

REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE INTER-AGENCY LIAISON GROUP ON INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES

GENEVA, 13 JULY 2012

1. Opening of the meeting

1. The third meeting of the Inter-agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species (IAS) took place at the WTO headquarters in Geneva on 13 July 2012. The main purpose of the meeting was to review progress made since the last Liaison Group meeting held at WTO on 14 and 15 February 2011, as well as to discuss new developments on the issue of IAS. The meeting was held immediately after the STDF Seminar on International Trade and IAS, organized on 12 and 13 July.

2. The Chairperson, Gretchen Stanton (WTO), opened the meeting and invited the participants to introduce themselves (See Annex 1 and 2 for the agenda and the list of participants, respectively).

2. Adoption of the agenda and organizational matters

3. The group adopted the agenda proposed in UNEP/CBD/LG-IAS/3/1.

3. Brief report on outcomes of the STDF seminar and follow-up

4. Kenza Le Mentec (STDF/WTO), referred briefly to her summary and closing remarks presented at the end of the STDF Seminar on International Trade and IAS (see Annex 3). She stressed the importance of focusing on the trade aspect of the issue, which had not always been the case during the Seminar. In particular, she highlighted the potential IAS pathway risk embedded inherent in any trade facilitation project. She added that the Liaison Group may wish to consider including the World Bank (WB), which has a trade facilitation programme and fund, and is involved in many of these projects.

5. Geoffrey Howard (IUCN), Ana Peralta (IPPC) and Marceil Yeater (CITES) shared these concerns and referred to trade facilitation projects in Asia and Africa where IAS risks were neglected. In particular, reference was made to a project involving the WB and COMESA to connect South Africa and Cairo, with the main focus being the removal of trade barriers. Also, a study on the implementation of the COMESA green pass had identified IAS as a major threat to Africa. The importance of safe trade and the necessity to involve organizations in charge of these projects was acknowledged. The Chairperson noted that the STDF was planning to work on trade facilitation in 2013. She also indicated that COMESA had just been granted observer status during the SPS Committee meeting held at the beginning of the week.

6. Recalling her statement during the STDF seminar, Sarah Simons (CABI) invited the Inter-Agency Liaison Group to play a central role in the coordination of international activities in the IAS area. To be able to play this role more effectively, the Liaison Group would need to be established more formally, and include other relevant actors, such as e.g. International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the World Customs Organization (WCO). (See also item 6).

4. Brief reports on the global invasive alien species information partnership

7. Junko Shimura (CBD) reported on the organizational workshop for the global invasive alien species information partnership held on 9-10 July 2012 in London. This project, funded by the EU, aims at implementing target 9 of the Aichi targets¹ in a more critical, effective and rapid manner. The

¹ The tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, in 2010, in Nagoya, Aichi Prefecture, Japan, adopted a Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, for the 2011-2020 period. Target 9 addresses IAS.

intention would be to develop a more comprehensive global information system to help members implement their national strategies (NBSAPs). The partnership would be a gateway to facilitate access to existing resources, without duplicating efforts. Jamie K. Reaser (CBD consultant) is the programme coordinator. The project, still at an early stage of development, would be outlined in an operational plan, including its structure. This would be presented at a side event at the CBD COP in October 2012.

8. The WTO asked for additional information and to be kept informed of future developments. This triggered a discussion on the importance of sharing information among the participants to make the Liaison Group more useful (see section 6 below).

9. Junko and Jamie agreed to prepare a brief summary report of the workshop that would be circulated to the Liaison Group participants.

5. Brief progress reports and updates on other matters from each organization, including capacity building activities

10. Representatives of each organization were invited to report on relevant activities, and in particular on training and capacity building activities, undertaken since the last LG meeting.

11. Marshall Meyers (on behalf of IATA) reported that in aviation, most people were unfamiliar with this topic, and in particular with tracking species and considering biodiversity. The difficulty of knowing who to engage on IAS was also raised, as well as worries on becoming an enforcement agency. On the other hand, there were agreements with CITES and OIE on other issues. The IATA representative suggested starting discussing this issue with people from the Live Animal and Perishables Board rather than with people from the Containers area who did not consider containers to be a pathway.

