GeNS goes offline (is down) – what will be the backup system or contingency plan for receiving and sending certificates? Will this be as simple as being able to email the certificate to relevant NPPO contact point or something else? [Action Item 26]
- F. Tonga – Ms. Tupou asked about the accessibility to country data contained in GeNS, for example, data for annual report? Mr. Dakaica responded that GeNS has an inbuilt reporting functionality where such data can be extracted from.

Australia moved the motion to endorse the presentation/report. This was seconded by Melanesia (PNG and New Caledonia) and Micronesia (Kiribati). *The PPPO ExCO endorsed the presentation and update provided for the regional ePhyto project.* The PPPO ExCO acknowledged the project progress with a round of applause. [Endorsement 5]

22.0 Overview and update on the Pest List Database (PLD) Upgrade (see Appendix...)

Ms. Carol Quashie Williams, DAWE Australia and Dr. Visoni Timote, PPPO Secretary and IPA-BSPS at SPC LRD

Ms. Williams firstly provided an overview of the Pacific Biosecurity Partnerships Program (PBPP) and countries that are receiving assistance through the PBPP. There are seven (7) projects under this program from which Ms. Williams heads the “Pacific Islands Pest List Database” (PIPLD) project and assists with “Pacific Trade and Market Access Support” project. She shared information on the original PIPLD that was built in 2003, and the frontend upgrades undertaken in 2021. She added that the PIPLD now requires extensive backend upgrades. She also shared PLD benefits, and the importance of pest lists from national reporting obligation (NRO) and surveillance perspectives. Ms. Williams then highlighted the present PLD IT system and the current information which is accessible through the database (including comparative pest reports) as well as different pests covered (fungi, viruses, bacteria, nematodes, insects, weeds, gastropods, rodents, birds, etc.).

Ms. Williams then updated the forum on the four options that were being explored for development of a new database which will use an app-based technology such as Kobo Toolbox for field data collection and input into the database. From these, option 4 is preferred by all countries (central SPC cloud-based system connected to national systems that are upgraded by country administrators). She also emphasised on the PLD consultations undertaken with countries so far including the three sub-regional meetings (Melanesia, Polynesia and Micronesia) plus unique requests from each of these meetings.

- Melanesia: requested priority or economic pest alert/notification; link to relevant pest sites; link to pest images; link to fact sheets
- Polynesia = link to or inclusion of Australia and New Zealand pest records; links to pest location; single point of failure (staff issue); future proofing/data system
- Micronesia = link to relevant website; trainings (to be SPC led); add conveyances/hitchhiker pests; add marine pests; add environmental pests

Dr. Timote then talked about the SPC procurement process which is being employed to hire an IT consultancy firm for the PLD upgrade. Ms. Williams then proceeded to discuss the database sustainability requirements which range from lack of good internet connection to transferring data entries into the database when back in office, natural disasters affecting various infrastructure, lack of funding, constant staff turnover, technical issues, data not being backed up and not receiving response from the app service desk when needed. She ended the presentation by sharing next steps for the upgrade which include selection of IT company through SPC RFQ process and completion of upgrade by mid to late 2022.

Comments, Q&A:

- A. Tonga – Ms. Tupou acknowledged the Australian Government’s funding and assistance with the PLD upgrade. She asked if there will be trainings on the new PLD considering the presentation also mentioned about staff turnover. Ms. Williams responded that once the system is upgraded, then trainings will also be provided. Mr. Timote confirmed that training and capacity building for country PLD administrators will take place after the upgrade and is being looked at for execution in the next (DAWE) financial year.
- B. SPC – Dr. Kami asked about a parallel database which Australia is setting up and is similar to the PIPLD. Ms. Williams asked if Dr. Kami was talking about the Australian Plant Pest Database (APPD). Dr. Kami responded with a yes and mentioned that PICs would also like to see pest data on commodities they trade with Australia. Ms. Williams mentioned that this is still work in progress; APPD is being updated and this is not as advanced as the PIPLD upgrade. Dr. Peterson added that Dr. Kami may be referring to the “Australian Pest and Disease Repository” (APDR)

which is an external database and work on this is again not as advanced as the PIPLD – she would be happy to follow up on this and provide an update as well as the scope of this database in the coming week through the PPPO Secretariat. **Action Item 27**

- C. New Zealand – Mr. Thomson thanked Ms. Williams and the PPPO Secretariat Team for the work done on the database upgrade so far. He mentioned that we saw specific requests in relation to the upgrade from the three sub-regions and asked how these requests were being prioritised and/or factored into the PLD upgrade or there is agreement that all requests will be taken on-board? Ms. Williams mentioned that addition of environmental pest and hitchhikers will not be an issue; ability to include links to pest alerts and other databases (pest lists and images) will be discussed with the selected IT firm as this is included in the TOR and the IT company will be best positioned to advice on this – there were not many additional features requested than what was already in the scope.
- D. New Caledonia – Ms. Chan asked if recording of non-compliances and interceptions will be possible in the upgraded database, or will this only be for pest information (pest presence) in a country? Dr. Timote responded that the ability of the PLD to provide an alert when there is an incursion is being explored. Ms. Williams mentioned that interception data can be included, however, what gets published will depend on what a country wants to share as each country does have a sovereign right to decide what they want shown/accessible on the database. Further, the plan is to complete the database upgrade first and then explore having it in other languages.
- E. Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa thanked Ms. Williams and the SPC team for significant uplift of the PLD from what it was some years ago and asked if there is potential for the PIPLD to house a website for the PPPO. Ms. Williams responded that the IPPC on its website has a link to the old PLD hence there should be no issue in having a link for the new PLD on the PPPO website.
- F. Australia – Dr. Smith asked if there were any plans in progress for long term sustainability, maintenance and funding of the PLD after the upgrade – is there something SPC is considering in their overall database management and planning? Dr. Timote responded that Ms. Ana Tunabuna-Buli was the Regional PLD Coordinator who has now fallen ill, and another colleague has filled in to assist with PLD work, hence this will ensure sustainability. Ms. Williams added that future proofing the PLD did come up in the Polynesian sub-regional meeting and the plan is to host this on the SPC server/cloud which will see that SPC IT is responsible for maintenance of the database (in a “business as usual” way). Dr. Timote added that inclusion of the SPC IT Team from the beginning is helpful in this regard whereas Mr. Rovaroivaivalu Waqanivalu is assisting from LRD’s end. Mr. Waqa further probed on the funding and HR capacity for PLD to which Dr. Timote responded that Mr. Waqanivalu is being trained to take over Ms. Tunabuna-Buli’s role. Ms. Williams added that the thinking was for the Regional PLD Administrator to be funded under the PPPO to which Dr. Timote agreed, however, added that PPPO does not have funding for this. He updated the forum that Mr. Waqanivalu is assisting via his employment in the PARC Project. Dr. Ero (PARC Project Manager) mentioned that Mr. Waqanivalu is hired until the end of 2023 and there should be consideration for additional funding for the PLD Coordinator role once Mr. Waqanivalu’s contract expires.
- G. Australia – Dr. Smith mentioned that this extra discussion is helpful and is something for the PPPO ExCo to keep an eye on. Mr. Waqa agreed and stated that this should guide us towards

seeking funds to continue to support this important work including ensuring sustainability of the project/PIPLD. [Action Item 28]

