

# APPFC Surveillance Workshop on Pest Free Places of Production (PFPP), Pest Free Production Sites (PFPS) and Pest Free Areas (PFA)

22nd–26th May 2023 – Kuta Beach, Bali, Indonesia

## Workshop Report



Image 1. Workshop participants with the Indonesian Agricultural Quarantine Agency (IAQA)'s General Director Ir. Bambang MM. ©IAQA/Alfian Dwi Rahmanto

## Acronyms

APPPC	Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission
CPM	Commission on Phytosanitary Measures
DAFF	Australian Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
IAQA	Indonesia Agricultural Quarantine Agency
IPPC	International Plant Protection Convention
ISPM	International Standard on Phytosanitary Measures
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization
PFA(s)	Pest free area(s)
PFPP	Pest free place(s) of production
PFPS(s)	Pest free production site(s)

## Participants

The APPPC Secretariat attended and supported the facilitating of the workshop.

The APPPC member countries who participated in the workshop included:

- Indonesia (host country)
- Australia (facilitators)
- Bangladesh
- Cambodia
- China
- Lao People's Democratic Republic
- Malaysia
- Nepal
- Papua New Guinea
- Philippines
- Republic of Korea
- Sri Lanka
- Thailand
- Viet Nam
- Japan (observer)

Due to visa issues on arrival the following countries were unable to attend the workshop

- Samoa
- Tonga

## Background

In 2016, the Asia and Pacific Plant Protection Commission (APPPC) agreed to the delivery of a suite of annual workshops over a six-year period on the implementation of International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) 6 and management of national surveillance systems. Proposed by the Australian Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF), the suite of workshops was designed to develop and increase the capacity of APPPC member (and observer) countries in implementing surveillance ISPMs and to harmonize the surveillance capabilities of National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) and facilitate agricultural trade in Asia and the Pacific region.

This workshop was the sixth and final surveillance workshop in the series. The workshop was led by Australia (DAFF), hosted by Indonesia (Indonesia Agricultural Quarantine Agency (IAQA)) and supported by the APPPC Secretariat. Delivery of this workshop was included as an activity in the APPPC 2023–24 work program under *Strategic Objective 2: Capacity development including the coordination and training of staff*.

The sixth workshop covered the fundamentals of surveillance systems and programs to establish and maintain pest free places of production (PFPPs), pest free production sites (PFPSs) and pest free areas (PFAs) in accordance with international and regional standards (including ISPM 4, ISPM 6, ISPM 10, ISPM 26).

Overall, the workshop contributed to the broader objective of developing NPPOs capacity to implement plant health standards, strengthening regional biosecurity capabilities and facilitating increased agricultural trade in the Asia and Pacific region while preventing the movement and spread of plant pests.

This workshop was designed to develop the technical and management knowledge of participants across the various facets of developing and maintaining a pest free area. The presentations, facilitated discussions and workshops aimed to develop participants' knowledge across the following areas:

- A deeper understanding of ISPMs relevant to pest freedom concepts (including ISPM 4, ISPM 6, ISPM 10, ISPM 26).
- A deeper understanding of the practical requirements for planning, implementing and maintaining pest freedom concepts.
- A deeper understanding of implementation challenges and opportunities specific to Asia and the Pacific region.
- Capacity to analyse the technical and economic feasibility of implementation.
- Capacity to determine which pest freedom concepts are most appropriate in their country (PFA, PFPP or PFPS).
- Capacity to assess the feasibility of implementing different pest freedom concepts according to different contexts (e.g. pest, commodity, recipient NPPO).
- Further insight into the steps required to practically implement or improve implementation of pest freedom concepts in their country.
- Increased knowledge and skill to support them in their roles as key plant health actors in Asia and the Pacific region.

## Workshop Summary

### Day One

#### Session One – Workshop opening

Day one focused on opening the workshop, setting the participants' understanding of ISPMs, focusing on ISPM 4, and sharing a collective understanding of APPPC countries' experience and status of pest free area/site/place implementation and management. A key outcome for the workshop was for participants to understand the expertise in the APPPC region and contacts to draw on for advice going forward.

