



منظمة الأغذية
والزراعة
للأمم المتحدة

联合国
粮食及
农业组织

Food
and
Agriculture
Organization
of
the
United
Nations

Organisation
des
Nations
Unies
pour
l'alimentation
et
l'agriculture

Organización
de las
Naciones
Unidas
para la
Agricultura
y la
Alimentación

TECHNICAL CONSULTATION ON BIOLOGICAL RISK MANAGEMENT IN FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Bangkok, Thailand, 13–17 January 2003

REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Technical Consultation on Biological Risk Management in Food and Agriculture met in Bangkok, Thailand, from 13 to 17 January 2003. The list of delegates and observers is attached as *Appendix A*. The aim of the Consultation was to consult Governments on the possibilities to harmonize, where appropriate, methods of risk analysis, to enhance capacity-building where needed, particularly among developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and to establish an official information exchange system on biological risk management in food and agriculture (“*Biosecurity*”). The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) had established a Priority Area for Interdisciplinary Action on *Biosecurity*, to coordinate this process within the Organization. During 2002, consultations had taken place with other relevant international organizations to explore the possibility of cooperation in this field. An Expert Consultation, with nineteen international experts and resource persons, had been held to pave the way for the current Technical Consultation, the results of which would be reported to FAO’s Committee on Agriculture (COAG) at its March 2003 session.

2. The Regional Representative for Asia and the Pacific, Mr. He Changchui, opened the meeting on behalf of the Director-General of FAO. He thanked the Government of Thailand for hosting the meeting. Mr. He noted that the Consultation was the culmination of considerable efforts by FAO and its various partners during 2002, to consider ways in which better management of biological risk in food and agriculture could be developed, and food safety, plant and animal life and health improved, while ensuring environmental sustainability. He observed that *Biosecurity* had until now usually been implemented in a sectorial manner, through food safety laws, animal and plant quarantine, and pesticide regulations, noting some national attempts had been undertaken to achieve efficiencies in the use of national *Biosecurity* capacities, and that global trade required improved coordination among the national bodies responsible for enforcing sanitary, phytosanitary and zoosanitary measures.

3. The aim of *Biosecurity*, Mr. He said, was to protect better human, animal and plant life and health without creating unjustified barriers to trade. The challenge before governments was to develop national and international rules, regulations and standards that are acceptable to all parties, and can be applied in a transparent and fair manner. He suggested that governments consider national regulatory systems and their capacity to meet the requirements of their trade partners, their national food safety systems, and to ensure the protection of animal and plant health. Mr. He requested participants to consider the need for information exchange among

regulatory agencies and the establishment of an Internet based information system to facilitate a regular flow of information among the parties concerned. He requested participants to consider the requirements for capacity building to create a sustainable national infrastructure for *Biosecurity*. The outcome of the Consultation would allow Governments to formulate recommendations at three levels: for activities by Governments themselves, to the FAO in the development of its programme, and to other international organizations involved in *Biosecurity* in food and agriculture, particularly to enhance coordination of activities related to capacity building for developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

II. ELECTION OF THE CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIRS

4. Mr. William Roberts (Australia) was elected as Chair. Ms. Tuanchai Boon-Long (Thailand) was elected as Vice-Chair, and Mr. Abderrahmane Hilali (Morocco) was elected as *Rapporteur*.
5. The Agenda was adopted, as given in *Appendix B*.

III. BIOLOGICAL RISK MANAGEMENT IN FOOD AND AGRICULTURE: SCOPE AND RELEVANCE

6. The FAO Secretariat presented document TC/BRM 03/2, *Biological Risk Management in Food and Agriculture: Scope and Relevance*, which provided background information on the scope and relevance of the evolving concept of *Biosecurity* for food and agriculture. It reviewed the development and evolution of the concept, in the light of changing technologies and of the rapidly increasing scale of global trade and transport. These factors both present countries with opportunities for economic development and raised concerns for the negative impacts of the failure – including catastrophic failure – of biological risk management, on this much larger scale. Countries had responded to this challenge by reviewing and revising their previous *Biosecurity* measures and institutions. There appeared to be growing recognition of the advantages of collaboration between the traditional sectorial structures, to meet the more complex challenges involved, and the recognition of the multiple roles and needs of stakeholders. At the same time, governments face an increasing need to implement obligations in regard to aspects of *Biosecurity* in food and agriculture that they had assumed under international agreements, in a coherent and cost-effective manner. There was a trend toward institutional approaches that bridged the various sectors¹ involved. The same challenges of integration and coherence that governments faced at the national level are faced by the international organizations responsible for the various sectors of *Biosecurity*. The paper described a “whole-cycle” approach to *Biosecurity*, which recognized the sequential stages of hazard identification and risk analysis; policy decisions on this basis; the establishment of legal and regulatory frameworks; monitoring at the point of risk, and surveillance; and remedial action. The paper concluded that though there were substantial benefits in a holistic approach, the specificity of the problems involved meant that there was no one-size-fits all solution; a “toolbox” approach was required that provided a set of proven practices and arrangements to handle the various aspects of risk management in food and agriculture in local, national and supra-national contexts.

7. The Inter-American Institute for the Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) described work it was undertaking with Governments of the Americas to address a number of evolving *Biosecurity* issues, and adapt their agricultural health and food safety infrastructures to rapid changes in

¹ With “agriculture” used in its broadest sense to include agronomy, livestock, forestry, fisheries and related environmental aspects.

production, trade, competitiveness, food security, and public health. This work illustrated numerous examples of the dramatic impacts that diseases and pests may have on production agriculture, trade, competitiveness, public health, food security, tourism and the environment. It also reviewed national regulatory mechanisms, technical capacity and institutional sustainability. Today's reality meant that the agriculture health and food safety institutions involved needed an expanded international vision and broader mandate, and needed to be restructured to include stronger alliances between, and integration of the activities of various ministries. Public and private sector involvement and collaboration were stressed as fundamental in establishing sound agriculture health and food safety systems.