12. Donatella Crosetti (on behalf of FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department) provided information on a recently published training course manual on risk analysis for movements of live aquatic animals available from the FAO website (<http://www.fao.org/docrep/015/i2571e/i2571e00.htm>).

13. Christiane Wolff (WTO) reported on the relevant activities and Specific Trade Concerns raised in the SPS Committee. Several WTO Members had raised concerns about trade restrictions put in place by their trading partners to address alien invasive species, including US measures on chrysanthemum white rust, Thailand's new Quarantine Act, China's measures on salmon from Norway, US measures affecting lemon imports from Argentina, and EU concerns about measures addressing the Schmallenberg virus. Costa Rica had reported that a concern regarding US measures on ornamental plants had been resolved. WTO conducted many regional and national SPS-related training activities, and would be willing to include IAS if training materials were provided or if a speaker from another organization wished to make a presentation.

14. Marceil Yeater reported that the next CITES COP would be taking place in March 2013 and that the Strategic Targets would be revised during that meeting. She reminded the participants that CITES did not have a strong mandate to work on IAS and therefore did not know at that stage what could be their contribution. Nothing had been proposed so far (deadline for presenting documents was October 2012). She could anticipate that some guidelines on ground-air transport would be adopted, and that some reference to the Liaison Group would be made. For the time being, CITES was supportive of the Liaison Group.

15. Brent Larson (IPPC) presented some slides on FAO and IAS as well as a one page document specifically prepared for the meeting (see Annex 4 and 5). He indicated that the material would be updated to include information on FAO fisheries.

16. Masatsugu Okita (OIE) referred to the new publication: Guidelines for assessing the risk of non-native animals becoming invasive`. Reference to this publication had been made in the report of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission (TAHSC) of February 2012. The OIE would continue monitoring members' reactions and interest. He mentioned that an internal website analysis, which would be launched in near future could help in this regard.. The OIE representative informed the group about the regional focal points training events scheduled before the end of the year.

17. Shyama Pagad and Geoffrey Howard (IUCN) reported on training n migration species. Also, all NBSAPs would be mapped to verify that CBD strategic target 9 had been included.

18. In reference to NBSAPs, Jamie K. Reaser (CBD) indicated that since 2000 a top down approach, from regional to national level, had been implemented. This approach had been applied in the Caribbean and in the Pacific.

19. Junko Shimura (CBD) provided information on decisions (regarding pet trade) and guidelines adopted in November 2011, in Montréal. The future work programme had also been discussed and the meeting and there had been recommendations of interest for the Liaison Group. All related documents would be soon available from the CBD Website. Jamie added that SBSTTA-15 (Islands, agriculture, tourism, trade?) and SBSTTA-16 (target 9) would be on the agenda of the next COP.

20. Junko then reported on a workshop for plant experts that would be taking place on 30 July 2012. The training would include plant species identification, project writing to make regional projects, and information on the process to apply for GEF funding and other funding opportunities (Germany). In November, another workshop would be organized with UNEP in Dubai, and in December a taxonomy capacity building for French African countries was scheduled in Dakar, with IUCN and Paris Museum funding.

21. The Chairperson informed participants that a PAN-SPSO project was being organized by the African Union in Dakar as well, at the beginning of December, with EU funding.

6. Future work and objectives of the Liaison Group and administrative matters

22. During the meeting, the question of the objectives and other organizational aspects of the Liaison Group were discussed. While some argued that a more formal structure was needed, others were of the opinion that the identification of catalytic projects to be implemented was more important. The Liaison Group could be a useful coordination mechanism and, by targeting efforts on a specific project, could encourage other people to join. The need to reflect on a plan on how to raise the Liaison Group's profile was also proposed, for example through a high-level meeting.

23. The issue of ownership of the Liaison Group was also discussed, and in particular whether the Liaison Group should be under the CBD's supervision, or on the contrary, independent from any organization. Junko clarified that the CBD recognized this group and encouraged the participating agencies to continue collaborating (COP decision IX/4 A). It was agreed, however, that the question of recognition was another issue, and that discussions should focus, in a first step, on clarifying the Liaison Group's purpose.

