APPPC-NAPPO Joint workshop on the implementation of the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) 15
Regulation on wood packaging in international trade
10-14 June, 2014, Beijing, China

Summary

A workshop on the implementation of the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) 15, Regulation on wood packaging in international trade was held in Beijing, China from June 10 to 14, 2014. This workshop was organised by the Asia-Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) and the North American Plant Protection Organisation (NAPPO) and hosted by the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) and the General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine (AQSIQ) of the People's Republic of China.

The meeting was opened by Deputy Director General of Department of Crop Production and Protection- Mr. Ouyang Ming representing China's Ministry of Agriculture and Mr. Zhao Zenglian representing AQSIQ of China who offered a warm welcome to all participants and wished the conference to be a great success and that the implementation of ISPM 15 has great significance to preventing the spread of pests in WPM.

A history and a summary of the technical basis for ISPM 15 were provided to the workshop participants. A summary of the available practical guidance for implementing ISPM 15, and this includes development of key elements of an official production system as including:

- Legislative tools to support authorisation and control
- Systems to verify elements of certification
- Producer systems to ensure compliance with standard
- Publication of information on authorised facilities
- Outreach and education
- Audit and oversight
- Follow up on non-compliance.

Each country had the opportunity to share their experiences in the implementation of ISPM 15. These presentations revealed that each of the 15 countries represented at the workshop had implemented ISPM 15 for export, although a few countries had not yet implemented for import. Based on summaries provided by some countries on non-compliances, ISPM 15 had significantly reduced the likelihood of the introduction of forestry pests. The majority of non-compliances are associated with WPM without the mark, and infestation is probably higher where WPM is not marked. There still continue to be a significant number of pest interceptions associated with WPM with the ISPM 15 mark. Non-compliance notification is quite low currently, but notifications are really important in order to check exporting countries' systems for WPM.

A field visit was undertaken by participants to Tianjin Municipality to visit the Beijing Concentrated Inspection Field for International Logistics to view inspections of WPM being carried out by the Tianjin Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau. Participants also

visited the New Found (Tianjin) Packaging Industry Science and Technology Co. Ltd to view the manufacturing, treatment and marking of ISPM 15 compliant WPM.

The workshop participants broke off into two groups to discuss ways to improve the implementation of ISPM 15, and to improve the notifications of non-compliance. The following recommendations were proposed from the workshop:

Improved guidance

1. NPPOs with technical experience should share information related to their procedures by posting these on the phytosanitary resources page of the International Phytosanitary Portal. In particular:
    - Procedures for evaluating heat chambers
    - Procedures for developing heat treatment schedules which use ambient temperatures as an alternative to core temperatures
    - Procedures for protecting the mark
    - Procedures for the use of third party and international accreditation systems
    - Procedures for undertaking enforcement actions related to non-compliant use of the mark
2. The explanatory document on ISPM 15 should be amended to add additional examples on measuring methyl bromide fumigation concentrations at varying (more frequent) intervals.
3. The International Forest Quarantine Research Group should be encouraged to develop and disseminate guidance on examples of contaminating pests which may be found associated with wood packaging materials.

Harmonised practices that should be adopted by NPPOs

1. Recognizing that NPPOs of countries manufacturing export wood packaging are significantly important in achieving compliance through the establishment of an effective certification system, exporting NPPOs should clearly outline the responsibilities of all parties involved in the system.
2. NPPOs should cooperate with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in registration of the mark.
3. NPPOs should ensure that the possess appropriate legislative and regulatory authorities needed to control and enforce proper use the mark.
4. NPPOs should consider the addition of serial numbers, date codes, and other security elements (outside the International Plant Protection Convention mark) which may assist in protecting the mark by adding components of traceability.
5. NPPOs should update information on the ISPM 15 implementation page on the IPP.
6. Notification of non-compliant imports should be provided in a timely way.

7. NPPOs should cooperate in developing more efficient ways in transferring non-compliance information between countries such as electronic exchange in order to assist with expedient follow-up by exporting countries.
8. NPPOs should update contact information on the IPP and should consider publishing a specific contact point for issues related to wood packaging.
9. NPPOs should be encouraged to include the following information in notifications of non-compliance:
   - General information of the consignment
   - Information on the ISPM 15 mark
   - Any other markings appearing on the wood (e.g. grade marks, etc.)
   - Photographs of the wood packaging materials and marks involved
   - Information on the pests involved including the life stage of pest and possible identification (specimens should be maintained)
   - Additional shipping and export information, if available
10. Notifications may be confined to detections of pests which indicate that the treatment may have not been applied or may have been misapplied.
11. NPPOs should recognize the difficulty in treating some large sized dunnage and should consider developing options for addressing the import risk by disposing or treating the dunnage.
12. NPPOs should consider posting lists of approved marks which would allow trading partners to determine if marks are legitimate.
13. NPPOs should undertake outreach and education particularly of those exporters found to be using non-compliant wood packaging materials.
14. NPPOs should consider cooperating and sharing resources and materials in conducting outreach.
15. NPPOs should publicise enforcement actions to the extent possible to discourage non-compliance.
16. As a good management practice, manufacturers and users of wood packaging should be encouraged to segregate and store wood packaging in a manner that reduces the risk of post treatment infestation.

Recommendations to the CPM:

Workshop participants agreed to encourage their NPPO representatives to CPM to propose consideration of the following:

1. The CPM should provide documentation to contracting parties indicating that the authority for proper use of the mark including the symbol has been transferred to NPPOs.
2. Revision to the standard should consider the addition of security elements which provide additional traceability to treatment such as date stamps, serial numbers, etc.

3. Consideration of an international workshop on ISPM 15 to improve harmonised implementation and compliance.

REPORT

Welcoming Address and Introductions

Opening Remarks by Executive Secretary of the APPPC

Dr. Piao Yongfan welcomed the participants and experts to the meeting and thanked China for hosting the meeting. He noted the importance of ISPM 15 *Regulation of Wood Packaging Material in International Trade* for preventing the spread of pests in wood packaging material (WPM). He invited the distinguished guests and participants to do introductions.

Opening of the Workshop by Director of Crop Protection, Ministry of Agriculture

Mr. OuYang Ming, Deputy Director General of Department of Crop Production and Protection, representing China's Ministry of Agriculture opened the meeting and offered a warm welcome to all participants and wished the conference to be a great success. Mr Yao commented that the implementation of ISPM 15 has great significance to preventing the spread of pests in WPM. Since 2005, China has adopted ISPM 15 and enhanced their inspection levels for WPM. He commented that China is going to fulfil their responsibilities to have fair, just and safe trade.

Opening Addresses by Distinguished Guests

Mr. Zhao Zenglian, Deputy Director General of the Department for Supervision and Animal and Plant Quarantine, reprensenting the General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine (AQSIQ) advised that AQSIQ is responsible for the regulations in China associated with the import and export of goods. He commented that implementation of ISPM 15 can help promote international trade and the standard has already prevented spread of pests in WPM, as more than 50% of packaging used in international trade is WPM. He noted that international countries need to better implement the ISPM 15 standard, including increasing efforts to ensuring people are more aware and better understand ISPM 15 particularly as Chinese CIQs have intercepted 40,000 cases of pests in imports and exports. Some problems that he identified included export companies being not that committed to implementing ISPM 15, pest interceptions are still occurring on WPM having the ISPM mark which suggests there is insufficient implementation including quarantine techniques, and the potential for counterfeit of ISPM 15 marks. He is hopeful that this meeting will be used to put forward suggestions, including implementation of better quarantine techniques and better communications between parties. Mr Yuan hoped that all participants enjoyed the conference and wished it every success.

