



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/LG-IAS/1/2
15 February 2012

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

INTER-AGENCY LIAISON GROUP ON INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES

First meeting
Paris, 17-18 June 2010

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

INTRODUCTION

1. In paragraphs 11 to 13 of decision IX/4 A on gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to (i) continue to collaborate with the secretariats of the international organizations relevant to invasive alien species, (ii) consult with the secretariats of relevant organizations to explore the extent to which existing international instruments recognize and address threats from invasive alien genotypes and (iii) report on implementation of decisions IX/4 A and VIII/27.
2. Pursuant to decision IX/4 A, the Executive Secretary established an inter-agency liaison group on invasive alien species in accordance with the *modus operandi* described in paragraph 9¹ of annex I to decision IV/16, in order to address the gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework identified in decision VIII/27.
3. The first face-to-face meeting of the liaison group took place at the headquarters of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) in Paris, on 17 and 18 June 2010. The agenda and list of the participants in the meeting are presented in annexes I and II to this document, respectively.
4. A summary and conclusions from the meeting (annex III below) was prepared for incorporation into the progress report on cross-cutting issues² prior to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The meeting was opened at 11 a.m. on 17 June 2010 with welcoming remarks by Mr. Bernard Vallat, Director General of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). Mr. Vallat stated that invasive alien species were an important issue for OIE and in the context of the International Year of

¹ To facilitate the preparation of documentation, and in order to avoid duplication of efforts and ensure the use of available scientific, technical and technological competence available within international and regional organizations, including non-governmental organizations and scientific unions and societies, qualified in fields relating to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, the Executive Secretary may establish, in consultation with the Chairman and the other members of the Bureau of the Subsidiary Body, liaison groups, as appropriate. Such liaison groups will depend on the resources available.

² UNEP/CBD/COP/10/21, section IV B on collaboration with relevant international agreements and organizations to address gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework regarding invasive alien species.

/...

In order to minimize the environmental impacts of the Secretariat's processes, and to contribute to the Secretary-General's initiative for a C-Neutral UN, this document is printed in limited numbers. Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

Biodiversity. Mr. Vallat reiterated that the mandate of OIE was to improve animal health and welfare and to set global standards for the prevention and management of animal diseases. To achieve this work, OIE was liaising with 230 reference laboratories and collaborating centres to supply scientific advice to its 177 members. One hundred and ten permanent employees operated from the OIE headquarters, five regional offices, and additional subregional offices. Mr. Vallat highlighted the recent publication “Invasive species – Part 1: general aspects and biodiversity”, *Scientific and Technical Review* 29(1). Under the global “One Health Initiative”, Mr. Vallat said that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the World Health Organization (WHO) and OIE were seeking to work in closer collaboration on issues of global animal and public health importance, including those relevant to biodiversity. In March 2011, OIE was to host a Global Wildlife Conference, which was expected to attract more than 500 participants. The ongoing liaison between OIE and WTO was an important feature of the OIE’s standard-setting role.

6. Mr. David Cooper (CBD) thanked the OIE for hosting the meeting and congratulated OIE on its recent publication on invasive alien species. Mr. Cooper stated that the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity would be renewed in 2010 and stressed that the issue of invasive alien species, which was embedded as Article 8(h) of the Convention on Biological Diversity, was actually related to many different sectors. The Convention on Biological Diversity was therefore seeking a comprehensive mechanism to frame all the inter-organizational activities on invasive alien species.

7. Mr. Cooper (CBD) suggested that a memorandum of cooperation between OIE and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity would be welcomed by the Executive Secretary of the Convention. The cooperation between FAO, WHO and OIE that was mentioned by the Director General of OIE marked significant progress and the proposed conference on wildlife in 2011 was also welcomed. The Convention on Biological Diversity had continued its bilateral arrangements with the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP), in addition to an ongoing partnership with the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC). The Convention on Biological Diversity now wished to engage in collaboration with other organizations as well. Capacity-building hinged on effective information sharing among the willing organizations. Good collaboration was exemplified, as in the case of the International Maritime Organization (IMO) which was implementing the GEF/UNDP/IMO Global Ballast Water Management Programme (GloBallast) and had provided technical support and expertise. WTO provided the Secretariat for the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) to facilitate the capacity-building and technical cooperation to assist developing countries to enhance their capacity to meet Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) standards. The Convention on Biological Diversity was keen to develop potential linkages with these organizations on the issue of invasive alien species.