24. Another related discussion revolved around the best way of improving coordination and communication among all the participating agencies. Many participants thought that a mailing list would be very useful, but that it required some maintenance. Shyama Pagad (IUCN) offered to host a distribution list. Other suggestions included creating a blog (CBD), to use a dedicated internet portal (CITES-IUCN), or using a restricted work space already set up for this purpose (IPPC). The need to involve other relevant organisations such as the IMO and the WCO was also highlighted.

25. Regarding administration and logistics, participants suggested rotating certain tasks; e.g. the hosting organization could convene the meeting, circulate a draft agenda, and prepare a summary report after the meeting. This way the burden would not be borne by one organization alone.

26. The participants agreed to continue the discussions on the purpose, structure and other related issues at the next Liaison Group meeting. Since the initially suggested dates in September were problematic for several participants, the IPPC/FAO offered to host the next meeting in Rome in February 2013, and proposed to communicate specific dates between 1 and 15 February at a later stage.

27. At the end of the meeting, the group agreed on the following actions:

- Each organization would check internally what its position was on formalizing the Liaison Group.
 - Participants would explore sending letters from heads of organizations to the heads of the World Customs Organization and the International Maritime Organization to convince them to participate in the group.
 - Participants would explore the possibility of organizing a high level meeting on IAS, to raise awareness and visibility of the issue and of the group.
 - The CBD would provide detailed information on how to access relevant COP and SBSTTA documents.
 - The WTO would prepare and circulate a summary report on the Liaison Group meeting for comments.
-

INTER-AGENCY LIAISON GROUP ON INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES

THIRD MEETING

GENEVA, 13 JULY 2012

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

1. Opening of the meeting.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organizational matters.
3. Brief report on outcomes of the STDF seminar and follow-up.
4. Brief reports on the global invasive alien species information partnership.
5. Brief progress reports and updates on other matters from each organization, including capacity building activities.
6. Future work and objectives of the Liaison Group and Administrative matters.
7. Closure of the meeting.

Participants

Inter-Agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species

13 July 2012

CABI

Sarah Simons, Ph.D.,
Director, International Liaison
CABI
United Nations Avenue
P.O. Box 633-00621
Nairobi
Kenya
Tel: +254 (0)20 7224450
Fax: +254 (0)20 7122150
Email: S.Simons@cabi.org
Website: <http://www.cabi.org>

CBD

Junko Shimura
Programme Officer (Invasive Alien Species, Global Taxonomy Initiative)
Secretariat, Convention on Biological Diversity
413 Rue St. Jacques, Suite 800
Montreal, QC H2Y 1N9
Canada
Tel: (direct) (1) 514 287 8706
Fax: +(1) 514 288 6588
Email: junko.shimura@cbd.int

Jamie K. Reaser

Consultant to CBD
President/CEO Congruence, LLC
1207 Bull Yearling Rd
Stanardsville, VA 22973, USA
Tel: +1 434 990-9494
Email: ecos@nelsoncable.com
Website: <http://www.jamiekreaserconsulting.blogspot.com>

CITES

Marceil Yeater

Chief, Legal Affairs and Trade Policy
Regulatory Services
CITES Secretariat
Tel: +41 22 917 84 64
Fax: +41 22 797 34 17
Email: Marceil.Yeater@cites.org

EPPO

Sarah Brunel

Scientific Officer
European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization
21, bd Richard Lenoir
75011 Paris – France
Tel: +33 (0) 1 45 20 77 94
Fax: +33 (0) 1 70 76 65 47
Email: brunel@eppo.int
Website: <http://www.eppo.int>

FAO

IPPC

Brent Larson

Standards Officer,
International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat,
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations,
AGP, Room B-764, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla,
00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: +39 06-5705-4915
Mobile: +39 340-699-9546
Fax +39 06-5705-4819
Email: Brent.Larson@fao.org
Website: <http://www.ippc.int>

Ana Peralta

Implementation Officer
International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat
Plant Production and Protection Division
Tel: +39 06 57055322
Fax: +39 06 57054819
Email: Ana.Peralta@fao.org

Stephanie Dubon

Stephanie.Dubon@fao.org

Steve Ashby

Chair, Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
Food and Environment Research Agency
Sand Hutton
Y041 ILZ
United Kingdom

Fisheries

Donatella Crosetti

On behalf of FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department
ISPRA
V. Casalotti 300
00166 Roma, Italy