Mr. Waqa stated that this project started after the last PPPO ExCo meeting hence there is a need for the ExCo to endorse the project as well as the update provided to the forum. Melanesia (PNG) moved the motion to endorse the project and the update. This was seconded by Polynesia (Tonga) and Micronesia (Kiribati), both through Zoom chat box. The PPPO ExCo endorsed the PIPLD upgrade and project update; this was acknowledged with a round of applause. [Endorsement 6]

Group Photo and Break for ten (10) minutes.

23.0 Overview on the Enhanced Pacific Market Access Partnership (EPMAP) Programme – Session 1 (see Appendix...)

Ms. Karen Pugh, NZMPI

Ms. Pugh provided a recap of the project highlighting that the EPMAP aligns with New Zealand's Pacific Reset Strategy – this is now called MPI-Pacific Systems Alignment. EPMAP commenced in 2019-2020 and is an MPI/MFAT partnership through MFAT funding. The activities are to be delivered by Biosecurity New Zealand. The program has market access and biosecurity components and is in the first (or inception) year as there were significant delays due to COVID. In December 2021, after submission of a business case, MFAT announced funding for a further 4 years. EPMAP is aimed at strengthening the Biosecurity agencies (NPPOs) in Fiji, Samoa, Tonga, Vanuatu and Cook Islands to facilitate the effective management of their export assurance system.

Ms. Pugh shared 5 outputs of the 5-year project which include:

- A. Establishing a holistic system to facilitate the development, management, monitoring and evaluation of export systems including export plans
- B. Review of the Phytosanitary Certification Systems (PCS) and Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) of selected countries
- C. Establishing a robust e-operational and GIS information database system for export facilitation
- D. Rolling out of ePhyto in line with the PPPO Regional ePhyto Implementation Plan 2020-2022
- E. Providing MPI annual subscription to PPPO based on proposals and costed workplans

Ms. Pugh stated that while the project is being rolled out in five countries, there will be benefits extending to other PICs as well. She then shared the expected short-, medium- and long-term outcomes from the project. She iterated the importance of keeping connected and discussing what assistance is being provided so that we are not duplicating efforts in the region, rather complementing or supplementing each other's work. Ms. Pugh stated that the overall purpose of the project is aimed at empowerment and strengthened bilateral partnerships through a coordinated approach. This will in turn:

- A. Enhance confidence of trading partners in Pacific biosecurity systems to increase trade opportunities for Pacific countries
- B. Establish systems in PICs to allow continuous trade and access to additional opportunities
- C. Remove inconsistencies in the operation and management of biosecurity systems
- D. Improve capacity to maintain existing systems including adequate infrastructure for core functions and coordination across value chain participants
- E. Reduce country reliance on external stakeholders to address issues within phytosanitary system

She also shared the project's key implementation principles which includes agile project management and ownership of project deliverables and milestones by countries. Ms. Pugh then showed the implementation plan for Year 1 (the inception year plus extension) for Fiji, Samoa, Vanuatu and Tonga. Two of the milestones for this phase are setting up of Governance, Drafting, Technical and Audit Teams and that the first export plan by each country is completed and signed off by June 2022 following the application of Market – Farm – Market (MFM) model.

Ms. Pugh also provided a brief overview of the implementation plan for Year 2 onwards and added that “Technical Implementation Teams” will be set up per country to be guided by a term of reference (TOR) and assisted by the PPPO Secretariat. She then shared what the functions of the Technical Implementation Teams will be and how the governance structure will work including the audit components. She also presented a graphical illustration of the EPMAP to provide a high-level overview and discuss elements that will be functioning in New Zealand, at the assisted country level and coordination with regional development partners.

Ms. Pugh then discussed the MFM model which is an important guiding mechanism for the support to be provided through EPMAP. MFM captures the whole supply chain framework and provides a coordinated holistic management approach. This will consist of 3 components – market watch system (in New Zealand to track market behaviour, demand, pricing and inform supply chain actors); market to the farm (houses the market watch system to provide information to exporters and growers); farm to the market (looks at biosecurity and phytosanitary aspects). She then shared progress update for all outputs and remaining activities in the inception year. At this stage, Ms. Pugh introduced the new Pacific Team (HITPAC) established within the MPI that will be responsible for the EPMAP and mentioned that the EPMAP will have a Project Manager based in Wellington and Project Coordinator based in SPC-Suva.

Comments, Q&A:

- A. Australia – Dr. Peterson asked if they could have a copy of the presentation. Ms. Pugh agreed and mentioned that the presentation will be shared with all ExCo participants.
- B. Tonga – Ms. Tupou thanked MPI for this important project and mentioned that this has already helped to lift the suspension on the watermelon pathway to New Zealand. She also acknowledged Australia and PHAMA Plus for this support. Ms. Pugh responded that she has enjoyed working with the Tongan colleagues.
- C. SPC – Dr. Kami thanked Ms. Pugh for the presentation and MPI/MFAT for the funding and assistance with project implementation. He stated that currently market access for commodities that are not exported in high volumes exist and he hoped that through the project new access for high value and highly available commodities (or new commodities) will increase. He said that he understands the concern on the public relations side (since there is a media component to the project), hence it is important that new markets indeed open, especially now that we have a multilateral trade agreement through PACER Plus, and there should be significant progressive results. He added that in regard to streamlining treatments, fruit fly infestation remains a major issue and we seem not to be addressing this – Fiji is the only country successfully using HTFA treatment without hiccups. We should be looking at how to support alternative treatments for high value commodities. Ms. Pugh responded that she understood the position of NPPOs in terms of trade and highlighted that MPI teams are also expected to do more things faster – New Zealand exports to 37 countries and there are new requests always coming in. However, processes are

being streamlined and expedited, for example, the move from “commodity-based standards” to “country-commodity standards”. The latter is tailored to country requests, and for example, there are now 37 import health standards (IHSs) for citrus from 13 different countries; NZMPI is also looking at new commodities of priority to the region such as pineapple, which is next on the list. She added that the MFM model and market research components will help identify priority pathways to work on.