The workshop was officially opened by the Indonesian Agricultural Quarantine Agency (IAQA). IAQA's General Director Ir. Bambang, MM. provided a welcoming address to the workshop participants, followed by welcoming addresses from the APPPC Secretariat and DAFF.

DAFF began the workshop with some introductory questions through the interactive platform 'Mentimeter'. Through these questions it was understood most workshop participants had worked in biosecurity an average of 10 years, with four participants having over 20 years' experience. More than half of the participants listed their confidence working on PFAs as a two or less on a scale of 5 (1 = not confident). Participants were also asked to put forward what questions they were seeking to have answered through the workshop. Some of the most common questions included:

- how to set up a PFA,
- how to design trap surveillance,
- the differences between setting up and maintaining PFAs, PFPPs and PFPSs,
- how to know when to set up a PFA or a PFPS or PFPP,
- how to enhance regional cooperation.

#### Session Two – APPPC Participant introductions

Whilst the workshop was facilitated by DAFF, all countries were invited on day one to present a short summary of their current experience with PFAs, PFPPs and PFPSs and major pests of concern. This provided a valuable opportunity for participants to understand the experience and expertise in the room and gain an insight into the status of PFAs in Asia and the Pacific region. The APPPC Secretariat also provided an overview of the regional status on PFAs and production of major agricultural commodities in the region.

#### Session Three – IPSPM overview

Dr Masahiro Sai joined the meeting virtually and provided a comprehensive overview on ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of Pest Free Areas. Dr Sai is a member of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Standard Committee from the Asian region. His presentation covered the core activities of the IPPC, an overview of ISPM development and interactions, and implementation of ISPM 4 and ISPM 8. He provided an update on the revised version of ISPM 4 which will be sent to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) 18 (March 2024) for adoption.

#### Official dinner

Indonesia hosted an official dinner at the Bali Dynasty Resort. All participants attended and received a welcoming address from the IAQA and the APPPC Secretariat.

## Day Two

The focus of day two was on the establishment and maintenance of PFAs, using numerous case studies from participating countries to understand and explore the topic. Participants were provided information to help interpret and, where suitable, develop their capacity to implement ISPM 4 and other relevant ISPMs.

### Session One – PFA surveillance considerations and diagnostic requirements

The first session was facilitated by Australia's technical expert Dr Guy Westmore (Senior Entomologist, Biosecurity Tasmania). This session focused on *Surveillance considerations and diagnostic requirements*. Through this presentation, participants received an overview of how Australia has implemented and maintains proof of freedom for tomato potato psyllid (TPP) in Tasmania. An important early step in establishing a pest free area is undertaking a cost benefit analysis, both for establishment and maintenance. An NPPO must understand if it is worth the investment. Cost benefit analyses may also need to be repeated as production and markets change to ensure that ongoing investment in maintaining a PFA is justified.

Understanding the type of surveillance required is another early consideration when assessing a PFA (general or specific surveillance). Specific surveillance is more structured and can be broken into three categories – detection, delimitation and monitoring. General surveillance data provides valuable support to a proof of freedom claim. Specific surveillance needs to be informed by risk and statistical design. For example, surveillance site selection must be informed by the likelihood of incursion. Sample size is related to and informed by other factors such as confidence levels, sample method sensitivity, design prevalence, and target population size. International guidelines may also exist to support the establishment of PFAs, for example ISPM 26 for fruit fly PFAs.

The Tasmanian TPP proof of freedom example ran through the following steps when designing the surveillance.

- Understand host range (production zones and density).
- Understand the pest – life cycle, seasonality, phenology.
- Understand the symptoms - important for public awareness and operational staff.
- Understand appropriate sampling methods.
- Risk-based and statistically supported surveillance design.
- Setting up surveillance and diagnostic protocols.
- Develop training to ensure consistency across the system.