8. Participants in the liaison group agreed that Ms. Sarah Kahn (OIE) and Mr. David Cooper (CBD) would co-chair the meeting, with Ms. Junko Shimura (CBD) as rapporteur.

9. The twelve participants, representing nine international organizations, then introduced themselves (see annex II).

ITEM 2. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF THE OBJECTIVES AND PROGRAMME FOR THE MEETING

10. Mr. Cooper (CBD) outlined the purpose of the liaison group and the expected outcomes of the first face-to-face meeting. The meeting then adopted its agenda (see annex I), which included briefings on decisions VIII/27, IX/4 and recommendations approved in May 2010 by the fourteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

11. Ms. Junko Shimura (CBD) reported on the joint secretariats meeting between the IPPC and the Convention on Biological Diversity, held in Montreal in December 2009. The two secretariats had agreed to exchange information on their respective governing bodies, i.e., the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) of the IPPC and the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, and to work closely to engage National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs) of the IPPC and national

focal points (NFPs) of the Convention for relevant events. Ms. Shimura also highlighted a report made to the fifth session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM5) by the Convention, as well as a side-event, held jointly by the Convention and the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP), which introduced the issue of IAS and the progress made under the Convention on Biological Diversity. The fifth session of CPM had approved an operational work plan for the Secretariat of IPPC, which included the production of a document to modify the relevant International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) in order to account for aquatic IAS as mentioned in decision IX/4 A. It was agreed that this endeavour would be carried in collaboration with GISP and the Convention on Biological Diversity.

12. Ms. Sarah Kahn, Head of the OIE International Trade Department, provided a brief overview of OIE. Since its establishment in 1924, OIE had expanded to 177 member countries and territories. The OIE delegate of each country was normally the head of the national veterinary services. In addition to animal health, OIE now also covered animal welfare and animal production and food safety under its mandate. Ms. Kahn stated that the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement) recognized OIE as the global organization responsible for standard-setting on animal health, including zoonoses. However, the members of OIE were not necessarily responsible for ecosystems or wildlife in general, at a national level.

13. Ms. Kahn (OIE) further explained that the current mandate of OIE covered diseases that were listed by OIE, some of which may be considered to be invasive species, depending on the definition of this term. The OIE mandate did not cover invasive species that were not agents of listed diseases. Any change to this mandate (e.g., to provide for OIE to set standards to prevent the global spread of IAS), would need to be formally adopted by members. In developing a work plan, sources of expertise and financial contributions would need to be identified. The mechanism to modify the mandate of OIE was via submission of a proposal to the Council for consideration, followed by submission of the Council's recommendation to the General Assembly, which met in May each year. The rationale for any modification to the mandate of OIE would need to be described in detail. Further discussion between OIE and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity might be needed to respond to decision IX/4.

14. Mr. Yukio Yokoi (IPPC) underlined the need to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the international organizations in the liaison group and for prioritization to assist the development and implementation of national policies and strategies, especially within the environmental sector, as the issue of controlling IAS was largely at the national level.

15. Mr. Cooper (CBD) noted the need for a united voice among the relevant secretariats of international organizations to speak to national Governments on the issue of IAS. If each organization extended its mandate a little on environmental issues, this would assist national-level implementation. In addition, the liaison group should collaborate on implementation of the relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties.

16. Mr. Yokoi (IPPC) informed the liaison group that existing IPPC standards such as the standards on pest risk assessment and other risk analysis tools could be useful for risk assessment/analysis on IAS. However, there seemed to be a lack of actions to collect necessary and sufficient information related to the relevant species for the use of such tools, possibly due to inadequate awareness of the tools in the environmental sector.

17. Mr. Geoffrey Howard (IUCN and GISP) mentioned that pathogens introduced with animals and plants at the same time as IAS also needed to be covered by an international regulatory framework, as IAS could be a vehicle for introducing pathogens. He stressed that the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands also had to be associated with the liaison group to further harmonize the international regulatory framework. At the national level, he also noted the successful practices carried out by Australia and New Zealand, where the Governments had developed new cross-sectoral agencies for "biosecurity" as a means to rectify veterinary, agricultural, trade, health and environmental issues.