8. The representative for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) noted the value of a collaborative approach to *Biosecurity* that included biosafety in terms of the Cartagena Protocol, and invasive alien species. He welcomed the growing cooperation between the CBD and FAO in moving toward this more collaborative approach to common *Biosecurity* issues.

9. The FAO Legal Office reviewed aspects of the international legal framework relevant to *Biosecurity*. The Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement of the World Trade Organization (WTO) was a major factor resulting in governments implementing common principles of risk assessment and management across sectors, including through the development of agreed international standards, guidelines, recommendations, and procedures in food safety, animal health and plant health. The *Codex Alimentarius* and the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the *Office international des Epizooties* (OIE) were recognized standard-setting bodies in this regard. The importance of trade agreements and their compulsory dispute settlement measures had led to an increasing focus on biological risk analysis approaches among the various international agreements relevant to *Biosecurity* in food and agriculture.

10. The Consultation recognized the advantages of a more coherent, holistic approach to *Biosecurity* that sought synergies among the sectors at national and international levels, without necessarily creating new or unified structures. It further recognized that the integration of various aspects of *Biosecurity* and the institutions involved was occurring in a number of countries. The traditional focus on regulating individual production systems was shifting to one of ensuring confidence in the overall regulatory framework.

11. The Consultation noted that many countries, including developing countries and countries with economies in transition, were revising their *Biosecurity* arrangements to take into account the SPS Agreement, and at the same time seeking greater efficiencies. It recognized the valuable contribution of the development of international standards², which provided countries, particularly small countries, with a means to achieve *Biosecurity* objectives, while reducing the burden of having to implement national risk assessment and management procedures in each individual case. However, external support for capacity-building in many developing countries and countries with economies in transition was crucial to enable them to effect such improvements, including facilitating the development of trade partnerships. It stressed the need to further incorporate developing country perspectives in the development of international standards, guidelines, recommendations and procedures, in ways that took into account local conditions and that facilitated their sustainable economic development. These include countries characterized by the existence of a large number of small farmer communities.

² The term "standards" used in this document includes agreed guidelines, recommendations and procedures.

IV. THE USE OF RISK ANALYSIS IN BIOLOGICAL RISK MANAGEMENT FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

12. The IPPC Secretariat introduced document TC/BRM 03/4, *The Use of Risk Analysis*³ in *Biological Risk Management for Food and Agriculture*, which outlined the wide recognition and acceptance of risk assessment methodologies and procedures across a wide range of disciplines, including for biological risk analysis. Risks are characterized by the existence of hazard and uncertainty, in which context, risk analysis and risk assessment provide information as a basis for decision-making. Decision-making is a distinct process that may consider both the results of risk analysis and other factors.

13. It was noted that there were two major risk models applicable to biological risk analysis: the static “toxicology model” that considered risk as the product of hazard and exposure to the hazard, and the dynamic “adverse event” model that considered risk as the probability of the event occurring and the magnitude of its consequences. In both cases, the concept of risk implies the existence of uncertainties. The relationship of the precautionary approach to the recognition and handling of uncertainty in risk analysis was discussed, and it was noted that precaution is inherent in the consideration of uncertainty and absence of scientific evidence in judgments associated with both risk assessment and risk management. Effective risk analysis procedures also stressed the importance of transparency and risk communication. Moreover, national regulatory authorities are not required to undertake risk assessment in a particular area of *Biosecurity*, if their *Biosecurity* measures are consistent with international standards.

14. The paper reviewed, documented and compared the risk analysis provisions and procedures associated with relevant international regulatory instruments, including *Codex Alimentarius*, the CBD and its Cartagena Protocol, the OIE, the IPPC, and the WTO-SPS Agreement. All employ the same fundamental model, but with procedural variations reflecting different sectorial levels of development, emphasis, and experience. The paper then reviewed the main challenges and opportunities for both national and international organizations. There was an almost universal need for building technical capacity in risk analysis, and for sustainable institutional capacity. There were many opportunities for harmonization and cooperation at both international and national levels, particularly to support decision-making in relation to cross-disciplinary, cross-sectorial hazard.

15. The Consultation recognized the central role of risk analysis as a framework for *Biosecurity*, including across sectors. There was therefore an opportunity to harmonize terminology and methodologies, while respecting the need for individual sectors to tailor risk analysis procedures to the characteristics of the risks involved. It recognized that risk analysis procedures should provide an appropriate basis for *Biosecurity*, while not creating unnecessary barriers to trade. Increased trade was amplifying the need for effective risk analysis capacities, including in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, and for bilaterally and multilaterally agreed standards. In this context, many developing countries and countries with economies in transition have insufficient risk analysis capacities to support *Biosecurity* frameworks for both imports and exports. The Consultation recognized that biological risk analysis across sectors necessarily involves the consideration of complex risks and uncertainties associated with them.

³ Risk analysis as used in this document includes risk assessment, risk management and risk communication, unless otherwise indicated.

V. ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS OF BIOLOGICAL RISK MANAGEMENT IN FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

16. The FAO Secretariat reviewed a variety of cases in which more coherent economic information and analysis could be useful in assisting governments in evaluating and implementing improvements in their *Biosecurity* systems. A number of economic information requirements were identified: examples of the economic consequences of the failure to prevent hazards, and through this, a quantification of the costs of weak or inadequate systems, and consequent losses to production and trade; socio-economic and ecological impacts; the costs and benefits of various risk management processes; and an analysis of the differing costs and benefits of intervention at different points of the “whole-cycle” biological risk management process. Information would be useful on how regulatory costs were shared between exporting and importing partners, and in this context it was noted that major importers often now found greater cost efficiencies in assisting exporters to achieve *Biosecurity* objectives at origin, rather than in relying on *Biosecurity* controls at point-of entry. Recognizing that the sustainability of *Biosecurity* institutions, particularly in developing countries and countries with economies in transition, was a major challenge, a better understanding of the full and possibly incremental cost implications of *Biosecurity* institutions, including of recurrent costs, would be valuable.