Supporting a case for proof of freedom requires a whole system and not just a set of data.

The Philippines delegate presented a case study focusing on the nationwide monitoring of mango pulp weevil (MPW, *Sternochetus frigidus*) and mango seed weevil (MSW, *Sternochetus mangiferae*) in mango producing regions/provinces of the Philippines. Mango is the third most important fruit crop of the country. MPW is present in the southern region of Palawan Island. In 1987 the Philippines declared a prohibition on the movement of fresh mango fruits, including seeds, seedlings, and any mango parts to be transported or moved outside Palawan and its island municipalities to other geographical areas of the country.

A PFA has been established. An extensive survey in 2009 provided data for the absence of MPW and MSW in 16 regions and 79 mango provinces except in Palawan where MPW is present. The Philippines has set up strict movement controls from the known infected region in Palawan and undertake periodic surveys to strengthen the absence declaration and monitor for leakage. The surveys and monitoring are informed by IPSM 4 and ISPM 6 and are undertaken any time of the year. The Philippines delegate reflected that some of the ongoing challenges maintaining the PFA are social unrest in the region, poor road networks, high costs and the strict quarantine requirements imposed by the importing countries.

The workshop participants broke into table-based discussion about the surveillance design issues they have faced when establishing PFAs.

### Session Two – PFA pathway controls

The second session was facilitated by Australia’s technical expert Ms Catherine Klaer (Manager, Market Access and Systems, Department of Primary Industries and Regions South Australia). This session focused on pathway controls, which are critical to prevent the introduction of the pest into the area. Before considering how to control pathways, first all possible pathways must be identified, and the managing body must consider if they are likely to introduce the pest into the area. This should be done through a pest risk analysis (PRA).

Ms Klaer provided an overview of environmental barriers and controls, phytosanitary treatments/regulation and compliance and monitoring activities. To explain these controls, a case study of pathway controls for the Riverland PFA in South Australia was used. The following aspects of pathway control was discussed:

- Identifying natural barriers, such as climate and landscape features (i.e. arid land).
- Defining the boundaries of the PFA. For example, the Riverland PRA set the boundaries based on local government boundaries, bushland and the economic drivers for communities.
- Establishing entry requirements for goods – what are the host plants and phytosanitary treatments?
- Setting up movement controls. In the Riverland case study, fruit disposal bins/pits and quarantine stations are located across entry pathways into the PFA. The quarantine stations and bins/pits are located outside the zone with lots of signs leading up to the border zone.
- Maintain pathways through ongoing reviews of entry requirements, community and industry engagement, declaration of outbreak conditions and ongoing oversight by the NPPO via audits.

The Thailand delegate provided a presentation on pathway controls focusing on the case study example of *Xulella fastidiosa* (XF). XF has never been reported in Thailand. To maintain the status of XF free area in Thailand, a specific survey was conducted from October 2018 to September 2021 in 87 grape-growing areas in 24 provinces. Signs of brown leaf blight that are consistent with the infestation of XF were sampled and tested. The survey revealed no XF.

The main pathway for the entry is imported host plant species for planting. As a pathway control imported host plant of XF (such as olive, grapevine, rose, some stone fruit trees) must be quarantined and inspected before importation. Insect vector and suspicious samples are examined and tested according to ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*). Thailand undertakes monitoring in XF host growing areas after the importation has been released.

The workshop participants broke into table-based discussion about pathway controls used in their country and some challenges experienced.

Some of the feedback included:

- Having access to the tools and resources to manage risks.
- Understanding all the pathways and how to manage them – both with technology and human resources.
- Engagement and relationships with industry and government. Challenge of bringing them along with the changes to pathway controls as the science or cost/benefits change.
- Working with domestic quarantine regulations to support pathways control.

### Session Three - PFA establishment case studies

Australia and Papua New Guinea delegates provided presentations on their PFA experiences, highlighting some of the surveillance, diagnostics and pathway considerations discussed in the previous sessions.