18. Mr. Matthias Halwart (FAO) presented a brief overview of relevant studies, reviews and guidelines, in particular the current FAO Technical Guidelines under the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), including the “Precautionary approach to capture fisheries and species introductions” (FAO 1996)³ and “Aquaculture Development 3. Genetic resource management” (FAO 2008).⁴

19. Mr. Halwart (FAO) introduced documentation on understanding and applying risk analysis in aquaculture as well as best management practices regarding the use of alien species in Asia and Pacific, and a publication on the use of genetically improved and alien species for aquaculture and conservation of aquatic biodiversity in Africa. He recommended that the liaison group consider these materials, developed for aquaculture, in order to harmonize the regulatory framework in all aquatic environments. He also introduced DIAS, a database on the introduction of aquatic species published in 1988 by FAO, and a special issue of the journal *Reviews in Aquaculture* dealing with access and use of aquatic genetic resources in aquaculture,⁵ for the liaison group to utilize.

20. Mr. Halwart (FAO) also mentioned the “FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries on Health Management for Responsible Movement of Live Aquatic Animals” (FAO 2007)⁶ and said that FAO and OIE had recently collaborated in regional capacity development on aquatic animal health in Africa.

21. Ms. Christiane Wolff (WTO) introduced WTO, which was established in 1995 and to date incorporated 153 member countries. WTO members were separate customs territories, but not all of them were countries. Since sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures could act as trade barriers, trade ministries and other agencies, such as animal and plant health sectors and phytosanitary authorities, were addressing these issues in the WTO SPS Committee. IAS were not explicitly mentioned in the SPS Agreement; however, the SPS Agreement made it clear that WTO members could take trade measures not only to protect animal and plant health, but also to protect the territory from damage caused by the entry and spread of pests. Thus if a WTO member took trade measures for protection from IAS, these measures were likely to be covered by the SPS Agreement. The SPS Agreement explicitly recognized the international standards developed by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, OIE and IPPC for food safety, animal and plant health, respectively. It could identify other international standards for matters not covered by these organizations. No specific international standard-setting body for IAS had so far been submitted for consideration by the SPS Committee.

22. The liaison group discussed the definition of IAS and the appropriateness of a work area for each of the organizations. The OIE stressed that the OIE standards referenced by the WTO SPS Committee were applicable to all WTO members globally, while the harmful impacts of IAS varied according to the region/country. Some IAS may not have been harmful in ecosystems where the species were native. Any standards developed would need to address these issues.

23. Mr. Dandu Pughuic (IMO) pointed out that addressing IAS required cross-sectoral collaboration at the national level as well as among the international organizations with relevant interests in the matter. Providing assistance to countries on how to raise awareness with regard to invasions was also essential and IMO had achieved significant experience in this respect through the implementation of the GloBallast Programme. As it appeared that terminology related to IAS varied from sector to sector, Mr. Pughuic

³ FAO 1996. Precautionary approach to capture fisheries and species introductions. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No. 2. Rome, FAO. 54 pp. Also available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/w3592e/w3592e00.htm>.

⁴ FAO. 2008. Aquaculture development. 3. Genetic resource management. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No. 5, Suppl. 3. Rome, FAO. 125 pp. Also available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/i0283e/i0283e00.htm>.

⁵ Bartley, D.M., Thuy, T.T. Halwart, M. & De Silva, S. (eds.) 2009. Special Issue on Use and Exchange of Aquatic Organisms in Aquaculture. *Reviews in Aquaculture* 1:157-278. Also available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/raq.2009.1.issue-3-4/issuetoc>.

⁶ <ftp://ftp.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/a1108e/a1108e00.pdf>.

suggested that a common terminology might facilitate communication among different sectors responsible for varying international agreements.

24. Mr. Yokoi (IPPC) stressed that in addition to harmonizing terminology, specialized containers for the transportation of living organisms should also be considered by the liaison group in the near future.

25. Ms. Marceil Yeater (Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora or CITES) made a presentation on the activities of CITES relevant to IAS. She explained that CITES regulated international trade in certain wildlife species through a system of permission and certificates. The degree of trade regulation depended on which of three CITES Appendices included the species. Appendix I included those species which were threatened with extinction and generally could not be the subject of international commercial trade. Appendix II included those species which were not necessarily threatened with extinction and could be the subject of international commercial trade under certain conditions (e.g., findings of legal acquisition and non-detriment to the survival of the species in the wild). Appendix III included those species which could be the subject of international commercial trade and were identified by a Party as needing cooperation from other Parties in the control of that trade.