17. The Consultation supported the need for a variety of economic analyses in relation to *Biosecurity*. It requested that examples be compiled and analyzed of where pest eradication campaigns or the implementation of improved food standards had resulted in quantifiable export increases. A possible methodology could be developed around an analysis of the values of goods transiting through control and inspection systems, in relation to the costs of such systems. Examples of effective, pooled regional *Biosecurity* standards and procedures were needed. Methodologies were required to document the economic advantages flowing from cross-sectorial cooperation, and of documenting and analyzing the costs and the benefits of public-private sector cooperation, as well as where investments in *Biosecurity* measures had been most successful. A further methodology could consider market opportunities in relation to the *Biosecurity* investments that would be required to realize them.

VI. BUILDING CAPACITY

18. The representative of the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA) described work being undertaken by his organization in the Americas to assist countries to modernize an important area of *Biosecurity*, namely Agricultural Health and Food Safety (AHFS), through technical assistance and investment projects. These aimed to build capacity and promote the modernization of AHFS systems. He noted that the way in which such assistance has traditionally been provided and the lack of innovation to meet changing circumstances had created an imbalance between the demand for such services and the capacity to provide them. Experience in the Americas indicated that dynamic approaches that reach out to the full range of stakeholders in the public and private sector, and help to concretize a common vision, were required. The IICA methodology aims to be easy to understand, to facilitate dialogue, to be adaptable and low-cost, and to enable changes to be tracked over time, so that results may be measured and the methodology improved. It emphasizes action to enhance the functional capacity of agricultural health and food safety systems. A key finding was that there is a crucial need to develop regional support networks and national leadership capacity in the relevant fields to ensure institutional sustainability over time.

19. The IPPC Secretariat described to the Consultation the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) method. This was designed to be used by governments as a self-diagnostic tool, in evaluating their phytosanitary needs and improve their capacities. By use of the PCE, they could create an inventory of the full range of capacities needed for national plant protection organizations to function effectively, and to meet government obligations under relevant

international instruments and international standards. The PCE focuses, in particular, on sustainable institutional development. The second step is the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the actual phytosanitary system, which matches needs against capacity, within the context of the country. The PCE thereby allows governments to formulate a national strategy for capacity building and set targets for the development of their national phytosanitary structures. This national strategy also serves as the basis for seeking technical assistance, and allows both the country and donors to evaluate the results. The IPPC is working with the OIE and the *Codex*, to extend the application of the concept of the PCE to their areas of interest.

20. The Consultation was informed of the initial strategy for capacity building in biosafety in the context of the Cartagena Protocol, supported by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), through a country-driven project implemented by United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). This provides funding for about 110 countries, which have ratified or intend to ratify the Protocol, to help them establish their national capacity to manage living modified organisms. The process of developing a national biosafety framework consists of four phases: setting up the project management structures; gathering basic information on needs and capacities; analysis of that information in consultation with stakeholders; and the drafting of legislation and regulations for the national biosafety framework. In addition, the GEF is assisting twelve Governments⁴ in the implementation of existing frameworks.

21. The Secretariat informed the Consultation that FAO and the World Health Organization (WHO) had developed a draft manual for the establishment of efficient food safety systems at national level. This had been tested in Africa, and would be finalized in 2003. In a similar way to the PCE and the GEF Project, the manual foresaw a thorough inventory of legislation, enforcement capacity, laboratory capabilities and compliance procedures, as well as of the country's participation in international food standard bodies, especially *Codex*.

22. The FAO Legal Office noted that FAO had the largest Development Law Service in the United Nations system. It was currently assisting many countries to prepare legislation for aspects of *Biosecurity*, in cooperation with relevant international bodies, including UNEP, the World Bank and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). It would be possible to create a *Biosecurity* legal advisory programme, which, within the specific objectives and priorities of a government, would inventory laws and institutional capacities and recommend relevant legislation, both within the wider scope of *Biosecurity* and for its individual sectors. FAO was also operating a number of projects to assist countries implement biosafety in food and agriculture (in terms of the Cartagena Protocol), complementing the work of other relevant organizations. The OIE noted that regional capacity building in Asia and the Pacific, in collaboration with FAO, had been particularly useful.

23. The Technical Consultation recognized the central importance of capacity building, in particular to assist developing countries and countries with economies in transition to establish and sustain their *Biosecurity* systems, to meet international *Biosecurity* standards for food and agriculture, and to take advantage of trade opportunities. It welcomed the various initiatives under way. The Consultation stressed that institutional sustainability should be a guiding priority in capacity building. It was agreed that the PCE model and similar tools would be useful in the development of *Biosecurity*-wide capacity building tools, and that relevant international organizations should be associated in such an initiative. The Consultation noted that case studies on institutional development for *Biosecurity* would be valuable, and that governments should take measures to ensure lasting support for their *Biosecurity* organizations.

⁴

Bulgaria, Cameroon, China, Colombia, Cuba, India, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Poland, Uganda.

VII. INFORMATION ACCESS AND EXCHANGE FOR FOOD SAFETY, ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH IN FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

24. The FAO Secretariat introduced document TC/BRM 03/5, *Concept paper for the development of the International Portal for Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health (IPFSAPH)*. The Portal, currently in the development stage, is intended to provide governments with a single access point for official *Biosecurity*-related information, with the full authority for the entry and maintenance of this information remaining with governments. It is an inter-agency initiative, with FAO providing the information technology lead, and can, as governments decide, accommodate a number of sectors within *Biosecurity*. The document described the intended purpose, scope and state of development of the Portal, which is a service to governments, to assist them to meet their international information exchange obligations. The Portal will improve access to official *Biosecurity*-related information, improve transparency and facilitate safe trade in food and agricultural products.