Australia's presentation provided an overview of Australia's biosecurity system being multilayered with prevention, management and response activities undertaken overseas, at our borders and within Australia. The Australian Government delivers, leads or supports more than five separate [specific] surveillance programs that help Australia maintain national pest freedom. In addition to national surveillance programs there are a number of industry-led programs. These programs are essential to providing evidence that Australia is free from pests and diseases, as well as providing an early warning system if a pest or disease enters. *Xylella fastidiosa* was touched on as an example pest for which Australia has undertaken specific surveillance to support a pest free status, based on the barriers to entry and surveillance programs in place. Australia has always been free of *Xylella*.

The Papua New Guinea representative presented a case study on the declaration of pest free status of New Britain Island in Papua New Guinea for palm lethal yellowing (Phytoplasma 16 Sr IV). The PFA was developed in response to Indonesia's ban on Dami Oil Palm Research Station (DOPRS) oil palm seed production. The NPPO of Papua New Guinea conducted surveys for the presence of lethal yellowing in seed mother palms at DOPRS. In determining the pest free status of New Britain Island for Phytoplasma 16Sr IV lethal yellowing, the NPPO of Papua New Guinea considered a myriad of factors which supported the absence of the pests. For example, the vector of lethal yellowing, *Myndus crudus*, has not been recorded in Papua New Guinea and no oil palm seeds have been imported from countries that have lethal yellowing phytoplasma in the past and used in the breeding program at DOPRS. Through evidence-based negotiations, the NPPO of Papua New Guinea established pest freedom at DOPRS. To help maintain the PFA, the NPPO of Papua New Guinea conducts pest risk analysis before the importation of any new products of plant origin into Papua New Guinea.

## Session Four - Challenges with PFA establishment

This session focused on exploring the challenges of PFA establishment and sought to learn from Nepal's experience attempting to establish a PFA in citrus orchards for export to China. Nepal shared some of the challenges which impeded the success of this PFA. These included:

- Geographical and landscape challenges – small and scattered orchards located on difficult geographical hilly regions impacted the PFA establishment. The adjoining forest ecosystem also impacted the PFA success.
- Movement of the pest – the capacity for the fruit fly to move distances by flying created challenges. As did the movement of maggots in infected fruit.
- Limitations on internal quarantine systems was a significant impediment to the PFAs success. A strong plant health system, including border functions, strict plant quarantine measures and an internal plant quarantine system is key for successful PFA implementation.

Some of the key learnings shared by Nepal included:

- The development of a public awareness program is important for successfully implementing a PFA.
- Integrating the pest management and surveillance at the community level is important.
- Promoting coordination and cooperation among stakeholders.
- Consideration of post-harvest treatment based on the feasibility of adopting PFA.

The workshop participants broke into table-based discussion about challenges their country has/may face when establishing a PFA and when it might not be possible or appropriate to establish a PFA.

Some of the feedback included:

- The ownership types in regions (size of business) can impact the PFA success. For example, lots of smaller growers may be more challenges for PFA establishment.
- A PFA may not be appropriate or more challenging when the pest is already established, and alternative hosts are present.

## Session Four - Interlinkage: World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (the SPS Agreement) versus ISPMs on surveillance for trade harmonization

Dr Antarjo Dikin (Senior Professional Expert of Plant Quarantine, IAQA) presented on the WTO SPS Agreement versus ISPMs for trade harmonisations. The presentation covered:

- the application of the WTO SPS agreement,
- ISPM 6 (*Surveillance*) and ISPM 8 (*Determination of pest status in an area*),
- challenges establishing and maintaining PFA's with land borders,
- critical factors for pest free places of production or pest free production sites, and
- buffer zones.

The presentation highlighted the importance of cooperation between neighbouring countries to support the region to work to collectively support each other.

## Day Three

The focus of day three was on the establishment and maintenance of PFPP and PFPS, using case studies from member countries to understand and explore the topic. Participants were trained to interpret and, where suitable, develop their capacity to implement ISPM 10 and other relevant ISPMs.