Dr Piao Yongfan, Secretariat of the Asia-Pacific Plant Protection Organisation (APPPO) advised that the initiative for working groups to lead discussions on ISPM implementation of ISPMs was presented at the IPPC Standards Committee last year. It was decided to have an

ISPM 15 implementation workshop in China focussed on Asia-Pacific and North America. This is the first workshop between two bodies, and the aim is to develop a joint proposal for implementation. He noted that there is a need for implementation from both public and private sectors to contribute to the successful and ongoing implementation of ISPM 15. Dr Piao also passed on his thanks to China's Ministry for Agriculture and AQSIQ, and the North American Plant Protection Organisation (NAPPO) for funding.

Mr Ian McDonnell, Secretariat of the NAPPO said that this was the first type of workshop with country officials and industry representatives. Recent publications have documented the success of ISPM 15 but improvements were still needed. He also noted that this meeting is a wonderful opportunity to learn from each other.

Dr Kyu-Ock Yim, the Meeting Chairperson, advised that this joint APPPC and NAPPO workshop is a great example of good cooperation amongst all countries, and particularly with the Chinese government as official hosts. Dr Yim commented that ISPM 15 has had the greatest impact on trade of all the ISPMs, and is potentially the most widely used in countries. She noted that the role of the IPPC is to help support implementation, including development of guidance information and building capacity for implementation. Dr Yim also stated that implementation is recognised as important and all contracting parties should implement, and that output from this workshop should be used to better implement ISPM 15.

Principles of plant quarantine

Mr. Brent Larson, Standards Officer of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) provided a summary of the history and status of ISPM 15. He advised that there are 181 nations who are contracting parties to IPPC. The IPPC key functions include the development of standards, enabling cooperation between contracting parties on plant quarantine matters, building capacity, disputes settlement, and more recently are a new body to support standard implementation. He commented that there is a general belief that if you follow ISPM 15, then you will greatly reduce the spread of pests on WPM. However, he advised that the issues of fraud of the mark and non-use of ISPM 15 are issues associated with implementation of appropriate ISPM 15 systems in each of the countries.

The IPPC have adopted 36 international standards, 4 diagnostic standards, 14 treatments, including three approved treatments for ISPM 15, being heat treatment (HT), fumigation with methyl bromide (MB) and dielectric heating (DH). There were many other standards in place to ensure consistency, which cover topic such as regulation of imports, phytosanitary principles, surveillance, and the notification of non-compliance. He commented that the strongest word used in the ISPMs is 'should', and provided examples on non-compliance notification where it states that non-compliances 'should' be notified, and countries 'should' report back.

1 THE CONTEXT OF ISPM 15

1.1 ISPM 15 - History

Mr. Brent Larson presented on the history of ISPM 15. He stated that ISPM 15 was unusual as this standard was the first non-theoretical standard and was not on an intentionally traded commodity. Several meetings were held by a working group before 2002. ICPM-4 (2002) adopted first version of standard, which included rectangular mark and symbol. As there was a need to continue to address concerns on efficacy, especially on methyl bromide, the International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) was formed.

A global IPPC workshop on practical application of ISPM 15 was held in Canada in 2005, where over 170 delegates participated, and each delegate was advised to implement a plan. The Commission for Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) was asked to revise ISPM 15, which specifically included changes to the MB fumigation schedule and to provide guidance information on how to conduct fumigation. A revised version of ISPM 15 was adopted in 2009 which removed the criteria for new treatments and the word 'guidelines' from the title. The revised version included text on reuse and remanufacture, bark risks, the removal of bark and tolerances, and provide further guidance on treatment applications and the use of the mark.

Dielectric heat (H) treatment was added by CPM-8 in 2013 and further new treatments have also been submitted for consideration. For example, sulfuryl fluoride is being considered by the Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) in 2014. However, it is considered that the criteria for ISPM 15 treatments are relatively vague and CPM has decided to revise the criteria as part of ISPM 15 revision. The Technical Panel for Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) are currently developing these criteria, in the form of publication of the Cardiff Protocol.

Mr. Larson commented that ISPM 15 is the first and possibly last case of a globally agreed Appropriate Level of Protection, which has had a huge impact on protecting trees and forests. However, there is a need to focus on proper implementation and as a result this has led to the first ISPM15 explanatory document being produced in 2014.

FAO has now registered the IPPC symbol in 114 countries as of June 2014. FAO have ownership of symbol and FAO can be contacted if used in fraudulent circumstances. If misuse of the mark is discovered, NPPOs can contact FAO to get a letter from FAO's Legal Services sent to the non-compliant company to "cease and desist" from unauthorised use of the symbol. Governments of each country can also make prosecutions if they have in place national legislation associated with the ISPM mark, or they will have to work on behalf of FAO to make prosecutions for inappropriate use.

1.2 ISPM15 - Technical basis

Dr. Eric Allen from IFQRG provided a presentation on the technical basis of ISPM 15, including explanation on the economic damage caused by pests, pest interceptions on treated wood packaging and the scientific basis for treatments. IFQRG are an advisory body for the

IPPC and identify and undertake collaborative research to answer priority forestry quarantine questions.

Dr. Allen summarised the work done by Canada in evaluating ISPM 15, which found pest infestation in 2% of containers with WPM. A number of studies have demonstrated the net economic benefits of ISPM 15, and that it is working with a potential reduction in pest interceptions of 50%. However, there are still pests arriving, and this equals the potential entry of 13,000 pests if calculated based on the 0.1% pest infestation rate for the 13 million containers arriving in Canada each year. He commented that species with low arrival rates are more likely to be mitigated than species with high arrival rates and establishments will still occur especially for pests with high arrival rates.

Dr. Allen summarised the possible reasons for pests still on WPM:

1. Pest tolerance of treatment
2. Infestation following treatment
3. Treatment not being applied properly
4. Fraudulent use of the mark

Eric commented that a careful analysis of interceptions can help focus efforts to improve ISPM 15 implementation. He noted that treatment success is dependent on proper treatment application.

2 IMPLEMENTION OF ISPM 15

2.1 Practical guidance on implementation

Mr. Shane Sela (NAPPO) provided a presentation on the practical guidance on the implementation of ISPM 15, and noted that the WPM sector usually lies outside normal plant protection sectors that NPPOs commonly deal with. Shane detailed key elements of an official production system as including:

- Legislative tools to support authorisation and control
- Systems to verify elements of certification
- Producer systems to ensure compliance with standard
- Publication of information on authorised facilities
- Outreach and education
- Audit and oversight
- Follow up on non-compliance.

It was noted that supervision of the export system can be difficult, as NPPOs cannot oversee of verify that every unit complies with requirements. Oversight should be based on documentation and records.

Mr. Sela provided a summary of considerations for import controls in each country, including legislation, outreach and awareness, availability and effective utilisation of inspection resources, location of inspection sites, requirements for import declarations to identify compliant shipments, equipment to conduct inspections, training and education of staff or agencies, protocols for the selection of imports for inspection, and described actions to be taken on non-compliant imports.

Mr. Sela noted that treatments practically eliminate risks, treatment should precede marking, and debarking should be done in advance of fumigation.

For heat treatment, it was advised that experts in wood drying technology should be a key resource to establish heat treatment schedules and operating conditions. Suitable air circulation around and through the wood stack is needed for effective heat treatment, but other factors can determine effectiveness, such as chamber type, heat sources and wood type. Shane identified that there are two ways of determining heat treatment by using either fixed sensors inserted into the wood to measure temperature, or testing treatments with multiple temperature sensors to identify a specific treatment schedule for ongoing use for a specific wood type.

Methyl bromide fumigation is usually carried out on the basis of dose, in terms of concentration over a period of time (CT). CT can be affected by sorption, leakage, temperature and humidity etc. MB infiltrates most woods very well, but will not infiltrate large dimensions of timber and requires temperatures over 10 degrees Celsius in order for MB to remain gaseous. Other factors to be aware of for successful fumigations include enabling appropriation air circulation, appropriate loading of chamber (i.e. below 80%), and the removal of articles that may prevent fumigation penetration (e.g. plastic wrapping).

2.2 Practical implications of implementation

Dr Kyu-Ock Yim outlined that an ISPM implementation working group was put together in 2006 to identify ways to improve implementation of standards.