Ms. Pugh also suggested regional coordination for identifying which commodities should be on the priority list to develop standards for and recognized that lack of treatment facilities for fruit fly is a problem in the region and PPPO Members need to look at how we're going to attempt to solve this. These will be looked at over the next four years, which is MPI's holistic approach in trying to solve such issues which are on the radar for which solutions do not exist yet, adding that that we've set up a good foundation for conversations, forums and players that can come in and help, and we can draw on their expertise and funding to help find the solutions that we need for the region.

- D. PNG – Mr. Tanekanai also requested for a copy of the presentation to which Ms. Pugh agreed. Mr. Tanekanai also asked if diagnostics trainings will be included. Ms. Pugh responded that the EPMAP is tailored more towards addressing export systems and market access, however, the components being handled by Dr. Kumaringhe's team will have this included.
- E. New Caledonia – Ms. Chan thanked Ms. Pugh for the presentation and requested for a copy of the slides as well. She added that the presentation shared new views and particulars and hoped to learn from the new systems; in terms of holistic approach, she asked if MPI could have common Pacific-wide interventions or projects because the issues are similar. Ms. Pugh responded that MPI will be working with countries not part of the EPMAP project on the side lines and this will be shared through platforms such as the Talanoa Sessions and hoped there will be benefits for other countries to come out of the EPMAP.
- F. PPPO Secretary – Dr. Visoni thanked MPI and acknowledged New Zealand Government's support for the EPMAP project as well as funding for the PPPO work plan through the GFA. Ms. Pugh appreciated the remarks and mentioned that she looked forward to working with the PPPO Secretariat.

Melanesia (PNG, Fiji and New Caledonia) mentioned that they support the project and endorse the presentation. Polynesia (Tonga) and Micronesia (Guam with Kiribati and Marshall Islands providing comments through Zoom chat box), Australia as well as PPPO Secretariat seconded. The PPPO ExCo endorsed the EPMAP project and acknowledged this work with a round of applause. [\[Endorsement 7\]](#)

24.0 Overview on the Enhanced Pacific Market Access Partnership (EPMAP) Programme – Session 2 (see Appendix...)

Dr. Lalith Kumarasinghe, NZMPI

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa updated that Dr. Kumarasinghe and Team were not available to provide this presentation due to prior commitments and another time slot will be allocated for them, or a copy of the presentation will be circulated to the ExCo through the PPPO Secretariat.

25.0 Overview of FAO areas of collaboration for the region (see Appendix...)

Mr. Tevita Keresoma, FAO Regional Office

Mr. Keresoma provided an overview of FAO key areas of work in the region. These are country demand driven and include biosecurity, pesticide risk reduction and integrated pest management and good agricultural practices (GAPs) to increase and protect biodiversity and preserve ecosystem services.

Under biosecurity, assistance is being provided in the revision and updating of biosecurity legislations in line with international agreements, standards and obligations (IPPC, OIE and WTO SPS) – there are two active projects in Kiribati and Fiji. Secondly, there is ongoing work in the area of climate change and transboundary pests – a new project (TCP/SAP/3704) is under development with SPC which will be implemented in Fiji, Samoa and Tonga. Initially Solomon Islands was included, however they withdrew providing opportunity for Tonga to join.

Under the pesticide risk reduction thematic area, a regional project (TCP/SAP/3803) targeting Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu is being finalized with SPC. The project will promote ecologically based alternatives to highly hazardous pesticides including biological control to enhance food security and safety in the region with key aspects being implementation of FAO/WHO International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management and revision of pesticide legislation and regulations to align with the FAO/WHO code and its guidelines. Moreover, work on the integrated pest management of coconut rhinoceros beetle (CRB) is ongoing in partnership with SPC and research organizations. A national project is being implemented in Samoa (TCP/SAM/3801) in this respect with assistance to be provided to Vanuatu as well through SOPs and Inspection Procedures to deal with CRD outbreak on Efate Island. Another project (TCP/SAP/3809) is in development to assist in the prevention, detection and management of fall armyworm (FAW) infestation in Solomon Islands and neighbouring PICs. Mr. Keresoma also highlighted the ACP MEA project (Capacity Building on Multilateral Environmental Agreement in African, Caribbean and Pacific Countries) which is being implemented in collaboration with SPC and SPREP.

Comments, Q&A:

- A. SPC – Dr. Kami thanked Mr. Keresoma for the presentation and mentioned that an area of concern is that there are signs of overlap in the regional programs, and it is important to coordinate in this respect so as to allocate our resources effectively and this is something that we as regional agencies need to be aware of in planning our work and moving forward. Mr. Keresoma responded that this is a valid point and is something that FAO is also looking into, and FAO is of the view to strengthen communication with regional partners in this respect – FAO will be inviting regional partners for meetings in this regard.
- B. Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa questioned how the above could be addressed so that overlaps do not repeat in future projects and asked if it was possible to address this through the monthly coordination meetings. Mr. Keresoma stated that these are internal coordination meetings for the FAO regional team, however, they can always consider meeting with external partners. Mr. Waqa requested that the SPC Team have regular meetings with FAO, with the first meeting in the coming weeks to have this discussion. [Action Item 29]
- C. Australia – Dr. Peterson suggested we invite FAO to make presentations (provide updates on matters of interest or projects) at the PPPO Talanoa Sessions. Mr. Keresoma mentioned that this

is possible and will be taking this up/discussing with upper-level management. Mr. Waqa requested PPPO Secretariat to invite FAO representative to future Talanoa Sessions so as to get the coordination started to which Dr. Timote agreed. **Action Item 30**

- D. PNG – Mr. Tanekanai asked if there is an avenue for assisting PICs with disposal of hazardous wastes and chemicals that have been stored over a very long period of time. Mr. Keresoma mentioned that this is more in line with the work SPREP is doing and he would be happy to relay this to SPREP for follow up with PNG and provide support. Mr. Tanakenai acknowledged this.
- E. Guam – Mr. Rosario supported the proposal from PNG and as Guam's assistance to the region's bee health offered any assistance that maybe required including provision of pest data.
- F. PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote thanked FAO for the ongoing collaboration with PPPO and SPC and in particular for the work on LOA and GCF funding proposal. He mentioned that PPPO Secretariat will share the first consultancy report with ExCo members for review and comments. [Already captured as Action Item 20]
- G. Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa requested that FAO/PPPO present on their coordination meeting (provide an update) at the next PPPO Talanoa Session planned for April or May 2022.

Melanesia (Fiji), Polynesia (Tuvalu through Zoom chat box) and Micronesia (Kiribati) moved the motion to endorse the update. New Zealand and Australia seconded. The PPPO ExCo endorsed the FAO update and acknowledged FAO's work in the region with a round of applause. **Endorsement 8**

Mr. Waqa then welcomed Dr. Chris Dale (DFAT Australia) for his presentation and thanked him for the support he has always provided to the region as well as representing the region at various IPPC forums.