25. The representative for the Convention on Biological Diversity informed the Consultation about the Internet-based Biosafety Clearing-House (BCH) established under the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, noting in particular that the BCH contains various components relevant to *Biosecurity*, such as a database of biosafety capacity building projects and opportunities; a database of capacity-building needs of countries; and a roster of government nominated experts on several aspects of biosafety, including legal issues, institutional development, teaching and training, and risk assessment and management.

26. The Consultation supported the development of the Portal as a valuable database and information tool for *Biosecurity*, which could help bring together the various sectors involved, nationally and internationally. It should be coordinated with other relevant organizations, so as to add value, avoid duplication, and achieve inter-operability. The Consultation noted that countries needed to improve their internal systems for communication and information exchange.

VIII. REPORT OF THE EXPERT CONSULTATION ON BIOSECURITY IN FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

27. Dr. Alfonso Torres, who had chaired the Expert Consultation on *Biosecurity* in Food and Agriculture that had met in Rome in September 2002 to prepare for the current Technical Consultation, presented its report (document TC/BRM 03/3). The main objectives of the Expert Consultation had been to assess the relevance of the wide concept of *Biosecurity* in food and agriculture; to identify the generic components of *Biosecurity*; and to advise FAO on modalities for the implementation of a practical approach to *Biosecurity*, particularly in support of developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

28. The Expert Consultation had concluded that the concept of *Biosecurity*, as used by FAO, was very relevant to national governments. There was a growing public concern for *Biosecurity* issues, including in regard to food safety, animal and plant life and health, and the protection of the environment. The Expert Consultation had stressed the fact that *Biosecurity* was to be understood as “a holistic process and objective of managing biological risks associated with food and agriculture.” *Biosecurity* in food and agriculture bridged a wide range of sectors or interests involved in ensuring the well-being of humans, animals, plants and the environment. The Expert Consultation had recognized that *Biosecurity* frameworks should respect the special needs of each sector.

29. The Expert Consultation had recommended that *Biosecurity* frameworks should be established without creating unnecessary barriers to trade.

30. The Expert Consultation had recognized that the various *Biosecurity* issues were addressed through specific international agreements and instruments. These were usually paralleled at national level by discrete national institutions, which would benefit from improved cooperation and coordination, within a general *Biosecurity* framework. The Expert Consultation had concluded that risk analysis is a unifying concept bridging the various *Biosecurity* sectors. Other generic components included coordinated communication, capacity building and information exchange.

31. In identifying areas of particular importance to FAO in the implementation of a practical approach to *Biosecurity*, the Expert Consultation had encouraged FAO to expand its role in promoting the benefits of a coordinated *Biosecurity* approach, and to encourage all stakeholders to participate in the decision-making process. It had suggested that FAO facilitate *Biosecurity* capacity building, in cooperation with other relevant organizations. It had requested FAO, in collaboration with relevant organizations, to continue the development of an Internet-based portal for the exchange of official information on *Biosecurity* issues.

32. The Technical Consultation expressed appreciation for the thorough and useful preparatory work of the Expert Consultation. It reviewed in detail the recommendations of the Expert Consultation and took these into account in formulating its own recommendations, which follow.

IX. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TECHNICAL CONSULTATION

General

33. The Technical Consultation considered the use of the English term, *Biosecurity*, bearing in mind the need for translation and to harmonize terminology. Delegates noted that the term *Biosecurity* is used widely, and that usage varies among countries. They also noted that the term presents translation challenges, particularly for French and Spanish and translation. Following considerable discussion on terminology, delegates agreed that the term *Biosecurity* in food and agriculture best describes the concept as used by FAO, and recommended that for the purposes of the Consultation and this report, the English term, *Biosecurity* be used in all languages, and that it be italicized and capitalized, and not be translated.

34. The Consultation considered that *Biosecurity* involves the management of biological risks in a comprehensive manner to achieve food safety, protect animal and plant life and health, protect the environment and contribute to its sustainable use. Achieving *Biosecurity* requires an understanding of and the ability to analyse diverse and complex risks, and determine and apply measures in a coherent manner, while respecting differences among sectors and organizations. Risk analysis is the most important unifying concept across different *Biosecurity* sectors. *Biosecurity* systems should not create unjustified barriers to international trade.

35. The Consultation recommended that:

[i] Countries should determine the potential for synergies and harmonization within their national and sub-national regulatory frameworks that would result from a holistic and coordinated approach to *Biosecurity*. Policy-makers should recognise the importance of *Biosecurity* as a key element of sustainable development, and the benefits, including in trade that can be gained from comprehensive approaches to *Biosecurity*.

[ii] Recognising the efficiencies that may emanate from regional and sub-regional approaches to risk analysis, particularly in relation to animal and plant life and health and living modified organisms, countries should also cooperate to address *Biosecurity* issues at regional and sub-regional levels.

[iii] Risk analysis and management frameworks are essential to achieve *Biosecurity*. In the past, such frameworks have been mostly sectorial or used to address specific technical issues. In future

such frameworks should seek to improve collaboration among diverse interests and institutions (particularly agriculture, public health, environment, trade, and their associated stakeholders) to achieve *Biosecurity* in a mutually supportive manner, thus avoiding duplication and possible inconsistencies.