The APPPC has completed a questionnaire to monitor implementation of ISPMs. APPPC members were provided a questionnaire, and a working group will be used to discuss findings and identify future work plans to support standards implementation. This questionnaire approach was done first for ISPM 15, and this involved 33 questions on topics, such as the registration of the IPPC mark, general implementation (including imports & exports), future implementation plans, and the identification of any suggested improvements for ISPM 15. 17 countries responded to the questionnaire. 11 of these countries identification that they had registered the IPPC mark although it turned out that some of these countries were incorrect when advising of their country's registration status.

All 17 respondent countries had implemented ISPM 15 for exporting, but only 15 countries for importing. Shortage of staff and training was highlighted as the main difficulty for implementation, with a lack of cooperation with the private sector also a common difficulty highlighted. Improvements in domestic capacity (e.g. lack of registered treatment providers,

capacity to undertake mark), full implementation by importing countries, improved ISPM content (e.g. unclear on treatment method) and information sharing was highlighted as the capacity needed by the responding countries. The suggested work plan for 2014-15 is to conduct follow up actions on ISPM 15, such as the completion of this joint workshop, and to facilitate registration and renewal by member countries where needed, plus focus on export certification and additional treatments advice.

Mr. John McDaniel from the American Lumber Standard Committee (ALSC) presented on the ISPM 15 mark. The ISPM 15 mark on the WPM is accepted as the evidence the WPM complies with ISPM 15 requirements and NPPOs provide ISPM 15 marks to manufacturers of WPM (e.g. USA – 5400, Canada 500). John commented that NPPOs should have standardised procedure for the safe keeping and use of the mark to assist countries in identifying official use. Ways in which NPPOs can do this include maintaining records and have a procedure for approving the mark before it is produced and issued for the WPM manufacturer, noting that successful implementation of ISPM 15 is dependent on strong programs for control of the ISPM 15 marks. John also outlined examples of fraudulent marks that have appeared in the USA, showing the differences between the authorised and non-authorised marks. Minor differences can be noticed, although NPPOs of other countries may not be able to distinguish the difference.

Participants discussed ways that could be used to identify fraudulent marks between countries, such as a register of all marks or the use of anti-fraudulent technology.

Mr. Young Chul Jeong from Korea's Animal and Plant Quarantine Agency (QIA) presented on the status of wood packaging and the marking system used in Korea. Korea has a large proportion (98.6%) of WPM heat treated. An online support system on WPM exists, which registers any heat treatment companies, the mark, staff and facilities. A registration procedure exists for companies, and regular monitoring is undertaken by regional QIA offices. Training is undertaken to ensure treatment application is conducted effectively. Several challenges were outlined for ISPM implementation including:

- Limitation of checking due to a shortage of officers and lots of HT operators
- Continuous administrative measures being required due to illegal use of mark and non-declaration of new marks being used
- A shortage of knowledge and skill due to changes in treatment technicians
- Requirements by importing countries, such as marking requirements and certificate requirements

2.3 Country reports on experiences in implementing ISPM 15, including current compliance rates and problems encountered by countries trying to address non-compliance

2.3.1 Australia

Dr. Christopher Howard from Australia's Department of Agriculture presented on Australia's import policy. Australia adopted ISPM 15 in 2004. Prior to 2004, Australia had various treatments for wood packaging, and they presently accept ISPM 15 or other certified treatments. In recent years, Australia has revised their bark tolerance in 2010 to align with ISPM 15 changes, and reviewed their policy for blue stain fungi to require no further actions if this was detected on WPM. Australia applies a risk-return approach at the border through targeted interventions. PM found to be non-compliant will be treated, re-exported or destroyed.

Mr. Peter Creaser from Australia's Department of Agriculture presented on the management of ISPM 15 for exports from Australia. There are four components to the Australian Wood Packaging Certification Scheme (AWPCS):

1. The Department of Agriculture who provide technical advice, interact with the third party accreditation body JAS-ANZ, and investigate non-compliance
2. Third party certification providers, who accredit certification bodies under the AWPCS. The Joint Accreditation Standard for Australia and New Zealand (JAS-ANZ) accredits certification of bodies, performs ongoing monitoring and notifies changes to accreditation status
3. Certification bodies, which are companies or organisations accredited by the accreditation body to assess the suitability of the applicant. These bodies conduct verification audits at 6 monthly intervals.
4. Treatment providers and manufacturers, who adhere to ISPM 15 and the AWPCS, and need to ensure all treatments and marks are being applied correctly.

Mr. Creaser commented that there is merit in having third party accreditation bodies, as they have specific expertise and are fully cost recovered, and this can mean that the NPPO, in this case the Department of Agriculture, can then focus on compliance and enforcement.

2.3.2 Canada and CBSA

Mr. Shane Sela from the Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA) presented on the implementation of ISPM 15 in Canada. Canada imposed emergency measures for coniferous WPM in 2001 due to new measures being put in place by Europe. In 2002 Canada implemented an import program, which was fully implemented by 2006. CFIA have established a certification program to comply, and elements include prescribed standards for treatment and/or production, control of application of marks, maintenance of records attesting to system operation, and the execution of audits to verify compliance.

Canada received 31 notifications of non-compliance in 2013, all of which were associated with exporters with uncertified on WPM. CFIA or approved third parties conduct outreach to improve compliance. The import programme is focussed on 4 major ports of entry, with targeted inspections based on importing history and manifests, with inspections conducted at bonded warehouses. Compliance has increased from 62% in 2006 to 95% in 2012-13. About

one third of non-compliant shipments are infested, and about 3 quarters of infested shipments have an IPPC mark.

2.3.3 China

Mr. Feng Chumguang from China's AQSIQ presented on the adoption of ISPM 15, and the challenges in their country for the implementation of ISPM 15 for imports and exports. China enforced two mandatory regulations (one on entry and one on exit) in 2005. AQSIQ has 35 inspection & quarantine bureaus (provincial or municipality level), which supervise and direct local inspection, and 831 inspection and quarantine local offices to monitor and implement the WPM program, including conducting sample inspections.

Key elements of concern include WPM from specific countries where non-compliance occurs frequently, and operators always using WPM but failing to declare for inspection. When WPM is missing the ISPM mark or pests detected, the WPM will be treated or destroyed. Over past few years from 2006 to 2013, total imported WPM has not changed a lot, but pests intercepted have increased significantly.

For exports, WPM used for export shall be treated and marked with ISPM mark, and exporters who use WPM should purchase WPM from certified companies, up to now 1128 companies. More use of HT, to gradually reduce fumigation. China are doing conformity assessment and certification to ensure consistent procedures across China for application of the mark, and they conduct routine surveillance and audits to verify activities are being conducted appropriately.

Specific challenges highlighted for ISPM 15 implementation include:

1. Fraudulence of ISPM mark and the lack of availability of anti-counterfeit measures. China has implemented new anti-fraudulence codes recently which involve printed or engraved marks on the outside of the ISPM mark (i.e. in the form of a serial code), with allocation by AQSIQ or affiliated CIQ through an online website system.
2. Reusing of WPM makes investigation less practical if non-compliance is notified by importing countries.
3. Measuring the core temperature for HT is difficult as the insertion of probes into the WPM may not necessarily reflect the core temperature of the wood if the air around the probe is warmer.
4. Key information is needed for tracing back and conducting investigations, and some information is missing when notifications are sent to China.

It was suggested that there is a need to promote a security system among trading partners to fight against illegal use of ISPM mark, and to expedite the process of communication in the case of non-compliance by appointing contact points among NPPO and APPPC members to transmit necessary information and documents.

2.3.4 India

Dr. Vasuda Gautam from India's Ministry of Agriculture presented on India's WPM system. India has 22 national standards for phytosanitary measures, and three are relevant to ISPM 15, and pertain to national standards around treatment and certification. India has implemented ISPM 15 since 2009 for export compliance to meet requirements of importing countries, with a phytosanitary certificate and ISPM mark needed. India has 454 MB registered and 270 HT registered treatment facilities and all facilities have trained staff and accredited procedures. The registration of the ISPM 15 symbol in India is underway. The main causes of non-compliance are considered to be pest resistance to treatment, failed treatment, and the inappropriate use of the mark.