26.0 FAW TWG, Surveillance and Pests of Concern to the PPPO Region (see Appendix...)

Dr. Chris Dale, DFAT Australia

*Dr. Dale was not able to share his presentation during the session and sent across a PDF later

Dr. Dale mentioned that it was good to be back into a PPPO forum as he has recently changed roles, however, he is always looking forward to complement DAWEs work in the region in collaboration with the PPPO Secretariat and partners across MFAT and MPI. He spoke of his recent duty travel to PNG and work with NAQIA. Dr. Dale spoke at length on the work of the regional TWG on FAW as well as progress and opportunities around that TWG aligned with work of the FAO and IPPC TWG. He stated that FAW as well as African Swine Fever (ASF) are two critical issues of interest, especially with FAW outbreak in Solomon Islands last year and DFAT/DAWE have been working closely with Biosecurity Solomon Islands in mounting a response – FAW poses significant issues for our region and this is the catalyst and motivation for the regional TWG, recognizing that similar TWGs exist in other regions for this same pest. He added that FAW remains a priority for PPPO, other regions as well as the IPPC and it is important that we work collaboratively in responding to this higher-level prioritization. Dr. Dale also shared preparedness, prevention and response efforts against FAW from an Australian perspective and mentioned that there is a lot we can draw on from the PNG, Solomon Islands and New Caledonia experience. He also discussed the range of resources available in this space (Australia FAW Continuity Plan, Surveillance Manual, Tracking Menu, etc.) and the importance of regional partnerships.

Dr. Dale highlighted APPPC's successful Action Plan on FAW which he has been involved in for a number of years and stated that this a useful practical reference for the region as well as resources from USDA and their programs around IPM. He additionally stated that PHAMA Plus did an extensive social and economic impact study on FAW incursion in PICs and that is a really useful document and report to draw on. At the global level, FAW is a big priority for FAO, it is supporting work of the "Global Action on FAW Control" through TWGs and also from coordination and implementation perspective with leadership and direction provided by FAO Director General – Dr. Dale mentioned that this really highlights the importance and priority FAO is placing on FAW adding that this global action is a model for dealing with other pests of concern. The regional TWG will focus on drawing from these global/FAO resources and the existing work instead of duplicating effort.

At the global level, the TWG has coordinated and delivered a number of really valuable and useful resources over the past two and a half years including the "Prevention, Preparedness and Response Guidelines on FAW" focussing on the role of the NPPO and this can be used as an example for other pest and disease outbreaks in the region. Dr. Dale highlighted that the global TWG has representation from the PPPO, Near East Plant Protection Organization (NEPPO) as well as the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization (EPPO). Other key achievements include the FAO IPPC FAW website housing all resources and materials and the series of webinars/workshops on FAW. The regional TWG aims to produce preparedness and response communications with focus on long-term management including resources for early warning and early detection for countries that do not have FAW yet. He encouraged countries to review resources around surveillance developed at a national level elsewhere or by other RPPOs and CABI (Centre for Agriculture and Bioscience International) as there may be learnings in these resources for the region.

Dr. Dale stressed that it will be important for the regional TWG to ensure that new sightings/incursions are reported through the IPPC pest report bulletin and NRO including internal regional alert and communications systems as this will be critical for preparedness and stepping up pre-border/border activities as well as emergency responses where required. He added that it also important that range extensions are also reported. He summarized the priorities for the regional TWG which include prevention of FAW incursions, providing support for FAW preparedness, ensuring regular reporting and alerts, coordinating FAW information into a consolidated database or repository (could even be part of the PLD), developing regional surveillance and diagnostics protocols for FAW (including endorsement of these in the region considering limited technical capacity and capabilities in some countries) and providing access to FAW risk assessments, producing awareness and communication resources, facilitating networking and collaboration opportunities (with ASEAN, CSIRO, PHAMA Plus) as well as organising and delivering regional workshops, webinars and field trainings on FAW.

Comments, Q&A:

- A. Australia – Dr. Smith asked if Dr. Dale mentioned guava as one of the affected tree species in PNG in his presentation. Dr. Dale confirmed that he did as this was reported from the community level, and he could observe obvious damage symptoms, however, did not actually see any FAW larvae and that he will follow up on this with NAQIA colleagues. Dr. Smith added that this is worrying since guava is in the Myrtaceae family and whether it was possible to distinguish between FAW primary and spill-over damage to secondary hosts. Dr. Dale responded that Mr. Kokoa and Mr. Tanekanai from NAQIA would be in a better position to comment on the PNG situation, however, damage symptoms of interest were observed in PNG communities during his

visit. There was little to no damage on corn, however, maize was significantly impacted – similar to the situation in Southeast Asia.

- B. PNG – Mr. Tanekanai asked if there is opportunity for biological control of FAW (some natural enemies other countries use for FAW control originate from PNG). Although PHAMA Plus (DFAT funding) is coming to the end of its financial year, can biological control also be supported so that after successful trials PNG can assist other PICs? Dr. Dale responded that a lot of current interventions are focussed on IPM including biological control and DFAT is already funding some of this work through PHAMA Plus; there are good opportunities to draw on those technical learnings. An USDA expert is being eyed to assist with this in the PNG environment hence, there is good prospect for NARI, NAQIA, PHAMA Plus and CSIRO collaboration – this will benefit the region and be part of the work of the PPPO TWG on FAW.
- C. Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked about the progress of response to the FAW incursion in Solomon Islands. Dr. Dale stated that he would not want to speak on behalf of Biosecurity Solomon Islands but updated that there have been a lot of efforts around response and extensive delimiting surveys to establish provincial distribution data with this work supported by PHAMA Plus and Solomon Islands Biosecurity Development Program as well as colleagues from Dr. Peterson's Team at DAWE. He added that Vanuatu was at high risk of FAW incursion and detection surveys are already being undertaken in islands close to the Solomons.
- D. Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked what could be the potential pathway and next country or countries FAW can make its way to? What can the PPPO ExCo do to prepare? Dr. Dale stated that his first recommendation to Vanuatu, New Caledonia and Fiji would be to closely follow FAO/IPPC guide on FAW – this manual provides a step-by-step guide to NPPOs and there are lots of links and references that could be really useful. He added that there are other resources on the IPPC website as well. His second recommendation was for PPPO Members to refer to and learn from the work done by other countries such as Australia, PNG and Solomon Islands as well as regional development corporations. Thirdly, he stated that there is opportunity to draw on the technical expertise in preparedness work done by Fiji, New Zealand and Australia as well as by agencies such as CSIRO and the regional TWG could really be helpful in this regard.
- E. PPPO Secretariat – Dr. Timote thanked Dr. Dale on behalf of the PPPO for his time today and that he looked forward to working with him and the Team in the regional TWG.