[iv] General principles for risk analysis for biological risk analysis in food and agriculture are the same although procedures may differ depending on the hazards addressed. The IPPC, the *Codex Alimentarius*, the OIE, the CBD and its Cartagena Protocol (noting that the Protocol has not yet entered into force), where appropriate, should apply coherent risk analysis methodologies in different sectors by jointly analysing differences and commonalities in approaches, and use of terms in risk analysis.

[v] Many developing countries and countries with economies in transition have limited infrastructure and limited capacity to undertake risk analysis and to enforce risk management decisions. International standards should thus be developed with due consideration of the implications and impacts on developing countries and countries with economies in transition, including the effect on their ability to participate in international trade. The participation of developing countries and countries with economies in transition in the development of such standards should be supported.

[vi] Countries should implement a more coherent and holistic approach to biological risk management in food and agriculture by the respective government authorities to strengthen the achievement of common *Biosecurity* objectives.

[vii] FAO, in collaboration with relevant international and regional organizations, should provide guidance and develop guidelines to assist countries to develop and implement national *Biosecurity* frameworks in harmony with their international obligations.

[viii] FAO, in collaboration with other relevant international and regional organizations, should consider undertaking further analysis to better understand and advance *Biosecurity*, including:

- analysis of differences, similarities, duplications and gaps, across the various sectors of *Biosecurity*;
- the implications for developing countries and countries with economies in transition of *Biosecurity* standards, procedures and technical regulations; and
- Measures required to establish coherent and mutually supportive *Biosecurity* approaches in relation to food safety, animal health and life, plant health and life, and the environment.

Capacity Building

36. The Consultation stressed the importance of capacity building as the challenges of *Biosecurity* are increasingly placing demands on countries, with urgent needs in particular areas. The Consultation identified the critical need for capacity building for developing countries and countries with economies in transition taking into account both the public and private sector. The Consultation recommended that:

[ix] FAO should work with *Codex*, the IPPC, the OIE, the CBD, and other relevant international organizations to further develop tools, including ways to extend Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) to other sectors, to assist countries analyse their capacity building needs that take account of the full scope of *Biosecurity*, including communicational, legal, institutional, scientific and technical aspects.

[x] Countries should use the tools developed under the above recommendations or other appropriate methodologies to identify, analyze and integrate their *Biosecurity* capacity building needs and determine priorities.

- [xi] Donors should base their support for sustainable capacity building activities on this assessment.
- [xii] In developing capacity building activities, donors and recipients countries should aim to achieve sustainable improvements in *Biosecurity* frameworks.
- [xiii] The roles and responsibilities of both the public and private sectors be considered in planning *Biosecurity* capacity building initiatives.
- [xiv] Appropriate linkages and coordination mechanisms among existing and planned *Biosecurity* capacity building initiatives be established to enhance complementarity and avoid duplication of efforts, and to ensure that sustainable capacity building is directed at country and regional *Biosecurity* priorities.
- [xv] FAO, in collaboration with other relevant international organizations, compile, analyze and summarize examples or cases studies of *inter alia*: economic analysis of *Biosecurity*; establishment of regional *Biosecurity* approaches; and implementation of *Biosecurity* measures, including risk communications measures, and widely share the examples and analysis among member countries and relevant organizations.

Information Exchange

37. The Consultation stressed the need to share information and ensure a better understanding of the requirements for achieving *Biosecurity*. It endorsed the need for an Internet-based portal to facilitate information exchange on *Biosecurity*. It also recognised the importance of information access and exchange in developing *Biosecurity* capacity. The Consultation recommended that:

- [xv] FAO, in collaboration with relevant organizations, give further support to the development of a publicly accessible, Internet-based *Biosecurity* Portal mechanism for exchange of official information on food safety, and animal and plant health and the environment, which would facilitate improved communication among countries in these sectors, noting the need for this mechanism to complement but not duplicate other relevant information exchange mechanisms. The Portal should be user friendly, demand-driven, and be linked with and inter-operable with other relevant portals.
- [xvi] Countries should be encouraged to develop appropriate mechanisms for information exchange in *Biosecurity*, and to participate in the development of the Portal.

Communication

[xvii] Countries should ensure adequate opportunities for appropriate participation of all stakeholders, including members of the public, in addressing *Biosecurity*, and enable them to contribute in meaningful ways to the design and implementation of *Biosecurity* risk management frameworks.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES**

Chairman: Mr W. Roberts
Président : Chief Plant Protection Officer
Presidente: Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry - Australia
GPO Box 858
Canberra ACT 2600
Australia

**Argentina
Argentine**

Ing. Agr. M. Alejandra Sarquis
Ingeniera Agronoma
Dirección Nacional de Mercados
Agroalimentarios
Secretaria de Agricultura, Ganadería, Pesca
y Alimentación
Av. Paseo Colon 922 – PB – 0733
1063 Buenos Aires
Tel. 54.11.434.92756/ 54.11.43492277
Fax. 54.11.434.92244
E-mail:
asarqu@sagpya.minproduccion.gov.ar
asarquis@sinectis.com.ar

**Australia
Australie**

Ms Mary Harwood
Executive Manager
Biosecurity Australia
Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry –
Australia
GPO Box 858
Canberra ACT 2601
Tel: 61.2.6272.5584
Fax: 61.2.6272.3307
E-mail: mary.harwood@affa.gov.au

**Bhutan
Bhoutan
Bhután**

Mr Karma Dorji
Executive Director
Quality Control and Regulatory Services
Ministry of Agriculture
Royal Government of Bhutan
PO Box 1071
Thimphu
Tel: 975.2.327.030/031
Fax: 975.2.327.032
E-mail: karma_d@moa.gov.bt
toepkarma@hotmail.com

Botswana

Dr. O.S. Motsamai
Senior Veterinary Officer
Division of Meat Hygiene and Quality
Control
Private Bag 12
Lobatse
E-mail: osmotsamai@it.bw