Email: donatella.crosetti@isprambiente.it

IATA

Marshall Meyers

On behalf of IATA and as Chair IATA Live Animals Board Advisory Committee

1620 L Street NW

Washington DC 20036

Email: mmeyers@meyersalterman.com

IUCN

Shyama Pagad

Manager Information Services

IUCN – SSC – Invasive Species

Specialist Group

University of Auckland

Email: s.pagad@auckland.ac.nz

Geoffrey Howard

Co-ordinator Invasive Species

Species Programme

Eastern & Southern Africa

Regional Office

Mukuma Road (off Magadi Road)

P.O. Box 68200-00200

Nairobi, Kenya

Tel: ++254 20 890605-12

Fax: ++254 20 890615

Email: Geoffrey.Howard@iucn.org

OIE

Masatsugu Okita

Chargé de mission

World Organisation for Animal Health

12 Rue de Prony 75017 Paris

Tel: +33 1 44 15 18 92

Fax: +33 1 42 67 09 87

Email: m.okita@oie.int

Website: <http://www.oie.int>

WTO

Gretchen Stanton

Senior Counsellor

Secretary, SPS Committee

Agriculture and Commodities Division

Tel: +41 22 739 5086

Email: gretchen.stanton@wto.org

Christiane Wolff

Counsellor

Agriculture and Commodities Division

Tel: +41 22 739 55 36

Email: christiane.wolff@wto.org

Rolando Alcalá

Economic Affairs Officer
Agriculture and Commodities Division
Tel: +41 22 739 65 83
Email: rolando.alcala@wto.org

STDF

Melvin Spreij

Counsellor
Secretary, STDF
Agriculture and Commodities Division
Tel: +41 739 66 30
Email: melvin.spreij@wto.org

Kenza Le Mentec

Economic Affairs Officer
Agriculture and Commodities Division
Tel: +41 22 739 65 38
Email: kenza.lementec@wto.org

REPLIED, BUT UNABLE TO ATTEND

IMO

Dandu Pughiuc

Deputy Director
Head, Marine Biosafety Section
Marine Environment Division
International Maritime Organization
4 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7SR
United Kingdom
Tel: +44 (0)20 7587 3247
Fax: +44 (0)20 7587 3261
Email: dpughiuc@imo.org
Website: <http://www.imo.org>

Fredrik Haag

International Maritime Organization
4 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7SR
United Kingdom
Email: phaag@imo.org

IATA

Andrea Graf Gruber

Manager

Special Cargo Standards

International Air Transport Assoc

ATA Centre, Route de l'Aéroport 33, PO Box 416.

Geneva 15 Airport Geneva - 1215 Switzerland

Tel: Customer Service +41 22 567 5163

HQ +41 22 770 2525

Email: grafa@iata.org

FAO

Matthias Halwart, PhD

Senior Aquaculture Officer

FAO - Fisheries and Aquaculture Resources Use and Conservation Division

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla

00153 Rome, Italy

Tel: +39 06 570 55080

Fax: +39 06 570 53020

Email: Matthias.Halwart@fao.org

Website: <http://www.fao.org>

IUCN

Piero Genovesi PhD (Papik)

Chair IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group

Website: <http://www.issg.org>

ISPRA (Institute for Environmental Protection and Research)

Via Vitaliano Brancati 48

00144 Rome

Italy

Tel: +39 06 50072645

Fax: +39 051 796628

piero.genovesi@isprambiente.it

STDF Seminar on International Trade and Invasive Alien Species

WTO, 12-13 July 2012

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The STDF Seminar on International Trade and Invasive Alien Species (IAS), organized in collaboration with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) was attended by approximately 110 participants, including 10 experts from developing countries whose participation was funded by the STDF. The seminar sought to:

- raise awareness about the mutually beneficial goals of the SPS Agreement and Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the contribution of effective SPS systems to help protect against the entry of harmful species, including pests, diseases and other IAS
- foster collaboration between the SPS and the CBD "communities" at both regional and national levels; and
- review initiatives that aim to build national and/or regional capacities to manage the entry and spread of IAS, including pests and diseases, and discuss common challenges, good practices, and additional capacity building efforts required (e.g. needs assessments, pest risk analysis (PRA), surveillance, development of training toolkits and materials, etc.)