2.3.5 Japan

Mr. Takashi Kawai from Japan's Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries provided an overview of the Japanese certification system for WPM for exports and imports. Japan have about 340 approved treatment companies and 1860 approved WPM manufacturers. In April 2007, establishment of the regulation on imported WPM in compliance with ISPM 15 based on a prior risk analysis. Inspection or treatment required if without required mark, and treatment, reship or destroy if found with pests. Reduced rate of inspection is considered to improved awareness of ISPM 15 with more compliant WPM being imported from trading partners.

2.3.6 Laos

Mr. Souliya Souvandouane from Laos' Department of Agriculture (DOA) presented on their ISPM 15 experience. Adoption of ISPM 15 has taken place since 2006 for exports. DOA have accredited framework and also do monitoring. They accredit treatment agencies and issue a treatment certificate with registration number, although only one MB facility is registered currently. Laos have no plan to implement for imports at present, but there is legislation that could be enforced at some stage.

2.3.7 Malaysia

Mr. Yusuf Othman from Malaysia's Department of Agriculture presented on Malaysia's experience for ISPM 15 implementation. Malaysia started registration of treatment providers in 2004 for MB and HT, particularly to facilitate export compliance. Malaysia established Malaysia's fumigation and heat treatment accreditation schemes (MAFAS and MAHTAS) with training conducted in 2007. In 2010 Malaysia started the implementation of ISPM for imports. A formal application process and auditing is conducted for WPM treatment service providers. Malaysia currently has 79 MB companies and 44 HT companies. For non-compliances, an investigation by auditors is conducted, suspension of treatment providers is undertaken until corrective measures have been approved, and de-listing from registration is used where needed.

Yusuf outlined several problems and constraints with ISPM 15 implementation including:

- It is difficult to inspect non-agricultural products as these imports are not normally inspected by Quarantine Inspectors and often there is no marking for this WPM and treatment could not be conducted
- There is no expiry date for treatment
- Sampling is based on non-statistical methods
- Forgery of the WPM mark makes it difficult to trace, especially when the non-compliant provider uses another company's valid registration number
- Handling of WPM after treatment can encourage post-treatment infestation
- There is a lack of man power to conduct unannounced audits to ensure compliance
- Re-use and repairing of WPM by importing country for export did not comply to the making requirement

Participants discussed the use of expiry or validation dates. It was noted that the original intention of ISPM 15 was to kill tree-living pests and that there was no intention to manage pests that may re-infest dried wood. Before assessing tools for managing re-infestation, further research is required. The use of expiry dates was because of regular detections of pests re-infesting in Malaysia. It was noted that several Asian countries had raised this concern previously, and that further work was required to determine if there was a problem before any expiry dates were implemented widely.

2.3.8 New Zealand

Dr. Shane Olsen from New Zealand's Ministry of Primary Industries (MPI) presented an overview of the export and import system for WPM in New Zealand. New Zealand adopted ISPM 15 in 2003. For exports, New Zealand have a 3-level system whereby there are approved MB, HT and mark providers, who are audited by Independent Verification Agencies (IVA), and these IVA's are audited and overseen by MPI. A standard for the certification of the mark has also been developed.

For imports, New Zealand have an Import Health Standard for WPM, which prescribe the requirements for importing WPM into New Zealand and these are based on ISPM 15. A targeted approach is used for identifying any non-compliant WPM which is estimated to be around 10% for all imports. Non-compliant WPM may be inspected, treated, reshipped or destroyed. Inspections take place in transitional facilities, which handle all imports including those not inspected by MPI inspectors. Shane suggested that a focus for improving implementation was on importing countries identifying priority pathways associated with pest detections and non-compliance and attempting to address these issues in the first instance.

2.3.9 Philippines

Ms. Joan-May Mozo of the Philippines' Department of Agriculture provided a summary of ISPM 15 implementatiin the Philippines. ISPM 15 was implemented in June 2005, with revised implementation in January 2011. The regulations in place cover both imports and exports.

Treatment procedures are aligned with the Australian Fumigation Accreditation Scheme (AFAS) and facilities are licensed by government authorities. There are currently 76 MB and 27 HT facilities. All treatments are being supervised by the quarantine service, but Philippines are moving to a risk-based approach. Less than 5 notifications of WPM non-compliance per year have been received since 2005. When non-compliances are notified an investigation is conducted and provide sanctions undertaken if required. Approaches for import inspections are moving from mandatory to risk-based approach. For imports, WPM only requires the mark, but exports may also require a treatment certificate or phytosanitary certificate.

2.3.10 Singapore

Ms. Ong Ai Khim from Plant Health Centre, Sembawang Research Station, Singapore provided a presentation on Singapore's experience of implementing ISPM 15. ISPM 15 is currently not implemented for imports in Singapore, but is implemented for exports. All 48 treatment providers are accredited under the Treatment Provider Scheme (TPS) and must adhere to the requirements stated in the TPS. Auditing of companies is undertaken, and the companies also have to be licensed by government agency in order to conduct treatments. Conditions for suspension and reinstatement associated with non-compliances.

Challenges encountered in addressing non-compliances include:

- Limited resource available to check and audit
- Time required to train technically competent staff
- There is need to promote a greater appreciation and awareness on the importance of plant health and phytosanitary measures
- Appeals against sanction are common, so often there is a delay in reporting back on non-compliance notifications.

2.3.11 Thailand

Thailand presented on their experience of ISPM 15 implementation. Thailand has implemented ISPM 15 for export since 2004. Registration for treatment providers and for ISPM mark providers is required. Auditing for registration of treatment providers is also required. Treatment providers are monitored once per year and renewed every year depending on record keeping, the undertaking of an unannounced audit, any non-compliance notifications, and treatment demonstration. There are 470 registered MB companies and 345 registered HT companies in Thailand. A two-step process for non-compliance exists involving the issuing of a warning firstly, followed by the suspension and corrective actions being required. The problems and constraints for ISPM 15 implementation are:

- Thailand haven't implemented ISPM 15 for importation as it would take many resources to administer
- There is a lack of auditors to conduct unannounced audits

- Fraudulent use of marks exists
- Limited record keeping
- Treatments used may not be in the standard
- Invalid registration numbers are used on occasion

2.3.12 United States

Mr. Tyrone Jones from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) presented on the experience of ISPM 15. Imports regulations for ISPM 15 were implemented in 2002 and exports regulations in 2006. For exports, there is a three tier audit program, involving inspection agencies auditing manufacturers and the American Lumber Standards Committee (ALSC) audits the inspection companies for HT providers and the National Wood Pallet and Container Association overseeing inspection companies for fumigation providers.

For imports, WPM enforcement is undertaken by Customs and Border Protection targeted through manifest and physical inspection of shipments.

Challenges to implementing ISPM 15 include:

- Handling dunnage of bulk carriers
- Identifying shipments for inspection
- Ensuring education of all sectors of industry
- Verifying ISPM 15 compliance for non-agricultural shipments

2.3.13 Vietnam

Dr Duong Minh Tu from Vietnam's Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development presented on Vietnam's ISPM 15 experiences. Vietnam's legislation focussing on the regulation of wood packaging was developed in 2009 and applies to exports. The technical regulations describe limits of remedial measures for WPM, and apply to organisations and individuals practicing fumigation and heat treatment. There are currently 35 companies approved for fumigation and are published on Vietnam NPPO website. New legislation on Plant Protection and Quarantine will come into enforcement for imports in January 2015.