Brazil
Bresil
Brasil

Mrs Cristina De A. Possas
Executive Secretary
National Technical Biosafety Commission
Ministry of Science and Technology
CTNBIO
SPO – Area 5 – Quada 3
Bloco B, Terreo 701610
Brasilia, D.F.
Tel: 55.61.411.5516
Fax: 55.61.411.5196
E-mail: cpossas@mct.gov.br

Cambodia
Cambodge
Camboya

Mr Srun Sokhom
Deputy Director
Department of Agronomy and Agricultural
Land Improvement
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and
Fisheries
No. 10 Monireth Street
Phnom Penh
Tel: 855.12.969611
Fax: 855.23.212266
E-mail: 012969611@mobitel.com.kh

Canada

Dr Robin C. McKellar
Food Research Program
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
93 Stone Road West
Guelph, Ontario N1G 5C9
Tel: 1.519.829.2400 X3106
Fax: 1.519.829.2600
E-mail: mckellarr@agr.gc.ca

Chile
Chili

Mr Juan Miguel Fuentes Mardones
Programa de Inocuidad de Alimentos y
Aplicación de Buenas Prácticas Agrícolas
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero
Av. Bulnes 140, 3er piso
Santiago
Tel: 56.2.6719619
Fax: 56.2.6966480
E-mail: miguel.fuentes@sag.gob.ch

China
Chine
Cina

Mr Yongzhong Qian
Director
Division of Technical Quality and Standards
Department of Science and Technology
Management
Chinese Academy of Agricultural Sciences
12 Zhonguanan South Street
Beijing 10081

Dominican Republic
République dominicaine
República dominicana

Mr Ramón Ozoria
Professor de Inocuidad de Alimentos
Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo
Ciudad Universitaria
Santo Domingo
Tel: 809.687.2564
Fax: 809.763.3851
E-mail: ozoria2000@hotmail.com

Ecuador
Ecuateur

Dr Enrique Balda Pesantes
Veterinario – Director de Investigación y
Transferencia de Tecnología
Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería
Dirección de Investigación y Transferencia
de Tecnología
Quito
Tel: 255.3703
E-mail: dittemag@hotmail.com

Egypt
Egypte
Egipto

Dr Tawfik Hafez Abdel Moity
Director of Central Laboratory
for Organic Agriculture
Giza
Cairo
Tel/Fax: 3365.261
E-mail: ecoa@soficom.com.eg
tawfikhafez@myplace.com

Mr Ahmed Hares
Deputy Head of Mission
(Second Secretary)
Embassy of Egypt
Las Colinas Building
Bangkok

Hungary
Hongrie
Hungría

Ms Vezenyi Hajnalka
Veterinary Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Regional
Development
Kossuth Ter 11
1055 Budapest
E-mail: hajnalka.vezenyi@fum.hu

India
Inde

Mr Prem Narain
Joint Secretary
Ministry of Agriculture
Government of India
New Delhi
Tel: 91.11.2410358
E-mail: pnarain@krishi.delhi.nic.in

Indonesia
Indonésie

Mr Sadarisman Suyoko
National Operational Coordinator
Agency for Agricultural Quarantine
Ministry of Agriculture
Gedung E
Lantai 5
Jl. Harsono RM No. 3
Jakarta
Fax. 62.21.781.6483
E-mail: caqsps@indo.net.id

Iran

Dr Mohebbatali Nadri Shahab
Ministry of Jihad-e-Agriculture
Agricultural Research and Education
Organization
Agricultural Biotechnology Research
Institute
Department of Biosafety
Karaj
Tel: 98.261.270.9485
Fax: 98.261.270.4539
E-mail: Man_Shahab@hotmail.com

Jordan
Jordanie
Jordania

Mr Nasser elddin Attalah Mohm'd
Hawamdeh
Epidemiologist
Veterinary Department
Ministry of Agriculture
Tel. 962.6.4126701/2
Fax. 962.6.417901
E-mail: vetjo@index.com.jo
nhawamdeh@www.com

Kenya

Dr Wilson Songa
Assistant Director – Plant Protection
Services
Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service
(KEPHIS)
Waiyaki Way
P.O. Box 49592 Nairobi
Fax: 254.2.444.8940
E-mail : kephis@nbnnet.co.ke

Laos

Mrs Khamphoui Louangrath
Deputy Director of Regulatory Division
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture
Vientiane
Tel: 856.21.412350
Fax: 856.21.412349
E-mail: daog@laotel.com

Malaysia
Malaisie
Malasia

Dr Mohamed Mohd Salleh
Deputy Director
Horticultural Research Centre
Malaysian Agricultural Research and
Development Institute (MARDI)
GPO Box 12301
50774 Kuala Lumpur
Tel: 603.8943.7228
Fax: 603.8948.7590
E-mail: mohdms@mardi.my

Morocco

Maroc
Marruecos

Dr Abderrahmane Hilali
Directeur de la Protection des Végétaux,
Ministère de l'Agriculture
B.P. 1803 DPVCTRF
Rabat
Tel : 212.3.729.7543
Fax : 212.3.729.7544
E-mail: ahilali@menara.ma
dpvctf@nomade.fr

Mozambique

Ms Armanda Gani
Senior Nutritionist
Ministry of Health
Nutrition Division
P.O. Box 264
Maputo
Tel/Fax : 258 (1) 321738
E-mail : armandagani@hotmail.com

Nepal

Mr Tika Karki
Director General
Department of Food Technology and
Quality Control
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Babar Mahal
Kathmandu
Tel: 977.1.262.369
Fax : 977.1.262337
E-mail: tika_bd8@tbk.whsik.com.np

Niger

Mme Diafarou Aissatou Cissé
Responsable Cellule Nutrition Alimentation
Ministère Développement Agricole
Direction Agriculture
BP 323 Niamey
Tel : 227.75.23.35/93.15.04
Fax : 227.72.27.75