26. Ms. Yeater (CITES) explained that to ensure effective regulation of CITES-listed species, Parties had to designate one or more Management Authorities competent to grant permits or certificates and one or more Scientific Authorities to provide relevant advice. Parties also had to adopt appropriate domestic measures (e.g., administrative and legislative) for enforcement of the Convention. Development of national legislation could be facilitated by the Secretariat of CITES.

27. Ms. Yeater (CITES) noted that international wildlife trade, and related transport, were important vectors for the spread of potential invasive alien species. Whether a species actually became invasive, however, was a reflection of its accidental or intentional release into the wild and its capacity to survive local conditions. Some known invasive species were listed in the CITES Appendices, for example, the monk parakeet (*Myiopsitta monachus*), the long-tailed macaque (*Macaca fascicularis*) and the erect prickly pear (*Opuntia stricta*) were included in Appendix II and the Indian mongoose (*Herpestes javanicus auropunctatus*) was included in Appendix III. The volume of international trade in these species varied significantly (e.g., from one specimen to about 51,000 specimens) and, accordingly, so did the potential risk of actual invasiveness. By contrast, the red-eared slider (*Trachemys scripta*) was not included in CITES and 3-4 million specimens were exported each year.

28. There was an opportunity under CITES for exporting and importing countries to consult about proposed trade transactions that might involve potential IAS, and the Conference of the Parties had recommended that Parties do so. The CITES Management Authority at national level had to ensure that live specimens were prepared and shipped in accordance with IATA live animal transport conditions, and the veterinary sector was often involved in ensuring national-level control of wildlife trade.

29. The criteria for including species in Appendix I of CITES included, for populations that were small or restricted or showing a marked decline, threats from alien invasive species (hybridization, disease transmission, depredation, etc.). The Conference of the Parties to CITES had urged Parties, prior to the establishment of captive breeding operations for exotic species, to undertake an assessment of the ecological risk, in order to safeguard against any negative effects in local ecosystems and native species.

30. Ms. Yeater (CITES) stressed that information about potential IAS needed to be accessible. One of the issue-based web modules developed under the UNEP/IUCN TEMATEA project covered IAS. A more recent, broader initiative on information and knowledge management which had been undertaken by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), relevant convention secretariats and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), should also facilitate access to IAS-related decisions taken by the governing bodies of global biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), including CITES, and might facilitate the task of collating data on IAS at the national level.

31. Ms. Yeater (CITES) pointed out that CITES was a legally-binding agreement on wildlife trade, and its Conference of the Parties had recommended that Parties should consider the problems of invasive

species when developing national legislation and regulations that dealt with the trade in live animals or plants (see Resolution Conf. 13.10 (Rev. CoP14)). There was potential for relevant legislative guidance materials on IAS to be developed under CITES.

32. Finally, Ms. Yeater (CITES) advised participants that CITES Parties had directed the Secretariat of CITES to explore ways to establish enhanced cooperation between CITES and organizations like OIE (also IMO and others) that dealt with transport through, *inter alia*, a memorandum of understanding or the creation of a liaison group. CITES Parties had also recommended that a relationship with IPPC be developed and they valued the collaboration that had already been established with IATA. These and other partner organizations in the transport and trade sectors could be good collaborators for addressing IAS.

33. Mr. Cooper (CBD) highlighted that all biodiversity-related groups responsible for liaison under the Convention might be able to consider IAS, although this did not easily resolve the cross-sectoral issues at national level.

34. Ms. Yeater (CITES) stressed the effectiveness of existing CITES compliance procedures which sought to promote, facilitate and achieve compliance with the Convention. She acknowledged that some species listed in the CITES Appendices were traded as pets. If no systematic international standard on invasiveness risk assessment currently existed in the pet trade domain, CITES would be willing to collaborate with other organizations to develop these.

35. Ms. Kahn (OIE) requested clarification about the scope of species that needed to be subjected to risk assessment on invasiveness and if it was proposed to develop an international protocol on IAS.

36. Mr. Cooper (CBD) stated that the precautionary approach under the Convention on Biological Diversity was slightly different from the risk assessment envisaged under the WTO SPS Agreement. International standards on IAS were currently lacking, although invasive species were regularly traded. The issue of an international protocol on IAS could be considered by an ad hoc technical expert group if the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity approved it at its tenth meeting.