Melanesia (PNG), Polynesia (Tonga) and Micronesia (Guam) all supported work in progress concerning FAW. Australia and New Zealand seconded. The PPPO ExCo endorsed the FAW TWG update and acknowledged Dr. Dale's work in this space with a round of applause. [\[Endorsement 9\]](#)

Mr. Waqa wrapped up the day's proceedings with acknowledging all the presenters as well as the participants for their attendance and contributions to the meeting. Mr. Tanekanai closed off the third day with a word of prayer.

Lunch and end of Day 03 at 2.10 pm Fiji Time.

Day 04 – Friday, March 25

27.0 The Pacific Community (SPC)/Pacific Plant Protection Organization (PPPO) Secretariat Team opened the virtual link at 09.00 am Fiji Time.

28.0 Meeting started at 10.15 am Fiji Time. Mr. Waqa welcomed all participants to Day 04 of the PPPO ExCo and Mr. Atumurirava commenced the day's proceedings with a word of prayer.

Mr. Waqa acknowledged presence of representatives from all the three sub-regions, especially host country Fiji and delegations from Australia, New Zealand and Tonga as well as the SPC/PPPO Secretariat Team and delegate from FAO.

Dr. Timote thanked all presenters from the past 3 days for sending through their presentations and papers for inclusion in the meeting report.

Mr. Waqa asked if any of the participants would like to ask questions or have comments for any of the previous days. There were no questions or comments. Mr. Waqa then mentioned that the PPPO ExCo will re-visit the papers presented by Australia and New Zealand that were endorsed in principle on Day 2 (to be presented again in the first session today) before we move onto presentation of papers from the PPPO Secretariat and discuss other issues.

29.0 Second presentation of Australian Information Paper on Regional Standard Setting Process Dr. Sophie Peterson, DAWE Australia

Dr. Timote mentioned that no questions or comments were received in relation to the paper. Mr. Waqa highlighted the two issues that were discussed on Day 02: approval process and decision making by the PPPO ExCo.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa highlighted concerns raised when the paper was first represented – the forum picked up the notion that the PPPO ExCo will have authority to make decisions on the regional standards and proposed that this should rest with the PPPO Full Board.

Australia – Dr. Peterson explained the revisions and clarified that the PPPO ExCo will not be making any final decisions on the regional standards, rather only allowing operations of the standard setting process to continue between important dates – the PPPO ExCo will receive submissions and say yes or no to proceed with drafting a standard (allows business of the PPPO to continue between Full Board meetings). She added that the decision-making power will sit with the PPPO Full Board in the adoption of regional standards, and this is in line with the PPPO Constitution and role of the PPPO ExCo.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson mentioned that New Zealand have had a look at the proposed procedures and are happy with this. New Zealand is content that the PPPO ExCo will have the opportunity to review the standards and other documents whereas the Full Board will make final decisions and adoptions. No further concerns or comments.

Tonga – Ms. Tupou mentioned that she agrees with what has now been put forward – Dr. Peterson has clarified that the revised statements in the standard setting procedure are now better aligned with IPPC decision making processes and Tonga endorses.

New Caledonia – Ms. Chan mentioned that the procedures are now clear; this simplifies submission of topics and endorsed the paper.

Fiji (Melanesia) and Kiribati (Micronesia) also supported the paper. *The IP on regional standard setting process was endorsed by the PPPO ExCo.* [Endorsement 10]

30.0 Second presentation of the New Zealand Information Paper on Renewed research vision in the Pacific. Ms. Karen Pugh, NZMPI

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa stated that PPPO ExCo had requested acknowledgment of the RTMPP in the information paper (in recognition of the RTMPP as a body of researchers in the region, however, taking note that they are not as well established as the PPPO). He added that in PPPO Full Board meetings, the Head of Research for every member country is also invited alongside the Head of NPPO. The Head of Research have side meetings where they discuss how science and academia could support biosecurity and trade priorities or safe trade in the region.

New Zealand – Ms. Pugh mentioned that a paragraph was added to the information paper recognizing the existence of the RTMPP, their role and importance of securing their endorsement as a crucial step in ensuring a strong regional commitment to the proposal in the paper New Zealand presented as well as its implementation. The information paper recommends that the PPPO Secretariat brief and consult the RTMPP, through their chairperson, on the contents of this paper before the next PPPO Full Board.

Melanesia (New Caledonia and Fiji), Polynesia (Tonga) and Micronesia (Kiribati) supported the revision. *The IP on renewed research vision in the Pacific was endorsed by the PPPO ExCo.* [Endorsement 11]

The information paper on strengthening the PPPO system will be further worked on by NZMPI and re-submitted to the PPPO ExCo for consideration. [Re-submission 1]

31.0 Secretariat Information Papers Brief PPPO Secretariat Team

31.1 Information paper on legislation options provided by FAO (see Appendix ...)

Dr. Visoni Timote, PPPO Secretary and IPA-BSPS at SPC LRD

Dr. Timote highlighted that FAO provides the option of stand-alone acts for Plant Protection and Animal Health/Animal Disease Control plus there can be another separate act for biosecurity including invasive species and/or food safety. The paper acknowledged that separate bills may work for bigger countries that have more resources and manpower whereas it will be a real challenge for smaller countries that have only 3 – 4 biosecurity officers that deal with SPS issues on a daily basis. Considering that legislation review support will be provided under the SAFE Pacific project, the paper requested the PPPO ExCo to provide direction to the PPPO Secretariat on the model legislation to consider moving forward (in updating, strengthening and harmonizing biosecurity SPS legislations across the region).

Comments, Q&A:

Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith mentioned that there can be staffing issues for implementing various acts, hence we should consider regional settings and local context and a Pacific approach to biosecurity legislation. We should also take into consideration that our flora and fauna are unique and vulnerable to many types of biosecurity risk – invasive environmental and aquatic species, for example. She added that

through our act, we should also be able to make interventions in pathways that are not plant product based but do pose biosecurity risks, for example, sea containers. The Australian legislation is adoptable and able to target all these biosecurity risks – it is sometimes difficult to interact with NPPOs where the acts are segregated.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson stated that he read through the paper and there was mention of three options provided by FAO, however, only two options were captured in the information paper – plants and animals, but not the option of these coming together. In other words, the FAO proposal does not account for a joint legislation. Mr. Thomson requested PPPO Secretariat to work with FAO for a joint/combined legislation addressing all sectors (plants, animals, invasive species, food safety, etc.) concerning biosecurity and safe trade. He mentioned that the same dilemma is faced at the international level, for example, in discussing proposal for a standard on safe aid (plants products vs animal products and if we need two standards). Overall, FAO should be encouraged to develop a third option/model integrating plants, animals and invasive species biosecurity into a single act. Dr. Visoni mentioned that we will wait to hear from Mr. Keresoma (FAO Regional office) and take note to correspond with FAO on the option of one biosecurity legislation. [Action Item 31]

Tonga – Ms. Siutoni commented that Tonga is scheduled to update/review its Plant Quarantine Act into a Biosecurity Bill and it does not cover animal products (there is a separate legislation for this). She added that Tonga supports plant and animal products to be covered in the same bill but expressed concern at the length of time it takes to review/realize an act (from when it is a bill) and duplication of donors for the same activity. Tonga biosecurity review is through an invasive species project, and it will also receive support from the SAFE Pacific project.