3. ADDRESSING NON-COMPLIANCE

3.1. Country reports on experiences for managing non-compliances, including non-compliance notification

3.1.1. United States

Mr. Tyrone Jones from the USDA presented non-compliance information from the USA perspective. Reporting was completed at the end of each month, although identifications were

done initially around whether a forest pest within 24 to 48 hours, with final identifications not normally completed for 2 to 3 months. Some of the major pest groupings intercepted was pests from Cerambycidae, Syricidae and Buprestidae families. The highest risk commodities were manifested WPM, machinery, metal products and stone products.

Mr. John McDaniel from the ALSC commented that information provided in the ISPM standards on non-compliance may not provide sufficient guidance for notification of WPM to trading partners. Traceback for WPM can be difficult where the treatment of the wood is not provided by the manufacturer of the WPM. In many cases manufacturers are getting wood from multiple sources. It was suggested that a report should be issued as soon as possible on finding a quarantine pest, as this gives the best chance for the NPPO to detect problems and undertake corrective actions. John provided a list of information that would be extremely helpful for following up on non-compliances:

- Detailed shipping records
- Digital pictures of suspect WPM showing all marking that appear on the suspect WPM
- The actual size of the infected piece as well as a listing of all markings observed on those pieces
- Surface condition of the infested components
- Moisture content of the infested pieces if possible
- Any other additional marking that could trace back to the manufacturer (e.g. US and Canada lumber has additional marking for HT as part of lumber industry, and this mark is useful to apply trace back to the lumber company)

3.1.2. Australia

Mr. Peter Creaser presented on Australia's non-compliances of imports and exports. There have been 24 non-compliances for imports since January 2014, and these are associated with either the detection of live insects or incorrect use of the mark. Non-compliances are reported to the exporting country, and the WPM destroyed, returned or treated depending on the perceived biosecurity risk. Supplier importer profiles are developed, with full unpack and inspections for next 5 consignments, and targeted surveys and profiles required for emerging issues.

For non-compliances in exports, Australia receives up to 4 non-compliance notifications per year, and the majority are related to no ISPM mark on export WPM. DOA follows up on notifications received and reports back with the course of actions undertaken. Peter presented a case of fraudulent activity where stamp had been passed on to other company and was used without treatment, whereby enforcement actions are being considered. Ways to improve compliance for consideration include:

- Providing a new round of communications to promote ISPM 15 to industry
- Communicating successful prosecutions

- Better using technology to reduce risk of fake stamps, perhaps by developing a unique identifier embedded in the mark
- Investigating other means of registering and auditing establishments for ISPM 15 that will improve transparency and accountability

3.1.3. China

Ms. Zhang Jiangqiu from the Chinese Academy of Inspection and Quarantine presented. Is a research organisation to undertake technical support for AQSIQ. Statistics show increasing non-compliances, with pest interception rates at 0.035% for WPM with then IPPC mark, and 0.925% for WPM without the IPPC mark. WPM from USA, Germany and Korea provide the highest non-compliant WPM. These interceptions included detections of a significant number of nematodes, which were frequently found to be Pinewood Nematode.

Automatic notifications are sent to the USA, Canada, Mexico and European Union which is tabulated and made available on a website. The largest automatic notifications were for no IPPC mark associated with WPM. China does not send regular notifications of pest interceptions to all countries as there are a large number of interceptions and non-compliance associated with WPM from over a hundred countries, which would require significant resources. Therefore there has been a focus on working with a fixed number of countries to date. China would like to send automatic notifications to more countries, and this is the objective in the future.

Ms. Han Lelin from AQSIQ provided an analysis of the notifications of non-compliance for export cargoes. A procedure is in place for handling notifications of non-compliance received from other NPPOs, including communication between AQSIQ and CIQ. Notifications come from 15 countries and these notifications were seen to be largely reflective of trading volume in terms of the countries involved. Types of commodities commonly notified included wood materials, mechanical or electronic products, metal and stone products etc. Reasons for notification by the exporting country could be summarised into three groups:

1. No ISPM 15 marks or unqualified marks
2. Pests found, including objects prohibited (e.g. bark)
3. Other reasons, such as non-conformity with the quarantine procedures of importing countries

Based on China's investigations the reasons for the non-compliant WPM included:

1. Unfamiliarity with the ISPM 15 standard, and export enterprises use untreated wood or not stamped, or not compliant (e.g. bark)
2. Fake information provided by the export enterprises (i.e. forgery of mark)
3. Improper quarantine storage and transport with non-compliant operations (i.e. potential reinfestation)
4. Improper treatment measures by processors
5. Other reasons, such as repeated notifications

3.1.4. Japan

Mr. Takashi Kawai presented from non-compliance notification in Japan. Total number of notifications from trading partners for Japanese exports has reduced from 29 to 13 between 2011 and 2013. 84% of non-compliances were for the absence of the required mark, with 7% related to the detection of quarantine pests. The Japanese NPPO investigates each case and takes necessary actions depending on the outcomes of the investigation.
For imports, WPM with required mark then import inspection is unnecessary, although quarantine pests are occasionally discovered. The number of import non-compliances was below 20 per year between 2007 and 2013. Actions to improve the compliance with ISPM 15, include strengthening verification activities to confirm whether imported WPM complies with ISPM 15, and quick notifications of non-compliance to the exporting country, and increasing publicity activities to disseminate information on importing and exporting WPM and the need to comply with ISPM 15.

3.1.5. Malaysia

Mr. Yusuf Othman presented on Malaysia's management of non-compliances. For exports from Malaysia, the company associated with the non-compliance notification will be investigated. If the company is proved to be the cause of the non-compliance, they will be suspended until corrective actions have been undertaken. After 3 consecutive warnings of unsatisfactory corrective actions, then they will be delisted.

For imports into Malaysia, records on the non-compliance will be sent to a central unit, and collection of information undertaken. All new interceptions of WPM with live insects will be destroyed or treated based on identification of the insect found.

Mr. Othman provided a list of the information required for traceability which should include:

- Treatment provider registration number
- Treatment type
- Exporter name and address
- Last port of departure and name of the exporting country
- Batch/running number

3.1.6. Singapore

Ms. Ong Ai Khim provided a summary of non-compliances for WPM associated with Singapore's exports. There are less than 20 interceptions per year resulting in the notification of non-compliances to Singapore, with the majority being for no marking on the WPM. There are several difficulties for managing non-compliances and undertaking further action, including because some exporting companies are foreign companies, there is inadequate information provided in the non-compliance notification, and notifications are received at 6 monthly intervals which makes it more difficult to undertake tracing and corrective actions. A list of suggestions for improving non-compliance notification was made, including:

- Establishing a timeframe for notification, corrective actions and reporting on corrective actions
- Communicating between with operational personnel of trading partners, besides through the IPPC contact point, and
- Providing more adequate information to enable appropriate investigation e.g. name and address of exporter, documents, distinguishing marks etc.

3.1.7. Thailand

Mr. Chusak Wongwichalcum from Thailand's Department of Agriculture outlined that non-compliances for exports from Thailand are related to no marking, live insects found on WPM at the port of entry, and live insects found after a period of time associated with WPM. Types of WPM that have been notified include pallets and cases. Any non-compliances associated with exports involved an investigation conducted by an auditor of the corresponding company. Any company found to be the cause of the non-compliance will be suspended or their registration number withdrawn and corrective actions must be done.

3.2. Information on Use of the Symbol

A handout was passed out on legal requirements for use of the ISPM 15 mark and was read by participants and translated to Chinese. As of June 2014, 114 countries have now registered the ISPM15 symbol (not the total mark which is not unique). FAO is the owner of the symbol and the only way to control the mark is to control the symbol. Countries that wish to internationally harmonise their legislation and/or regulation of WPM should follow the guidance and requirements set out in ISPM 15 when developing national legislation and/or regulations. FAO do not need to be involved, if there is national legislation or regulations that could enforce specific use of the symbol. In addition, the NPPO may also request FAO to provide a 'cease and desist' notice to the company to person who is using the mark without permission, and can do this even in countries where the symbol is not registered. If the unauthorised use continues, the NPPO may request FAO permission to prosecute the offender on behalf of the FAO with associated costs to be borne by the NPPO or contracting party. This option is only applicable in countries where the ISPM 15 symbol is registered. It was advised that this information is important to take back to each NPPO.