37. Ms. Sarah Simons (GISP) stressed the need for harmonized terminology, as currently the term “invasive alien species” was defined in numerous different ways and had different meanings for different groups of stakeholders. The terminology could be discussed and agreed in the liaison group. For example, GISP used the term, “invasive species” in preference to “invasive alien species”, and its definition of invasive species was broader than that of the Convention on Biological Diversity or many other organizations. As climate change influenced the habitats of native species and provided a wider range of acceptable receiving environments, an increasing number of indigenous species were spreading into new ecosystems and becoming invasive.

38. Ms. Simons (GISP) emphasized the urgent need to control the spread of both native and non-native invasive species, and suggested that a single virtual platform on invasive species be created by the organizations participating in the liaison group. Indeed, the liaison group could provide for the creation of a solid multi-sectoral platform on IAS.

39. Ms. Kahn (OIE) commented that the development of such a platform might require approval by the governing bodies of each organization and that the introduction of new programmes would necessitate additional resources for participating organizations.

ITEM 3. ADDRESSING THE GAPS AND INCONSISTENCIES IN THE INTERNATIONAL REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES

43. Mr. Cooper (CBD) explained the expected outcomes of the meeting and asked participants to read the terms of reference for the liaison group. The Secretariat presented decision IX/4 and explained that two of the standard-setting bodies (IPPC and OIE) recognized by the WTO SPS Agreement were invited by the Conference of the Parties to consider broadening their coverage and the SPS Committee

was invited to broaden the standards by considering ways and means to address risks of IAS associated with international trade.

44. Mr. Halwart (FAO) mentioned that FAO-COFI had adopted the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, and that this and other available guidance, such as the document on international mechanisms for the control and responsible use of alien species in aquatic ecosystems,⁷ needed to be considered when addressing gaps and inconsistencies. Mr. Halwart made further reference to the “FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries No. 5, Suppl. 3, Aquaculture Development 3. Genetic resource management” and “FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries No. 2. Precautionary approach to capture fisheries and species introductions”. He mentioned that these only partially covered the issue of aquatic alien species. Further discussion and guidance were needed from FAO-COFI regarding the need for comprehensive technical guidelines on aquatic alien species, the proposed process for their elaboration, and expectations regarding their formalization.

45. Ms. Kahn (OIE) mentioned that OIE’s procedure for listing disease agents did not specifically address the issue of whether or not the diseases affect wildlife. Mr. Atagi (OIE) presented the OIE decision tree and gave an example of a listed disease that only affected wildlife: the chytrid fungus, *Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis*, which affected amphibians.

46. However, Ms. Kahn (OIE) noted that it was not clear if diseases that only affected wildlife and not domestic animals would qualify for listing under the current decision tree approach. The OIE agreed that this question could be addressed within the OIE (for example, by the ad hoc group on disease listing, or the wildlife working group) and further advice could be provided to the liaison group.

47. Mr. Cooper (co-chair) agreed to this suggestion.

48. The liaison group then discussed animals transported via freight (rats by ships for example).

49. Ms. Kahn (OIE) clarified that unintentional animal transportation was not specifically addressed by the OIE but that human quarantine agencies had protocols for de-ratting of ships.

50. Ms. Kahn (OIE) also clarified that the issue of animals harming ecosystems, except where this was related to the entry or spread of listed diseases, was not under OIE’s mandate at the present time.

51. Mr. Cooper (CBD) confirmed that the analysis was made and considered by the Conference of the Parties at its ninth meeting and decision IX/4 A was the conclusion. The expansion in coverage of plant pests under IPPC within its mandate, together with an expansion in the mandate of OIE to address a wider range of animal diseases and to address invasive animal species, were both mentioned in decision IX/4 A.

52. Ms. Wolff (WTO) stated that WTO members could suggest agenda items for the SPS Committee such as information on issues related to international trade. Any action related to paragraph 4 of decision IX/4 A would require a discussion in the SPS Committee, and potentially a Committee decision. The SPS Committee met three times a year, and the next meeting would overlap with the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. In order for this to be reconsidered by the SPS Committee, it would need to be raised by a WTO member.

53. Mr. Halwart (FAO) also mentioned that there were two sub-committees under COFI, one for trade and one for aquaculture. They would meet in September 2010 and again in February 2011. These were opportunities to introduce the issues raised in paragraph 5 of decision IX/4 A. As with the SPS Committee, the issue needed to be raised by a member of the committee.