Australia – Dr. Peterson mentioned she was concerned that even with a combined legislation option, the FAO proposed legislation is still quite narrow because FAO's stand on separate models is in relation to IPPC and OIE and we have had issue with definition of plant pests. She added that it is important we do not restrict the biosecurity legislation to only align with IPPC and OIE but also include invasive and environmental pests that do not have a standard setting body to align to. She further stated that when the TOR for legislation review under SAFE Pacific is circulated, countries should consider including invasive species as well so that we do not face the situation where countries are not able to intervene when such an interception is made (for example, ants in containers).

FAO – Mr. Keresoma mentioned that he agrees with Dr. Peterson and there have been discussions on this subject at FAO as well. He is happy to share the report that has been compiled for BAF (Fiji) and encouraged countries to read through the report, in particular the recommendations which provide explanations on the separate legislations and to take these into account when developing TOR for legislation review consultancy under SAFE Pacific.

Kiribati (in chat box) – Ms. Teka supported what was raised by Australia - to harmonize biosecurity legislations to pathways that can potentially introduce biosecurity risks while noting the need to cover sea containers which is lacking in the current Kiribati biosecurity act.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if there is a need to revise the information paper based on comments from Australia and New Zealand. Dr. Peterson stated that there may not be a need to update the paper, rather factor the comments in the legislation review TOR. To this Mr. Waqa responded that it is important to revise the paper for our records and then allow SAFE Pacific Team to progress with the TOR.

Fiji – Mr. Pratap mentioned that Fiji’s biosecurity legislation review with FAO is indeed separating the acts into plants, animals and a generic biosecurity act which are currently in draft stage. Since the engagement with FAO originated few years back, he asked if there is funding through SAFE Pacific to further look at harmonization of these acts in Fiji. Dr. Visoni responded that 8 countries are tagged under this component and considering Fiji is being assisted by FAO, assistance is diverted to other countries. However, the TOR to be drafted will factor in the harmonization aspects requested by Fiji.

Australia – Dr. Peterson clarified on the SAFE Pacific legislation review TOR – whether this will be submitted to ExCo for approval or just for review and comments as ExCo does not have this decision-making power. Mr. Waqa and Dr. Timote clarified that this will just be for review and inputs.

Melanesia (Fiji), Polynesia (Tonga), Micronesia (Kiribati), New Zealand and Australia supported the IP with the understanding that comments from today’s discussion will be factored into the development of the TOR for biosecurity legislation review and upgrade under the SAFE Pacific Project. *The IP on legislation options was endorsed by the PPPO ExCo.* [Endorsement 12]

31.2 Information paper on alternative to methyl bromide treatment for the region (see Appendix ...) Dr. Visoni Timote, PPPO Secretary and IPA-BSPS at SPC LRD

Dr. Timote highlighted the challenges faced by the PPPO Member Countries on alternative fumigants or fumigation treatments given the phasing out of methyl bromide as an ODS. He stated that potential alternatives are now in the market and data on the efficacy of these fumigants will be useful to the PPPO Members – there is research potential in this regard which PPPO Secretariat will be happy to be a part of. Dr. Timote requested to have this tagged as a priority for the PPPO region and be an activity in the new PPPO work plan with necessary costings included around research and development.

Comments, Q&A:

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked if there is funding for this work. Dr. Timote responded that there are some potential collaborations being worked on, but funding is not available for work on alternative treatments to methyl bromide fumigation.

Australia – Dr. Peterson mentioned that Australia will not be able to commit to the paper for now since it was submitted to ExCo members very close to the meeting, however, she is aware of some projects (such as the one under EUPHRESCO) that are working on alternatives to methyl bromide through which information and awareness materials could be obtained for sharing when these are ready.

New Zealand – Ms. Pugh asked if the IP was to request for sharing of information on alternative treatments or this will be scoped out as a project to identify current methyl bromide use and options for alternatives, and whether someone will be leading this. Dr. Timote responded that the idea was to inform the ExCo on alternatives and then work with certain NPPOs on conducting trials for efficacy data which could be provide to countries. Ms. Pugh highlighted that New Zealand already offers a number of alternative treatment options in its import health standards, but these are related to the commodity and pest so it would be helpful to know what commodities or pests that are being looked at for alternatives. This would help out in narrowing down what information to provide. Dr. Timote responded that the Secretariat does have some information in this regard which could be circulated to member countries.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa stressed on the need to be clear on the objectives of this information paper, especially when there is no funding to support the work on alternative treatments. If only information is being shared for noting, then there is opportunity to collaborate with funding agencies to carry out this work. However, PPPO is not in a position to self-fund research on alternatives. Dr. Timote agreed in that the PPPO is not in the position to fund any activities, rather able to collate and distribute information to Member Countries. [Action Item 32]

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson supported discussions so far and encouraged sharing of information on methyl bromide alternatives research being conducted around the world; he mentioned that New Zealand is happy to share data on such research trials conducted locally. He recognized that there may be pests of importance to the region that are not targeted in these trials, and these can be included in new trials assisted by MPI but stated that we need to be realistic and modest in our ambitions as such treatment trials can be very expensive. [Action Item 33] Dr. Timote acknowledged New Zealand for their commitment to provide information and assistance for initial trials.

Tonga – Ms. Tupou supported the PPPO Secretariat in sharing of information on alternative export treatments considering the phasing out of methyl bromide and to be mindful of the timeliness in disseminating this information to countries. Tonga is building two new fumigation facilities and it is important to factor such developments in the biosecurity sector otherwise it may be a waste of money.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that this information paper ties with the information paper from New Zealand on PPPO's research strategies/priorities hence gives us the opportunity to better coordinate within ourselves as well as with partners in the region.

Micronesia (Kiribati through Zoom chat box), Polynesia (Tonga and Tuvalu), Melanesia (New Caledonia and Fiji), New Zealand and Australia supported the IP. *The IP on alternative to methyl bromide treatment was endorsed by the PPPO ExCo.* [Endorsement 13]

31.3 Information Paper on categorizing partners for future collaboration (see Appendix ...)

Dr. Visoni Timote, PPPO Secretary and IPA-BSPS at SPC LRD

Dr. Timote highlighted donor-funded projects which the PPPO Secretariat team is a part of and where PPPO priority activities are built into. There is one signed agreement with EDF 11 under execution as the SAFE Pacific project covering 15 PICTs. There are two incoming projects funded by Australia and New Zealand through DAWE and MPI, respectively. There is a good chance for future projects with STDF and GCF based on current feasibility studies and consultancies. Dr. Timote also shared on-going and potential collaboration with NZMPI, DAWE Australia and regional agencies such as PHAMA Plus and PACER Plus.