Oman

Mr Nasar Bin Ali Al-Wahaibi
Director General of Animal Health
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
P.O. Box 182
Code 117
Muscat
E-mail: nalwahaibi@hotmail.com

Philippines Filipinas

Mr Gilberto F. Layese
OIC-Director of the Bureau of Agriculture
and Fisheries Product Standards
Department of Agriculture
Manila

Samoa

Mr Kirifi Pouono
Assistant Director for Quarantine
Ministry of Agriculture, Forests, Fisheries
and Meteorology
PO Box 1874
Apia
Fax: 685.20103
Email: kpouono@lesamoa.net

Senegal

Dr Mamady Konte
Chercheur à ISRA-Inerv
Ministère de l'Agriculture et Elevage
B.P. 2057 Dakar
Tel: 221.832.12.69/646.63.56
Fax. 221.832.3679
E-mail: mkonte@sentoo.sn

Slovakia Slovaquie Eslovaquia

Dr Peter Siekel
Ministry of Agriculture
Food Research Institute
Priemyselna 4
P.O. Box 25
83145 Bratislava 26
Tel: 42.1.555.66114
Fax: 42.1.555.71417
E-mail: peter.siekel@vup.sk

Sudan Soudan

Mr Babiker El Mubarak El-Amin
Director of SSMO Airport Branch
Sudanese Standards Organization
Khartoum
Fax: 786.222
E-mail: Wadelmubarak@hotmail.com

Mr Khider Gebriel Musa
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Plant Protection Directorate
Khartoum North
Fax: 249.13.337495/249.11.474933

Suriname

Mr Jagdies Bhansing
Director of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture
Animal Husbandry and Fisheries
Letitici Vriesdelaan P.O. Box 1807
Paramaribo
Tel: 470517
Fax: 470301

Thailand **Thaïlande** **Tailandia**

Mr Chavalvut Chainuvati
Deputy Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Rajdamern Nok Road
Bangkok

Mrs Tuanchai Boon-Long
Director of Plant Pathology and
Microbiology Div.
Department of Agriculture
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
50 Paholyotin Road
Bangken
Bangkok 10900

Dr Chanin Charoenpong
Expert in Food Standard
Food and Drug Administration
Tiwanond Road
Nonthaburi 11000

The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia **L'ex-République yougoslave de Macédoine** **Léx-República Yugoslava de Macédonia**

Mr Blagoja Aleksoski
Director
Republik Institute for Health Protection
Skopje

Tunisia **Tunisie**

Mr Zakaria H'mad
Directeur de développement des industries
alimentaires
Ministère de l'Industrie et de l'énergie
Rue 8011 Montplaisir
1002 Tunis

Uganda **Ouganda**

Mr Komayombi James Bulegeya
Assistant Commissioner
Regulation and Certification
Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry
and Fisheries
P.O. Box 102 Entebbe

Dr Abdul Ndifuna
Microbiologist
Ministry of Tourism, Trade and Industry
Plot M217 Nakana Industrial Area
Kampala

United Arab Emirates **Emirates Árabes unis** **Emiratos Árabes unidos**

Mr Ahmed Al-Muaini
Director of Ministers
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
P.O. Box 1509
Dubai
E-mail: almuaini-maf@uae.gov.ae

Uruguay

Dr Héctor J. Lazaneo
Director
Food Safety Division
Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and
Fisheries
Constituyente 1476
Montevideo
Tel: 598.2.412.6346
Fax: 598.2.412.6317
E-mail: hlazaneo@mgub.gub.uy

Zambia Zambie

Dr Bruce Mukanda
Principal Veterinary Officer
Epidemiologist
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
Lusaka

**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
ORGANISATIONS INTERNATIONALES
ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES**

Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC)

Mr David Byron
Food Standards Officer
Secretariat, Codex Alimentarius
Commission
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.57054419
Fax: 39.06.57054593
E-mail: david.byron@fao.org

Convention on Biodiversity (CBD)

Mr Ryan Hill
Programme Officer, Scientific Assessments
Biosafety Programme
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
393 St-Jacques Street, Suite 300
Montreal, Quebec
Canada H2Y 1N9
Tel: 1(514)287.7030
Fax: 1(514)288.6588
E-mail: ryan.hill@biodiv.org

European Association of Animal Production (EAAP)

Mr David Steane
European Association of Animal Production
Villa del Ragno
Via Nomentana 134
00161 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.863.29141
Fax: 39.06.863.2963
E-mail: eaap@eaap.org

Inter American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA)

Mr Kevin Walker
Director
Agricultural Health and Food Safety
IICA
PO Box 55-2200 Coronado
San José
Costa Rica
E-mail: kwalker@iica.ac.cr

**International Plant Protection
Convention (IPPC)**

Dr Robert Griffin
Coordinator
International Plant Protection Convention
Secretariat of the International Plant
Protection Convention
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.57053588
E-mail: Robert.Griffin@fao.org

Dr David Nowell
Agricultural Officer
Secretariat of the International Plant
Protection Convention
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.57052034
E-mail: David.Nowell@fao.org

**International Union of Forest Research
Organizations (IUFRO)**

Dr Norwati Muhammed
Head of Genetic Unit
Forest Research Institute Malaysia
Kepong
52109 Kuala Lumpur
Malaysia
Tel: 603.627.97085
Fax: 603.62797856
E-mail: norwati@frim.gov.my

Office International des Epizooties (OIE)

Dr Teruhide Fujita
OIE Regional Coordinator for Asia and the
Pacific
1-1-1 Minami-Aoyama
Minato-ku
Tokyo 107-0062
Tel: 81.(0)3.5411.0520
Fax: 81.(0)3.5411.0526
E-mail: oietokyo@tky.3web.ne.jp