Further discussion was had on NPPOs authorising companies in their countries to enforce the use of this mark. FAO only owns the symbol, and the contracting parties (i.e. the NPPOs) have authorisation for use of the mark. It was advised that NPPOs could extend the use of the mark to companies themselves, and each country could apply this in national legislation or regulations. It was highlighted that the model phytosanitary certificate is a good example where the contracting parties are responsible for developing and enforcing the use of the phytosanitary certificate for goods from the country. A suggested recommendation is to get FAO to make an official legal statement on the status of the symbol and to make it clear that contracting parties have authorised use of the symbol and mark.

4. Group Discussions

The participants split off into two groups for discussion on a separate topic. The first group was on the topic of general ISPM 15 implementation, including the following topics:

1. Key component of certification system
2. Control of the mark (roles of NPPO, IPPC, industry)
3. Communication between other countries e.g. contact point
4. Manual/explanatory document and what else needs to be included

The second group focussed on non-compliance and notifications, and the topics this group covered were:

1. Non-compliance – marked and unmarked, and how to improve compliance
2. Fraudulent mark/stamp
3. Components of notification
4. How to increase notifications in timely manner
5. What kind of pests are we worried about

Each group reported back on a list of proposed recommendations which would help to improve the implementation of ISPM 15 and to address non-compliances. A small working group was used to compile these recommendations into a document for discussion on the last day of the workshop.

5. Field Visit

On Friday 13 June, a field visit was undertaken by participants to Tianjin Municipality to visit the Beijiang Concentrated Inspection Field for International Logistics to view inspections of WPM being carried out by the Tianjin Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau. Participants also visited the New Found (Tianjin) Packaging Industry Science and Technology Co. Ltd to view the manufacturing, treatment and marking of ISPM 15 compliant WPM. This day was hosted by China's Ministry of Agriculture.

6. Discussion on Workshop Recommendations

A document was presented on Saturday outlining proposed action points and recommendations from the workshop. The participants were allowed time to read this draft document. Once reviewed, Discussion was made on the specific text which provided the actions and recommendations from the workshop.

The following recommendations were concluded:

Improved guidance

1. NPPOs of the APPPC, NAPPO and from other regions with technical experience should share information related to their procedures by posting these on the NPPOs area of the International Phytosanitary Portal and submitting them to the Secretariat for consideration by Capacity Development Committee for posting on the phytosanitary resources page. In particular, examples for procedures for:
    - Evaluating heat chambers
    - Developing heat treatment schedules which use ambient temperatures as an alternative to core temperatures
    - Protecting the mark
    - The use of third party and international accreditation systems
    - Undertaking enforcement actions related to non-compliant use of the mark
2. Request the author to amend the explanatory document on ISPM 15 to add examples on measuring methyl bromide fumigation concentrations at varying intervals and to reference the technical information identified in #1 above.
3. Request the International Forest Quarantine Research Group to develop and disseminate guidance on:
    - Examples of contaminating pests which may be found associated with wood packaging materials;
    - Infestation of wood packaging following treatment, and
    - How to properly use temperature measurement sensors

Harmonised best management practices for NPPOs

1. Recognizing that NPPOs overseeing the manufacture of wood packaging used in exports are important in achieving compliance through the establishment of an effective management system, exporting NPPOs should clearly outline and communicate to stakeholders the responsibilities of all parties involved in the system
2. NPPOs should cooperate with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in the process of FAO registering the ISPM 15 symbol in their country.
3. NPPOs should ensure that they possess the appropriate legislative and regulatory authorities needed to control and enforce proper use of the mark.
4. NPPOs should consider the addition of information outside the ISPM 15 mark such as: serial numbers, date codes, batch codes, etc. This information along with any corresponding supporting production data may assist in improving traceability.
5. NPPOs should add or update information on the "Create the ISPM 15 implementation page" on the IPP. NPPOs should consider posting examples of nationally approved marks which would allow trading partners to determine if marks are legitimate.
6. Notification of non-compliant imports should be provided promptly in accordance with ISPM 13. The workshop participants recommended notification within 1 month. If the wood packaging is not marked, the notification should be provided to the NPPO of the

exporting country. If the wood packaging is marked, the notification should be provided to the country in which the wood packaging material was marked.

7. NPPOs should cooperate in developing more efficient ways (in addition to the official contact point) in transferring non-compliance information between countries such as electronic exchange in order to assist with expedient follow-up by exporting countries.
8. NPPOs should ensure that their contact information on the IPP is current and up to date and should consider communicating a specific contact point for issues related to wood packaging.
9. NPPOs should be encouraged to follow ISPM 13 for notifications of non-compliance which should include the following information:
    - General information of the consignment (e.g. information on the quantity of wood packaging material involved)
    - Information on the ISPM 15 mark
    - Any other markings appearing on the wood (e.g. grade marks, etc.)
    - Photographs of the wood packaging materials and marks involved
    - Information on the pests involved including the life stage of pest and possible identification (specimens should be maintained)
    - Additional shipping and export information, if available
    - Date and description of actions taken
10. Notifications of non-compliance related to ISPM 15 should not be made for contaminating pests.
11. There may be a difficulty with treating large sized dunnage. Therefore, NPPOs should pay particular attention to monitoring the treatment of dunnage.
12. NPPOs should undertake outreach and education particularly of those exporters found to be using non-compliant wood packaging materials.
13. NPPOs should consider cooperating and sharing resources and materials in conducting outreach.
14. NPPOs should publicise enforcement actions, to the extent possible, to discourage non-compliance.
15. NPPOs should strengthen international cooperation (e.g. innovation, exchanges, technical visits, etc.) to improve implementation and compliance

Other recommendations

Workshop participants agreed to encourage their representatives to CPM to consider requesting:

1. FAO to provide documentation to contracting parties clearly indicating that NPPOs have the authority for the proper use of the mark including the symbol.
2. Revision to ISPM 15 to consider the addition of security elements such as date stamps, serial numbers, etc. to the ISPM 15 mark which may provide additional traceability.

3. An international workshop on ISPM 15 to improve harmonised implementation and compliance.
4. The development of a harmonised format and electronic exchange system on the IPP for the transfer and receipt of the notification of non-compliance

7. Closing of the meeting

The meeting was closed with concluding statements from several participants. Mr. Wu Lifeng, a representative from China stated that the meeting had been very inspiring and fruitful and, and hoped all participants enjoyed their visit to China.

Mr. Ian McDonnell thanked the Chinese hosts, and Dr Piao for working closely on the agenda, and hoped there continued to be further co-operation between APPPC and NAPPO.

Dr Piao Yongfan thanked everyone for their cooperation in ensuring that the meeting provided an opportunity to share experiences and lessons associated with the implementation of ISPM 15. The workshop also provided a clear picture of the status for at least 15 countries in the Asia-Pacific and North America, and that these types of collaborations may continue in the future. He wished all participants a safe travel home.

Mr. Brent Larson stated that the workshop was a special opportunity for him to link to people doing the work on implementing international standards in their country.

Chairperson Dr. Kyu-Ock Yim concluded the meeting by commenting that the workshop had been very fruitful and she hoped that everyone departed with good memories.