Comments, Q&A:

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa requested clarification on “hard pipeline” and “soft pipeline” agreements. Dr. Timote stated that hard pipeline agreements are those already under finalization between SPC and donor/funding partner and currently with the legal teams for vetting and signing. The soft pipeline agreements are those requiring further work and submission of concept notes for development into projects.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson asked how far away are the “soft pipeline” agreements – are these very well advanced or just ideas/on the discussion table? Dr. Timote responded that an example is the GCF project whereby first draft of the project proposal has been provided and another consultant has been hired to address gaps and comments after which a second draft of the proposal will be submitted to FAO. Concerning the STDF submission on the CoE, this is still in the infancy stages whereby a 2-pager concept note is to be submitted for development into a project – this is 3-4 years away.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked about IPPC support to the PPPO. Dr. Timote stated that the Secretariat is looking at submitting a request and/or proposal to the IPPC for this support. Mr. Waqa clarified that we are an PPPO, and should we also include IPPC as a partner? Dr. Timote mentioned that IPPC shall be considered as partner.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa asked about support for the Francophone countries and if they have French territory partners that also need to be acknowledged. Dr. Timote responded that the EU and other partners can be included, however, French territories have direct bilateral agreements for such support.

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that the SAFE Pacific project covers 15 PACPs and asked what support is there for other PPPO Member Countries? Dr. Timote mentioned that currently there are no projects for other countries. The 15 PACPs covered under SAFE Pacific are:

- Melanesia – Fiji, PNG, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, *Timor Leste
- Micronesia – FSM, Kiribati, RMI, Nauru, Palau
- Polynesia – Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu
- Not supported – American Samoa, CNMI, French Polynesia, Guam, New Caledonia, Wallis and Futuna, Tokelau, Pitcairn Islands

Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that it was important to take note of the countries without any support as their priorities have also come forth through the PPPO Secretariat. We must discuss during “other matters” how we can proceed from here.

Melanesia (New Caledonia, while highlighting that no active projects or funding assistance are currently available to them and other French territories, and Fiji), Polynesia (Tuvalu through Zoom chat box), Micronesia (Kiribati through Zoom chat box), New Zealand and Australia supported the paper stating that it provides a reasonable framework. *The IP on partners for future collaboration was endorsed by the PPPO ExCo. [Endorsement 14]*

Break for twenty (20) minutes.

32.0 Presentation and endorsement of final proposed PPPO workplan

Mr. Waqa updated the forum that there will not be a presentation and endorsement of the PPPO workplan at this meeting. As agreed here, a smaller group will meet virtually to review, revise and finalize the workplan. Because of this, we will need to have another (special) ExCo meeting before the Full Board meeting that is scheduled for later in the year. At this special ExCo meeting, the deferred information paper (that was presented by New Zealand) will also be discussed. The dates for this special ExCo meeting will need to be worked out and will be communicated by the PPPO Secretariat in due course.

33.0 Dates for the PPPO Full Board and venue

Dates for the Pacific Week of Agriculture (to be hosted in Fiji in the week of September 12-16) and the APPPC regional workshop (in the week of August 29–September 02) were taken into consideration. The IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop and Draft ISPMs Workshop was tentatively scheduled for August 22-26 to be held face-to-face (FTF) in Fiji.

After lengthy discussions, Dr. Timote proposed August 01-05 or August 08-12 for the special PPPO ExCo meeting and September 05-09 or September 19-23 for the PPPO Full Board meeting.

Comments, Q&A:

Australia – Dr. Peterson asked if we need a full week or just a few days for the special ExCo meeting. Mr. Waqa and Dr. Timote responded that we may need 2-3 days. Dr. Peterson suggested having the special ExCo meeting virtually and alternative dates for the PPPO Full Board meeting as travel and logistics would become an issue.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson suggested combining the IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop/Draft ISPMs Workshop with the special ExCo meeting. Dr. Peterson agreed and mentioned that this may be an efficient way to do it and the IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop/Draft ISPMs Workshop can be 3 days with 2 days (or 4 days and 1 day) for the special ExCo meeting. However, she asked when will the PPPO Full Board meeting be held then considering some time will be required between the PPPO ExCo and Full Board. She also suggested having the special ExCo meeting virtually then devoting 1 day before the IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop/Draft ISPMs Workshop for final discussions.

New Zealand – Mr. Thomson mentioned that a lot of IPPC updates are presented at the IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop/Draft ISPMs Workshop, but these can actually be covered in the PPPO Talanoa Sessions leaving more time for the special ExCo meeting.

New Caledonia – Ms. Chan supported having the special ExCo meeting and IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop/Draft ISPMs Workshop together. Fiji (Mr. Pratap) also supported the same. Mr. Thomson added that virtual/hybrid workshops are difficult to manage, hence it is better to have a small group to work on the PPPO workplan virtually (as discussed earlier in the week) and then 1 or 1.5 days of FTF special PPPO ExCo meeting to review and finalize along with the information papers.

It was agreed that the special PPPO ExCo meeting and IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop/Draft ISPMs Workshop will be held together, FTF. Tentative dates are August 22-26, 2022. The special PPPO ExCo meeting will be held on the 26th of August after the Draft ISPMs Review Workshop.

Details on how the days will be split between the two will be decided later. Following this will be the APPPC regional meeting from August 29-September 02 (Mr. Waqa asked Australia if they are okay with the dates. Dr. Peterson responded that she is a member on the SC for SWP hence attending the IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop/Draft ISPMs Workshop will be extremely important, however, Australia will be able to manage the travel/attendance to APPPC regional meeting).

The tentative dates for the PPPO Full Board meeting was set as September 26-30 (subject to confirmation from Mr. Thomson after the CPM Bureau meeting next week).

Dr. Timote asked if this will also be FTF? Mr. Waqa asked if there is funding for a FTF meeting? Dr. Timote responded that the IPPC PPPO Regional Workshop/Draft ISPMs Workshop will be supported by the SAFE Pacific project for 15 PACPs plus the Secretariat Team, however, there is no funding for the PPPO Full Board meeting. Mr. Waqa raised concern on attendance by the remaining countries (not funded as they are not part of the SAFE Pacific project) as well as funding for organizing the PPPO Full Board meeting – he mentioned that we keep FTF as the first option and virtual as option B.