2. The seminar was well-received with positive feedback from participants. Participants agreed on the following set of conclusions and actions to improve the management of trade-related IAS :

- (a) The international regulatory framework under the SPS covers almost all aspects of trade-related IAS. Measures applied to prevent entry, spread and establishment of IAS via trade, aiming to protect human, animal and plant life or health, and the territory are thus SPS measures and should abide by WTO/SPS rules. Risk-based approaches as applied in the SPS context are a key tool in preventing the movement of organisms that have potential to become invasive. It was suggested that WTO Members should decide on whether the SPS Committee needs to adopt a specific decision to clarify the status of the IAS with regard to the SPS Agreement.
- (b) A Gap in standard-setting was identified in the area of invasive animals. The seminar called OIE Members to decide and evaluate the extent of the need for specific standards in this area. For this need to be properly assessed at national level, in-country consultations should be undertaken involving both SPS and biodiversity institutions. In the meantime, OIE issued guidelines on assessing the risk for animals to become invasive and countries are encouraged to use them.
- (c) In view of the multiplicity of institutions involved in the area of IAS at national level, coordination of policies and strategies should be sought to achieve common goals. Formulating common goals and visions is a prerequisite. This coordination can take several forms and should as much as possible use existing mechanisms and framework at national level (national SPS coordination mechanisms, etc.)
- (d) National SPS systems are well equipped to deal with the vast majority of trade-related IAS (whether it is related to border control, quarantine measures, risk assessments, control and eradication measures etc. as we saw in the case of aquatic plants). However, further building SPS capacity in countries is necessary. Building SPS capacity in building capacity to address IAS.
- (e) Engaging stakeholders in early stages of development of policies and strategies is essential to ensure effective implementation of these policies and strategies.

Stakeholders include the industry, research and academia, and civil society including local communities, etc. Public-Private partnerships should be encouraged in this area.

- (f) Education and awareness-raising is important. Communication strategies, tools and channels adapted to the target audience should be used (such as NGOs, civil society groups, community groups, school curricula, electronic fora and knowledge-networks, etc.).
- (g) Conducting studies on economic cost and benefits of prevention vs. control and of both prevention and control vs. returns in terms revenue generation can help in advocacy and awareness-raising of decision-makers.
- (h) Regional approaches can prove very effective in prevention and control. Establishing regional networks can help in experience- and knowledge-sharing.
- (i) IAS capacity building programmes aiming to preserve biodiversity should be encouraged to take into account existing national SPS capacity and infrastructure. A sound assessment of the needs can be obtained by applying the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) and the Performance of Veterinary Services (PVS). Consultation with National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs), veterinary services, fisheries authorities and public health institutions from a very early stage of elaboration of programmes is a key element.
- (j) Efforts should be sustained at international level to foster dialogue, collaboration and coherence in action of SPS- and biodiversity-related organisations. The role of the SPS community (the STDF and its partners, IPPC, OIE, the WHO, etc.as well as other SPS technical assistance providers) and the CBD community (CBD Secretariat, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), etc.).

3. The STDF commissioned a background study on the trade-related IAS. The study was presented at the Seminar and will be finalized taking into the deliberations and conclusions of the seminar.



International Plant Protection Convention
Protecting the world's plant resources from pests

The IPPC Secretariat's Offices
Rome, 13 July 2012, Geneva

IPPC update to the meeting of the Inter Agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species,
13 July 2012,

CPM-7 (2012)

- Adopted a new IPPC Strategic Framework with four objectives (list them: food security, trade, environment and capacity development)
- Capacity Development Committee (CDC) formed and a 6 year capacity development work plan was adopted
- Celebrating our 60th anniversary of the IPPC
- Adopted several new standards:
 - ISPM 36: *Integrated measures for plants for planting*
 - ISPM 35: *Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)*,
 - revision of Supplement 1 to ISPM 5. *Glossary of phytosanitary terms: Guidelines on the interpretation and application of the concepts of "Official control" and "Not widely distributed"*,
 - amendments to ISPM 5. *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*
 - Russian language version of ISPM 5. 2011. *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*
 - DP 35 Annex to ISPM 27:2006 Diagnostic protocol for *Plum pox virus* (2004-007)
 - D36. Annex to ISPM 27:2006 Diagnostic protocol for *Trogoderma granarium* (2004-006)