## Session One - Community and industry engagement

This session was facilitated by Australia's technical expert Ms Catherine Klaer and focused on community and industry engagement. Ms Klaer highlighted that communities and industries are a significant factor in the success of a PFA. This presentation provided an overview of the importance of community and industry engagement as it supports:

- shared responsibility over biosecurity,
- surveillance activities (general surveillance),
- awareness and compliance with post-border activities (pathway controls), and
- compliance with pathway controls (pathway controls).

It is important to understand the stakeholders in the PFA and how best to engage with them. How do they receive information? Who is the target segment the message needs to reach? Should this be a two-way conversation?

Ms Klaer used the Riverland PFA as a case study to highlight how the community and industry is engaged. The Riverland PFA uses a range of tools to engage industry and the community, including:

- community meetings,
- stalls at public fairs and carnivals,
- information posters and flyers located at roadside rest and tourist stops around the PFA,
- signs along the roads leading into the PFA,
- awareness campaigns through TV, social media and radio,
- educational school resources, and
- attendance at industry forums.

Engaging industry and communities can be challenging. Ms Klaer outlined some PFA engagement considerations and challenges:

- People need to be aware before they will engage.
- When you are resource poor and need to engage with a highly diverse audience, what's the most effective way to get the message across?
- Finding a suitable time to encourage participation at community meetings.
- The community needs to understand the reasons why a decision is made.

The delegate of the Republic of Korea presented on community and industry engagement using the fire blight PFA case study. Industry engagement has been important for the success of this PFA. The National Agriculture Cooperative Federation supports growers with biosecurity management and distribution records. Farm workers receive biosecurity education to ensure they know fire blight symptoms, understand farm hygiene practices and undertake regular surveillance and control. The Republic of Korea also highlighted community engagement activities undertaken to support the PFA. The Government of the Republic of Korea supports general awareness through media broadcasts and newspapers (306 occurrences in 2022). They have also developed banners, leaflets and internet advertisements. These public resources seek to encourage the uptake of the spraying, disinfection, canker removal and community reporting. In 2022 there was a significant drop in fire blight infections, which is thought to be influenced by the community and industry engagement programs.

## Session Two - The role and processes of verification

The Australian representative, Ms Claire Hollis, discussed the role and process of auditing. The presentation covered the value and principles of auditing, using Australia's national fruit fly system audits as a case study. The case study provided an example to work through audit preparation, implementation and reporting.

### Session Three - ISPM 10 – Introduction to PFPP and PFPS

The purpose of this session was to provide workshop participants with an understanding of ISPM 10 (*Requirements for the establishment of PFPP and PFPS*) and learn from the experience of other APPPC member countries experience through case study examples.

Dr Cesar Augusto Noe Pino, Deputy General Director of the National Agri-food Health and Safety Service for Honduras (SENASA), virtually presented at the workshop on ISPM. Dr Augusto Noe Pino has more than 45 years' experience in phytosanitary regulations and provided a comprehensive overview of ISPM 10. Dr Augusto Noe Pino touched on some benefits of implementing ISPM 10, which include access to markets, elimination of restrictive phytosanitary barriers to trade and reduction in treatment requirements. However, there are also challenges implementing ISPM 10. Some of the challenges Dr Augusto Noe Pino discussed include, compliance with activities throughout the year, development of quality control measures and the empowerment of producers, technicians and authorities for the implementation of these new forms of production.

Two APPPC member countries provided case studies for the workshop participants to learn from. The representative from China provided an overview of PFA case studies, including Huanglongbing and codling moth. The representative from Sri Lanka shared their experience implementing PFPPs.