Annex 1

Agenda

Chairperson: Dr. Kyu-Ock Yim, Korea

DAY 1: June 10

Time	Agenda	Presenter	Comments
8:00-9:00	Registration		
9:00-9:30	Welcoming address and introductions	APPPC, NAPPO, MOA-China, AQSIQ-China	
9:30-10:00	Principles of plant quarantine - basic information on the Convention and ISPMs, in particular	Mr.Brent Larson,IPPC Secretariat, Dr. Kyu-Ock Yim, Meeting Chairperson	
SESSION I	The context of ISPM 15		
10:00-10:30	ISPM 15 - History - Why and how the standard was developed – How successful it has been – Current situations on registration – Challenges	Mr.Brent Larson, IPPC Secretariat	Including question and answer session
10:30-11:00	Break		
11:00-12:00	ISPM 15 – Technical basis – Economic damage caused by pests that are eliminated by correct implementation of the standard – Scientific basis of the treatments(eg. to seek scientific evidence to calculate core temperature by using room temperature) – Analysis of interceptions based on wood packaging type	Scientific experts Dr.Eric Allen, Int. Forest Quarantine Research Group	Including question and answer session
SESSION II	Implementation of ISPM 15		
12:00-12:30	Practical guidance on implementation – Regulated commodities (pallets, crates, boxes, dunnage, etc.) – How to implement the various components of ISPM 15 – Phytosanitary certificates	Mr.Shane Sela, CFIA , author ISPM 15 explanatory document Australia's import policy	Including question and answer session
12:30-14:00	Lunch		
14:30-15:00	Practical implications of implementation: - Result of survey in APPPC on implementation of ISPM 15 - Technical and practical implementation of the treatments, marking system	Chair of APPPC implementation working group –Dr. Yim Rep. of Korea (NPPO)	Including question and answer session

Time	Agenda	Presenter	Comments
	– Options for program delivery (third-party) – Control of the ISPM 15 mark (measures for fighting against the mark's fraudulence; ---Authority to prevent the use of the mark for non-compliance; how to raise the cost for business operators' applying the fake mark) – Use of WCO internet systems to share information	American Lumber Standards Committee, John McDaniel	
15:00-15:30	Break		
15:30-17:00	**Country report on:** 1. Country experiences in implementing ISPM 15 developing and developed countries – What is working well and what can be improved – Approaches for inspection (frequency, sampling rate, etc.) – Types of non-compliances – What does non-compliance mean? Reports by developing countries – Scope to include import and export? – How are non-compliant WPM slipping through NPPO border systems – How to tackle the challenge of reusing WPM when the exporting country is different from the country indicated by IPPC mark.(Exporting country should bear the main responsibility) 2. Current compliance rates and problems encountered by countries trying to address non-compliance – Resource usage in monitoring compliance – Resources required to address new pest introductions – Cooperation in joint inspections	<u>Country experts</u> Australia Canada, Shane Sela China, (Mr.FENG Chunguang, AQSIQ) & (Ms. HAN Lelin) India Japan Korea Laos Malaysia, New Zealand Philippines Singapore Thailand United States, Mr.Tyrone Jones Vietnam	15-20 minutes per country report
17:00-17:15	Day 1 closing remarks	Chairperson	

DAY 2: June 11

Time	Agenda	Potential Presenter	Comments
9:00-9:15	Review of Day 1 and introduction to Day 2	Chairperson	
9:15-10:30	Country report (cont.)		
10:30-11:00	Break		
11:00-12:00	Group discussions on implementation	Facilitators	Discuss presentations and propose recommendations
12:00-12:30	Presentations to plenary session	Rapporteurs	Identify common themes and seek plenary consensus on recommendations
SESSION III	Addressing non-compliance		
12:30-14:00	Lunch		
14:00-15:30	Group discussions on addressing non-compliance	Facilitators	Suggested questions may be provided
15:30-16:00	Presentations to plenary session	Rapporteurs	Identifiy common implementation issues-recommend best practices.
16:00-16:30	Discussion/Q&A	Chairperson	
16:30-17:00	Day 2 Closing Remarks	Chairperson	

Day 3: June 12

Time	Agenda	Potential Presenter	Comments
9:00-9:15	Review of Day 2 and introduction to Day 3	Chairperson	
9:15- 10:30	**Non-compliance notification** – Timeliness – Enhancing efficiency of notifying non-compliance of importing WPM to exporting party – Information required for trace back and trace forward – Pest involved – Minimum information requirements for regulation and commerce – Type of wood packaging involved – Diagnostics (pest ID) – Reporting back – Shipping info (invoice, bill of lading, manifest, exporter, certification number, additional marks, photos) – Report on corrective action	<u>Country experts</u> U.S. (Mr.Tyrone Jones) Australia China (Mr. Zhang Jianqiu) Malaysia Japan Singapore Thailand Vietnam Korea Philippines Cambodia	20 minutes per country report
10:30-11:00	Break		
11:00- 12:30	Non-compliance notification (cont.)		
12:30-14:00	Lunch		

14:30-15:30	Group discussions on non-compliance notification	Facilitators	
15:30-16:00	Presentations on group discussions to plenary	Rapporteurs	
16:00-16:30	Discussion/Q&A	Chairperson	
16:30-17:00	Conclusions of the day	Chairperson	

Day 4: June 13 (Field Visit)

8:00-16:00 Visiting Beijiang Concentrated Inspection Field for International Logistics and the New Found Packaging Industry Science and Technology Co. Ltd.

Day 5: June 14

Time	Agenda	Potential Presenter	Comments
9:00-9:15	Opening remarks	Chairperson	
9:15- 10:30	Field trip Q&As	Chairperson	
10:30-11:00	Break		
11:00- 12:30	Group discussions on recommendations for IPPC on best practices	Facilitators	
12:30-14:00	Lunch		
SESSION IV	Recommendations for Best Practice		
14:30-15:30	Presentations on group recommendations to plenary	Rapporteurs	
15:30-16:00	Plenary Discussion of recommendations	Chairperson	Record consensus recommendations
16:00-16:30	Conclusions of the workshop and next steps	Chairperson	
16:30-17:00	Closing Remarks	APPPC, NAPPO, China	

Annex 2

List of Participants

Australia

1. Dr. Christopher Garry Howard
Risk Analysis, Technical Advice & Timber/Forestry Section
Plant Biosecurity
Biosecurity Plant Division
Department of Agriculture
7 London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
PO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 Australia
Email: Chris.Howard@agriculture.gov.cn
Tel: +61 2 6272 4154
Fax: +61 2 6272 3307

2. Mr. Peter Creaser
Director, Grain and Seed Exports Program
Plant Export Operations
Biosecurity Plant Division
Tel: +61 2 62723355
Email: Peter.Creaser@agriculture.gov.cn

Cambodia

Mr. Uch Sothy
Deputy Director
Department of Plant Protection Sanitary & Phytosanitary
General Directorate of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries
Tel: (855) 12 47 16 87 / 888 47 16 87
Email: uch.sothy@yahoo.com

Canada

1. Mr. Shane Sela
Chief, Forest Product Market Access
Forest Products, Plant Biosecurity and Forestry Division
Canadian Food Inspection Agency
Room 358, 506 West Burnside Rd.,
Victoria, B.C. V8Z 1M5
Canada
Tel. 1+(250) 363-3432 / Fax : 1+ (250) 363-0775
Email : Shane.Sela@inspection.gc.ca

2. Dr. Eric Allen
Research Scientist
Natural Resources Canada
Canadian Forest Service
Pacific Forestry Centre
506 West Burnside Road, Victoria, BC V8Z 1M5
Tel. : 1+ (250) 298-2350, Canada
Fax : 1+ (250) 363-6004
Email : eallen@nrcan.gc.ca

China

1.Mr. Feng Chunguang
Deputy Director of Bio-safety Unit
Department for Supervision on Animal and Plant Quarantine
General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine
Tel: +86 10 8226 1896
Email: fengcg@aqsiq.gov.cn

2.Mr. Lou Xuri
Section Chief
Tianjin Entry and Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau
Tel: +86 13502036889
Email: louxr@tjciq.gov.cn

3.Mrs. Zhang Jingqiu
Professor
Chinese Academy of Inspection and Quarantine
Tel: +86 10 6492 7413
Email: jingqiuzzl@163.com

4.Mr. Wu Lifeng
Director of Division of Plant Quarantine
National Agro-technical Extension and Service Centre
Ministry of Agriculture
Tel: +86 10 5919 4524
Email: wulifeng@agri.gov.cn