34.0 Other issues

- A. Australia – Dr. Peterson mentioned that we are not having a Talanoa Session in March due to the PPPO ExCo meeting and asked if we should have one for April before the CPM meeting (April 05, 07 and 21). Fiji (Mr. Pratap) seconded and stated that we should have a Talanoa Session before the CPM-16. Dr. Timote iterated the same and the importance for PPPO to meet before the CPM – he will get in touch with the NPPO Tuvalu for presentation as host country. **It was agreed that the next PPPO Talanoa Session will be held on Friday April 01, 2022.**
- B. Meeting Chair – Mr. Waqa mentioned that in 2018 when the EDF funding was pulled from SPC, PPPO Secretariat's status to be housed at SPC was in question. Upon request from the PPPO Full Board, the then Director of LRD had committed and provided a letter of support (in 2019 or 2020) that PPPO Secretariat will be supported by SPC. He requested that the PPPO Secretary look for and provide this letter to the PPPO ExCo before the next PPPO Full Board meeting where this support can be discussed further. **[Action Item 34]**
- C. Executive Secretary – Dr. Timote mentioned that the PPPO Secretariat was asked to make a presentation today on PPPO Secretariat operating systems and funding streams. In the interest of time, Mr. Waqa requested Dr. Timote circulate this to the Member Countries via email.
- D. SPC – Mr. Atumurirava mentioned that the RTMPP is married to the PPPO but has not been performing or functioning the way it was designed to be (scientific inputs and research arm of the PPPO). He asked who should be the players to drive the work of the RTMPP? Mr. Waqa mentioned that one of the challenges is that the RTMPP does not have a constitution, executive committee or organized way of operating but has existed even before the PPPO was established and existed as an organization; mechanisms for engagement with the RTMPP or contact points (to follow through on discussions, action points, etc.) is also not established. He added that if RTMPP was to be given some structure then LRD would be best placed to absorb this work (at the regional level, start the coordination and setting up of the RTMPP). Dr. Timote suggested that there has been some discussions around this before and it makes sense that the focal point for the RTMPP also then rests with the regional body (SPC Plant Health Team) and proposed that Mr. Atumurirava be appointed into this role. Mr. Waqa mentioned that the proposition is noted and will be discussed further at a later date. **[Action Item 35]**

35.0 Review and adoption of meeting report

Mr. Dakaica and Mr. Gosai presented the draft meeting report and action items through Zoom “screen share”. The comments from Meeting Chair, PPPO Executive Secretary and national delegates were noted by the rapporteurs.

Comments, Q&A:

- A. New Zealand – Mr. Thomson asked about the process for approving the report. It can be approved in principle but there should be time to look at the report in full and a number of action items still need to be captured. Mr. Waqa mentioned that the rapporteurs will work on the report further and then circulate for comments – all these comments will be factored in and circulated before report is finalized. He also suggested to have a separate list of action items and persons responsible.
- B. Australia – Dr. Vivian-Smith and Dr. Peterson also supported the adoption of meeting report in principle and thanked the rapporteurs for their hard work in compiling the draft report.

Melanesia (Fiji, New Caledonia), Polynesia (Tonga) and Micronesia (Kiribati) as well as the FAO delegate also endorsed the draft PPPO ExCo meeting report.

The draft report was adopted (in principle) by the PPPO ExCo.

Final remarks

SWP CPM Bureau Rep and CTO MPI, Mr. Thomson

Mr. Thomson mentioned that he was happy with the week's proceedings and the opportunity to have open discussions to share thoughts as this builds greater understanding and strengthens the relationships that we have across the Pacific. He added that this also shows that we all have common interests that we are trying to work towards and there is so much to be done. Mr. Thomson thanked the PPPO Secretariat Team for all the work in organizing and delivering this meeting and stated that the PPPO Secretariat is the “oil that keeps the wheel moving smoothly” and we need to find a way to establish a sufficiently resourced secretariat that will keep moving smoothly and maybe turn a little faster. Mr. Thomson ended by saying that he looks forward to meeting everyone in-person again, soon.

Mr. Waqa re-iterated Mr. Thomson's final remarks in keeping connected and working as team; he also thanked the PPPO Secretariat for their efforts in organizing this PPPO ExCo meeting.

Closing remarks

Mr. Pratap, aCEO BAF and Head of Fiji NPPO

Mr. Pratap acknowledged the FTF and virtual presence of delegates from the three PPPO sub-regions as well as Australia, New Zealand, FAO, the PPPO Secretariat and Meeting Chair Mr. Waqa. He then congratulated Dr. Peterson on her new appointment as Director for the Pacific Engagement Office at DAWE Australia. He mentioned that over the last 4 days, we have had some great presentations from discipline experts on topics that have a biosecurity influence in our region and our daily activities, adding that despite the numerous setbacks with natural disasters, pandemics and climate change, we continue to show our commitments and leadership of endurance for food and income security for the Pacific region.

He stated that members of the ExCo very well understand the issues affecting us and the various weaknesses that we encounter in the attempt to keep our beautiful region bio-safe, however, our efforts to work as a team and embrace the PPPO theme of being “Connected, Informed and Prepared – a PPPO family where no member is left behind” has been our pillar of strength, making a special mention of the Talanoa sessions.



Mr. Pratap acknowledged the PPPO Secretariat for their work and guidance provided to the PPPO Family and to ExCo, adding that as the ExCo team, we have explored and also provided directions to the PPPO Secretariat on a number of activities. He recognised potential funding support for these planned work and mentioned that we collectively are very grateful to agencies like DFAT, MFAT, EU and other donors for their kind contributions to the Pacific region.

Mr. Pratap then thanked all countries that presented information papers and acknowledged discussions at this meeting covering important topics of sea container hygiene, alternatives to Methyl Bromide fumigation, provision of safe aid, fall army worm, coconut rhinoceros beetle, Pacific Islands Pest List Database, Australia's Pacific Biosecurity Partnerships Program and New Zealand's Enhanced Pacific Market Access Program. He updated the PPPO ExCo that NPPO Fiji has finalized its EPMAP governance group's TOR, and first governance meeting is planned in the coming month.

Mr. Pratap further acknowledged updates from the ePhyto project and FAO's regional office as well as support to the PPPO Secretariat from SPC LRD including logistics for the 4 days of meeting and provision of rapporteurs adding that he looked forward to the next meetings – virtual Talanoa Session before the upcoming CPM-16. He hoped that in the future, meetings can be organised in the traditional “face to face” way where we all can enjoy the company of our PPPO family. He then wished everyone a pleasant weekend, almighty's guidance and safe travels back home.

Final words of acknowledgement from Mr. Waqa, prayer by Dr. Kami, Lunch and end of Day 04 as well as PPPO ExCo Meeting at 2.55 pm Fiji Time.