The Sri Lankan Government introduced a field certification program based on system approach, which focuses on the management of fruit fly and melon fly in major fruit crops and cucurbits and the management of pests and diseases of leafy vegetables. Regular inspection and testing of exporting nurseries and orchards maintain the pest free status in the field. Sri Lanka also has experience with seeking to establish PFPS for XF in *Lavandula* plants. Some of the PFPP and PFPS challenges highlighted by Sri Lanka include:

- lack of technical expertise,
- limitations of legal frameworks,
- funding resources,
- small farms having multiple cropping systems, and
- limited biosecurity management knowledge at the grower level.

### Session Five - Workshopping activity – Putting it all together!

Dr Westmore led an interactive workshop supporting participants to work through a decision tree for establishment and maintenance of PFAs. This decision tree was taken from the IPPC Guide for Establishing and Maintaining PFAs (2019).

Participants were provided with an example Dr Westmore had completed using the Tasmanian Fruit Fly PFA. Participants worked on an example relevant to their country with the support and collaboration of other workshop participants on their table.

## Day Four – Field Trip

The IAQA arranged a full day field trip to Alas Harum Tegalallang (coffee plantation and processing facility) and Penglipuran (a traditional Balinese village).



Image 2. Workshop participants at Penglipuranv village ©IAQA/Alfian Dwi Rahmanto

## Day Five

Day five summarised the learnings of the workshop and sought feedback from participants on future capacity building investment areas for the APPPC.

### Session One – Workshop learnings

Through the Mentimeter platform, participants were asked to summarise their key learnings from the workshop. The responses included:

- The logic flow of how to establish a PFA, PFPP and PFPS and the decision points (IPPC decision tree flow chart).
- Importance of community and industry engagement in PFA, PFPP and PFPS establishment.
- Differences between PFA, PFPP and PFPS and suitability factors for establishment.
- The requirements needed before embarking on establishing a PFA, PFPP and PFPS (e.g. landscape barriers, legislative frameworks, pest knowledge).
- Importance of regional cooperation.
- Insights into the APPPC regions PFA, PFPP and PFPS status and experience. Learning from other countries with similar geographical and social context.
- Importance of cost benefit analysis when establishing and maintaining a PFA, PFPP and PFPS.

### Session Two – Bioprotection Research Centre

Dr Alison Watson joined the workshop virtually to provide an update on the design process of the virtual Bioprotection Research Centre to ensure best connections can be made to support the work of the APPPC. Workshop participants were encouraged to provide feedback to Dr Watson regarding how the Bioprotection Research Centre can support the APPPC, what type of research activities would support the APPPC objectives and what gaps do APPPC members see in biosecurity research. Members were provided with Dr Watson's email to provide feedback.

### Session Three – Capacity development needs across the APPPC

Through the Mentimeter platform, participants were asked to identify future workshop subjects that would help build capacity in the Asia Pacific region. The responses included:

- further workshops on the implementation of PFA, PFPP and PFPS,
- field management of fruit flies,
- industry and community engagement in pest management,
- protocol surveillance for storage pests in applying HACCP principles,
- implementing and strengthening domestic quarantine to prevent the spread of established pests and diseases, and
- use of biopesticides and biological control agents.

### Session Four - Workshop close

The IAQA and the APPPC Secretariat provided closing remarks and expressed thanks to all workshop participants and facilitators.

The workshop officially closed.

APPPC Surveillance Workshop on pest free places of production (PFPP), pest free production sites (PFPS) and pest free areas (PFAs)

22nd–26th May 2023 – Kuta Beach, Bali, Indonesia

Bali Dynasty Resort  
Meeting room Grand Nusa Penida

Day One: Monday 22nd May 2023

Time	Agenda item	Speaker
9:00-9:20	Opening ceremony <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Official welcome by host Indonesia</li> <li>• Introductory address by APPPC Secretariat</li> </ul>	IAQA representative APPPC Secretariat
9:20-9:40	Opening of workshop	DAFF facilitator
9:40-10:10	Regional Status on Pest Free Area (PFA) production of major agricultural commodities in the region	APPPC Secretariat
10:10-10:30	Group photo	DAFF facilitator
<b>10:30-11:00</b>	<b>Morning Tea</b>	
11:00-12:30	APPPC country participant presentations (introduction and country context)	Australia Bangladesh Cambodia China Indonesia Japan Republic of Korea Lao People’s Democratic Republic Malaysia Nepal
<b>12:30-2:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
2:00-3:00	APPPC country participant presentations (introduction and country context)	Papua New Guinea Philippines Samoa Sri Lanka Thailand Tonga Viet Nam
<b>3:00-3:30</b>	<b>Afternoon Tea</b>	