**United Nations Environment Programme
(UNEP)**

Mr Per Sorenson
Programme Officer
UNEP/RUAP
Bangkok

Observers

Ms Walaiporn Tongmongkol
Senior Policy and Plan Analyst
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity
and Food Standards
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
Rachadamnern Ave.
Bankok 10200

Mr. Somsak Kosokwatana
Senior Land Reform Officer
National Bureau of Agricultural Commodity
and Food Standards
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
75/77 Soi Kamnanman Ekachai Road
Bangbon
Bangkok

Mrs Krissana Suhkumparnich
Senior Food Technologist
Fish Inspection and Quality Control Div.
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
Kaset Klang
Chatuchak
Bangkok 10900

Mrs Patcharee Meenakanit
Senior Subject Matter Specialist
Pest Management Disease Bureau
of Agricultural Product Quality Development
Department of Agricultural Extension
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
10/S Soi Prachachuen
Prachachuen Road
Bangkok 10800

Ms Sastorn Kanarat
Senior Veterinary Officer
Department of Livestock Development
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
Phhyathai
Bangkok 10400

Mr Preecha Dhammaniyom
Senior Scientist
Department of Science Service
Ministry of Science and Technology
Rama 6 Road
Ratchathewi Bangkok 10400

Mrs. Nonglak Ratanarak
Senior Scientist
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
50 Paholyotin
Chatuchuk
Bangkok 10900

Mr Sompong Nimchuar
Senior Foreign Relations Officer
Department of Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
Kaset-Klang Jatujak
Bangkok 10900

Mr Somchai Komolyingcharoen
Senior Food Specialist
Ministry of Public Health
Food Control Division
Food and Drug Administration

Mr Pinit Korsieporn
Director
Foreign Agri. Relations Division
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
Rajdamnern Ave.
Bangkok

Mr Kasem Prasutsanchan
Plan and Policy Analyst
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
Rajadernern Nok, Bangkok

Mr Thamachat Pongsopa
Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
(MOAC)
Rajdamnern Ave.
Bangkok

Dr Nares Damrongchai
Policy Researcher
Biotechnology Policy Study Program
National Center for Genetic Engineering and
Biotechnology
National Science and Technology
Development Agency
113 Paholyothin Road
Klong Luang, Pathumthai 12120

FAO (Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific)

Mr Changchui He
Regional Representative for Asia and the Pacific
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
39 Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: 662.697.4222
Fax: 622.697.4445
E-mail: Changchui.He@fao.org

Dr Chong-Yao Shen
Regional Plant Protection Officer
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
39 Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Tel: 662.697.4268
Fax: 622.697.4445
E-mail: Chongyao.shen@fao.org

Mr Pijush Kanti Saha
Technical Officer (Plant Protection)
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
39 Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand

Mr P.K. Mudbhary
Policy Officer
Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
39 Phra Atit Road
Bangkok 10200
Thailand

FAO Secretariat

Mr N.A. Van der Graaff
Chief
Plant Protection Service
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.57053441
E-mail: Niek.VanderGraaff@fao.org

Ms Irene Hoffmann
Chief
Animal Production Service
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.57052796
E-mail: Irene.Hoffmann@fao.org

Mr Lawrence Christy
Chief
Development Law Service
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.57053216
E-mail: Lawrence.Christy@fao.org

Mr Andrea Sonnino
Senior Agricultural Research Officer
Research and Technology Development Service
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.57055499
E-mail: Andrea.Sonnino@fao.org

Mr Clive Stannard
Senior Liaison Officer
Secretariat of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.57055480
E-mail: Clive.Stannard@fao.org

Dr Ezzeddine Boutrif
Senior Officer
Food Quality and Consumer Protection
Group
Food and Nutrition Division
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00100 Rome
Italy
Tel: 39.06.57056156
Fax: 39.06.57054593
E-mail: Ezzeddine.Boutrif@fao.org

Resource persons

Dr Julian Kinderlerer
Professor of Biotechnology Law
University of Sheffield
Conduit Road
Sheffield S10 1FL
United Kingdom

Mr Richard Laing
FAO Consultant
275 Woodbridge Dr. SW
Calgary
Canada

Dr Eric Schoonejans
Intergovernmental Committee for the
Cartagena Protocol – Bureau Member
Biotechnology MEDD/DPPR
20 Av. de Segur
75307 Paris 07
France
Tel: 33.142191417
Fax: 33.142191467
E-mail: [eric.schoonejans
@environnement.gouv.fr](mailto:eric.schoonejans@environnement.gouv.fr)

Dr Alfonso Torres
Associate Dean for Veterinary Public Policy
College of Veterinary Medicine
Cornell University
Upper Tower Road
Ithaca, NY 14853
USA

Dr Julian Thomas
Consultant
Via Braccianese 199
00123 Rome
Italy
E-mail: julianathomas@compuserve.com

Appendix B



**TECHNICAL CONSULTATION ON BIOLOGICAL RISK
MANAGEMENT IN FOOD AND AGRICULTURE**

Bangkok, Thailand 13-17 January 2003

Agenda

Agenda Item	Subject	Document Reference
1.	Opening of the Consultation and Nomination of Chair	
2.	Adoption of the Agenda	TC/BRM 03/1
3.	Biological Risk Management in Food and Agriculture: Scope and Relevance	TC/BRM 03/2 TC/BRM 03/3
4.	The use of Risk Analysis in Biological Risk Management for Food and Agriculture	TC/BRM 03/4
5.	Economic Considerations of Biological Risk Management in Food and Agriculture	TC/BRM 03/3
6.	Capacity Building for Biological Risk Management in Food and Agriculture	
7.	Information Access and Exchange for Food Safety, Animal and Plant Health in Food and Agriculture	TC/BRM 03/5
8.	Other Business	
9.	Adoption of the Report	