Substantial Concerns Commenting Period 15 May to 20 October 2012

- Draft Annex to ISPM 11: Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (2005-001)
- Draft revision of Annex 1 to ISPM 15: Approved treatments associated with wood packaging material (2006-011)

Member consultation 1 July to 20 October 2012

- Draft Appendix to ISPM 12: Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms (2006-003) - ePhtyo
- Determination of host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly (Tephritidae) infestation (2006-031)
- Draft Annex to ISPM 26: Establishment of fruit fly quarantine areas within a pest free area in the event of an outbreak (2009-007)
- Draft Annex to ISPM 27: Diagnostic Protocol for *Tilletia indica* (2004-014)
- Draft Annex to ISPM 27: Diagnostic Protocol for *Guignardia citricarpa* (2004-023)

Standards under development of interest for IAS:

- Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (2005-001) – to 2012 November SC
- Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade (2008-001) – to 2013 May SC
- Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts (2008-002) – pending Sea Containers
- Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004) – pending call for experts

Capacity development activities

- Implementation of the Phytosanitary Resources Page at www.phytosanitary.info
- Participation in 34 projects of national, regional and global level.
- Application of the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation tool in 10 countries for 2012, with a waiting list of 15 countries.
- New project proposals developed for training of phytosanitary trainers and training of PCE facilitators.
- 7 regional workshops on draft ISPMs organized worldwide.

Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS)

Has a similar effect as compliance articles of Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) but uses encouragement as opposed to penalties

- Scoping study on:
 - *Aquatic plants , their uses and risks.*
- Desk study on :
 - *Internet trade in plants, potential phytosanitary risks.*
- Completed implementation surveys on:
 - ISPM 4:1995 *Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas*
 - ISPM 6:1997 *Guidelines for surveillance*
 - ISPM 8:1998 *Determination of pest status in an area*
- On-going implementation survey on:
 - ISPM 13:2001 *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*
- New implementation surveys agreed for:
 - ISPM 17:2002 *Pest reporting*
 - ISPM 19:2003 *Guidelines on lists of regulated pests*



FAO and IAS

*most domesticated plants and animals are aliens,
but not invasive...*

Slide 1

Towards a responsible use and control of alien species, FAO can assist with:

- *Providing a neutral forum for stakeholder discussion and information exchange to facilitate improved policy making*
- *Developing national and regional policies regulating the introductions of species*
- *Assembling groups of experts from many disciplines to address technical, political, social and economic issues*

Slide 2

Towards a responsible use and control of alien species, FAO can assist with (continued):

- *Assembling information sources on aquatic species such as websites, databases and electronic forums*
- *Helping to implement the frameworks (codes, policies, standards, etc.) through technical cooperation projects*
- *Raising awareness of risks and benefits of the use of alien species through web sites, publication and other media*

Slide 3

FAO, with assistance from member countries and other partners, has developed the following frameworks for responsible use and control of IAS (among others):

- ***Asia Regional Technical Guidelines and the Beijing Consensus*** – *tools for dealing with introduced pathogens risk through transboundary movement of live aquatic animals*
- ***Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF)*** – *an overarching agreed-upon international instrument*

Slide 4

FAO, with assistance from member countries and other partners, has developed the following frameworks for responsible use and control of IAS (among others):

- ***Database on Introductions of Aquatic Species (DIAS)*** – *a valuable information source on aquatic species introductions and impacts*
- ***International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) Code*** – *protocols for implementing the CCRF and other international agreements*

Technical Guidelines on Genetic Resource Management in Aquaculture – to support sections of the FAO's CCRF on aspects of aquatic genetic resource management in aquaculture as a way to promote sustainable use and conservation of aquatic biodiversity

Slide 5

FAO, with assistance from member countries and other partners, has developed the following frameworks for responsible use and control of IAS (among others):

Alien Invasive Species: Impacts on Forests and Forestry – A working paper on health and biosecurity issues relating to IAS within a Forestry context

International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) – Framework (the Convention and related standards) – obligations and guidance for the management of IAS that are deemed to have risk to plants and plant products as determined by pest risk analysis

International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP) – a valuable information source on invasive alien species that are harmful to plants