Time	Agenda item	Speaker
3:30-4:30	Unpacking ISPM's for Pest Freedoms  ISPM 4 update – Assessing the feasibility of PFAs and requirements for establishment	Mr Masahiro SAI  Japan Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF)
4:30-4:40	Close and summary	DAFF Facilitator
<b>Pause</b>		
7:00	Official welcome dinner hosted by IAQA	IAQA representative

### Day Two: Tuesday 23rd May 2023

Time	Agenda item	Speaker
9:00-9:05	Overview of day	DAFF Facilitator
9:05-10:30	PFA establishment and maintenance: <i>Surveillance considerations and diagnostic requirements</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Australia case study example</li> <li>• Philippines case study example</li> </ul>	Australia  Philippines
<b>10:30-11:00</b>	<b>Morning Tea</b>	
11:30-12:30	PFA establishment and maintenance: <i>Pathway Controls</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Australian case study example</li> <li>• Thailand case study example</li> </ul>	Australia  Thailand
<b>12:30-2:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
2:00-2:40	PFA establishment case studies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Australian case study example</li> <li>• Papua New Guinea case study example</li> </ul>	Australia  Papua New Guinea
2:40-3:30	Challenges with PFA establishment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nepal case study example</li> </ul>	Nepal
<b>3:30- 4:00</b>	<b>Afternoon Tea</b>	
4:00-5:00	Interlinkage: WTO -SPS measures versus ISPMs on Surveillance for Trade Harmonization	Indonesia
5:00	Close	DAFF Facilitator

### Day Three: Wednesday 24th May 2023

Time	Agenda item	Speaker
9:00-9:10	Overview of day	DAFF Facilitator
9:10-10:10	PFA establishment and maintenance: <i>Community and industry engagement</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Australian case study example</li> <li>Republic of Korea case study example</li> </ul>	Australia Republic of Korea
10:10-10:30	The role and processes of verification	Australia
<b>10:30-11:00</b>	<b>Morning Tea</b>	
11:00-11:30	ISPM 10 – Introduction to PFPP and PFPS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing feasibility and requirements for establishment.</li> </ul>	Mr Cesar Augusto Noe Pino
11:30-12:30	ISPM 10 – Establishment and maintenance of PFPP and PFPS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>China case study example</li> <li>Sri Lanka case study example</li> </ul>	China Sri Lanka
<b>12:30-2:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>	
2:00-3:30	Workshopping activity – Putting it all together!	Australia
<i>Opportunity for participants to network and share PFA, PFPP and PFPS experiences/lessons</i>		

### Day Four: Thursday 25th May - Field Trip

Time	Agenda item
7:00-8:00	Breakfast at hotel
8:00-9:30	Leaving hotel by bus for Alas Harum Tegalallang
9:30-11:00	Visiting Alas Harum Tegalallang (a coffee plantation and processing facility)
11:00-11:45	Travelling to Kintamani
<b>11:45-2:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>
2:00-2:30	Travelling to Penglipuran
2:30-4:00	Visiting Penglipuran, a traditional Balinese village
4:00-5:30	Travelling back to hotel

### Day Five: Friday 26th May

<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
9:00-10:00	Summary of workshop outcomes, available resources, relevant contacts, and next steps	DAFF facilitator
10:00-10:30	Closing remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Official close by host NPPO Indonesia</li><li>• Official close by APPPC Secretariat</li></ul>	IAQA representative APPPC Secretariat
<b>10:30-11:00</b>	<b>Workshop close and morning tea</b>	