5.Mrs. Zhao Wenxia
Deputy Director

Institute of Forestry Ecological Environment and Protection
Chinese Academy of Forestry, State Forestry Administration
Tel: +86 13910632582
Email: zhaowenxia@caf.ac.cn

India

Dr. (Mrs.) Vasudha Gautam
Assistant Director (E)
Dte. Of Plant Quarantine & Storage
Department of Agriculture & Cooperation
Faridabad (Haryana), India
Email: vasudha.gautam@nic.in

Japan

Mr. Takashi KAWAI
Plant Protection Officer,
Yokohama Plant Protection Station,
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
5.57, Kitanaka-dori, Naka-ku, Yokohama
231-0003, Japan
Email : kawait@pps.maff.go.jp

Lao, PDR

1. Mr. Phaydy Phiaxaysarakham
Deputy Director-General
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Lane Xang Avenue, Patuxay Square, P.O. Box 811
Vientiane, Lao PDR
Tel: +856 21 412350
Fax: +856 21 412349
Email: phaydy8@yahoo.com; doag@laotel.com

2. Mr. Souliya Souvandouane
Head of Plant Health Section
Plant Quarantine Division
Email: souliya_ss@yahoo.com

Malaysia

Mr. Yusof Othman
Acting Director, Plant Biosecurity Divison
Department of Agriculture
1st Floor, Wisma Tania
Sultan Salahuddin Road
Kuala Lumpur 50632, Malaysia
Tel: 60-3-2030-1441
Fax: 60-3-2697-7164
Email: yusofothman@doa.gov.my; yusofothman@gmail.com

New Zealand

Dr. Shane Olsen
Manager
Plant and Forestry
Plant Imports & Exports
Ministry for Primary Industries
25 The Terrace, PO Box 2526
Wellington 6140, New Zealand
Tel: 64 4 894 0460
Mobile: 64 21 872 670
Email: Shane.Olsen@mpi.govt.nz

Philippines

Ms. Joan May T. Mozo
Agriculturist II
Bureau of Plant Industry
Department of Agriculture
692 San Andres Street
Malate, Manila, Philippines
Tel: (+632) 404-0409
Email: jomatolents@yahoo.com

Rep. of Korea

1. Dr. Kyu-Ock YIM
Senior Researcher,
Export Management Division,
Dept. of Plant Quarantine /QIA ,
Ministry of Agriculture , Food and Rural Affairs
178, Anyang-ro, Manan-gu, Anyang city
Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea
Tel: 82-31-420-7664, 82-31-420-7665
Fax: 82-31-420-7605
Email: koyim@korea.kr

2. Mr. Young Chul JEONG
Deputy Director
Plant Pest Control Division,

Dept. of Plant Quarantine /QIA
Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
178, Anyang-ro, Manan-gu, Anyang city
Gyeonggi-do, Republic of Korea
Tel: 82-31-420-7632
Fax: 82-31-420-7607
Email: ycjeong9@korea.kr

Singapore

Ms. ONG Ai Khim
Plant Health Centre, Sembawang Research Station
17 Km, Sembawang Road, Lorong Chencharu
Singapore 769194.
Tel: (65) 67530658, (65) 97489034
Email: Ong_Ai_Khim@ava.gov.sg

Thailand

Mr. Chusak Wongwichakorn
Senior Agricultural Research Specialist
Office of Agricultural Regulation,
Department of Agriculture (DOA)
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MOAC)
50 Phaholyothin Rd. Ladyao, Chatuchak,
Bangkok 10900, Thailand.
Tel: +662 249 4384, +6689 825 9430
Fax: 662 249 1799
Email: wongwichakorn@hotmail.com

United States

1. Mr. John Tyrone Jones
Forestry and Forestry Products Trade Director
USDA; APHIS;PIM
4700 River Road, Unit 140, 4C-01.77
Riverdale, MD 20737-1236, USA
Tel.: 1- 301-851-2344 / Fax: 1+301-734-7639
Email: John.T.Jones@aphis.usda.gov

2. Mr. John McDaniel
PRESIDENT
American Lumber Standard Committee
P.O.Box 210
GERMANTOWN, MD, USA 20875
Tel.: 1+301-972-1700 / Fax: 1+301-540-8004
Email: jmcdaniel@alsc.org

3. Mr. Elia Vanechanos
Asia-Pacific Regional Manager
Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)
U.S. Embassy
Beijing, China
Tel: +86-10-85314524/Fax: +86-10-85313033
Email: elia.p.vanechanos@aphis.usda.gov

4. Mrs. Xu Yan
Agriculture Scientist
Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)
U.S. Embassy
Beijing, China
Tel: +86-10-85313071/Fax: +86-10-85313033
Email: yan.xu@aphis.usda.gov

Vietnam

Duong Minh Tu, PhD
Entomologist
Director
Plant Quarantine Diagnostic Centre (PQDC)
Plant Protection Department (PPD)
Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD)
149, Ho Dac Di, Dong Da
Hanoi, Vietnam
Tel/fax: (84) 4 3851 3746
Mob: 0904 101 090
Email: tudm.bvtv@mard.gov.vn

APPPC

Mr. Piao Yongfan
Senior Plant Protection Officer
Executive Secretary of APPPC
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO/UN)

39, Maliwan Mansion, Pra Atit Road,
Banglumpoo
Bangkok 10200
Tel: 66 2 697 4268
Email: Yongfan.Piao@fao.org

IPPC

Mr. Brent Larson
Standards Officer, International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Via delle Terme di Caracalla, 00100
Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06-570-54915
Email: Brent.Larson@fao.org

NAPPO

Mr. Ian McDonell
Executive Director
North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)
1431 Merivale Rd. 3rd Floor, Room 140
Ottawa, Ontario, K1A OY9 - Canada
Tel.: (613) 773-8180
Email: ian.mcdonell@nappo.org
Website: www.nappo.org

Observers

1. Mrs. Chang Xueyan
Section Chief
Division of Plant Protection & Plant Quarantine
Department of Crop Production, Ministry of Agriculture
Tel: +86 10 5919 1451
Email: ippc@agri.gov.cn

2. Mr. Zhao Yuxiang
Deputy Director of Division of Pest Control
Department of Afforestation and Greening, State Forestry Administration
Tel: +86 10 84238513
Email: zhaoyx1221@126.com

3.Mrs. Han Lelin
Agronomist
Center of Standard and Regulation
General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine
Tel: +86 10 8460 3702
Email: hanlelin@tbtsps.com

3. Mr. Yang Yi
Section Chief
Shanghai Entry and Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau
Tel: +86 13564387007
Email: yangy@shciq.gov.cn

5.M r. Lou Shaozi
Deputy Section Chief
Nantong Entry and Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau
Tel: +86 13962963200
Email: lszwp@vip.sina.com

6.M rs. Song Jing
Section Chief
Fujian Entry and Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau
Tel: +86 13600802163
Email: fjciqdz@126.com

7. Mrs. Ruan Leqiu
Deputy Division Chief
Guangdong Entry and Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau
Tel: +86 13570232863
Email: ruanlq@gdciq.gov.cn

8. Mrs. Zhou Lu
Section Chief
Dongguan Entry and Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau
Tel: +86 18925799705
Email: dgzhoulu@163.com

9.Mr. Huang Dezhu
Deputy General Manager
China Certification & Inspection Group Inspection Co. Ltd.
Tel: +86 13488874887
Email: huangdzh@ccic.com

10. Mr. Liu Jinfu
General Manager
Tianjin Xinfuda Wood Industry Co. Ltd
Tel: +86 13702081225
Email: zhiyanlitj@163.com

11. Mr. Yang Jianhong
General Manager
Tianjin Jili Wood Industry Co. Ltd
Tel: +86 13662165152
Email: yangjianhong@jlmy.cn

12. Mr. Wang Lixin
General Manager
New Found (Tianjin) Packaging Industry Science and Technology Co. Ltd.
Tel: +86 13803052349
Email: wanglixin@new-found.com