54. Mr. Cooper (CBD) stressed that alien genotypes (infraspecific varieties) introduced for use in aquaculture was an issue that required financial resources to develop adequate standards.

⁷ International mechanisms for the control and responsible use of alien species in aquatic ecosystems. Report of an Ad Hoc Expert Consultation. Xishuangbanna, People's Republic of China, 27–30 August 2003. Rome, FAO. 2005. 195 pp.

55. Ms. Simons (GISP) mentioned that analysis on the economic impact of IAS was lacking. Building up cases of costs of eradication (billions of US\$ for each) was extremely useful and would result in a much more accurate figure of the economics of IAS. It would also be an important tool for decision makers.

56. Mr. Cooper (CBD) mentioned that the IPPC Secretariat was developing a discussion paper on the application of IPPC standards to the aquatic environment, which was being prepared for alternate consideration by CPM in response to the invitation mentioned in paragraph 2 of decision IX/4 A.

57. In response to the invitation in paragraph 3 (a) of decision IX/4 A, Ms. Kahn (OIE) undertook to obtain additional advice for the liaison group.

58. In response to the invitation in paragraph 3 (b) of decision IX/4 A, Ms. Kahn (OIE) noted that OIE would develop a paper examining the issues relevant to broadening its mandate to address invasive species that were not listed at that time as disease agents. In the case of animals and animal pathogens, OIE could have a comparative advantage as it already provided advice to Governments and international organizations that regulated international animal movements. The OIE paper would take into account the global "One Health" initiative.

59. Mr. Halwart (FAO) mentioned that FAO had developed a number of relevant technical publications. One option was to update and complete the technical guidance for possible adoption by COFI. In relation to the invitation in paragraph 5 of decision IX/4 A, the secretariat of FAO could explore bringing this issue to the attention of the Sub-Committee on Aquaculture (September 2010) and COFI (February 2011) under the standing item on the Code of Conduct on Responsible Fisheries.

60. Mr. Cooper (CBD) further noted the threat from introduced species carrying different genotypes (infraspecific varieties), as such species disturb natural boundary of biotypes. This threat might also reduce genetic diversity. However, the issue needed to be further clarified by the members of liaison group and if necessary in consultation with international legal experts.

ITEM 4. CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AND PROMOTING COLLABORATION AT NATIONAL LEVEL TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES

61. Mr. Cooper (CBD) explained that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity reaffirmed the need for capacity-building and urged Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to provide such support (paragraph 9 of decision IX/4 B). Moreover, the Conference of the Parties requested that the Executive Secretary continue to collaborate with the secretariats of other bodies, *inter alia*, to promote other actions to address invasive alien species at the national level and facilitating support to Parties, via capacity-building (paragraph 11 of decision IX/4 A).

62. The liaison group reiterated the need for capacity development to address the impact of invasive species on biodiversity and agreed to explore the possibility of collaborating to facilitate the implementation of existing international instruments relevant to the issue of invasive species.

63. Ms. Wolff (WTO) reaffirmed that the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) was a joint initiative of WTO, FAO, WHO, OIE and the World Bank for capacity-building and technical cooperation aiming at raising awareness on the importance of sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) issues, increasing coordination in the provision of SPS-related assistance, and mobilizing resources to assist developing countries to enhance their capacity to meet SPS standards.⁸

64. There was interest in the Standards and Trade Development Facility Working Group in possibly organizing an event on invasive alien species and this needed to be followed after the first meeting of the liaison group.

⁸ <http://www.standardsfacility.org/>.

65. Mr. Pughiuc (IMO) made a presentation on the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM Convention), adopted in 2004, and the Global Ballast Water Management Programme (GloBallast) which was a joint programme of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and IMO to assist developing countries to reduce the transfer of harmful aquatic organisms and pathogens in ships' ballast water.⁹

66. Mr. Pughiuc (IMO) indicated that his organization was prepared to consider any possibility of cooperating with the Secretariat of the Convention and other organizations interested in stemming the transfer of invasive species. The BWM Convention, which addressed a major pathway for invasions, had been ratified by 27 countries, and it was widely expected to enter into force during the within the next two years.

67. Ms. Simons (GISP) informed the liaison group that it had assisted developing countries to implement Article 8(h) of the Convention and had contributed extensively to the knowledge and awareness of invasive species.¹⁰ GISP would continue collaboration with the Convention on Biological Diversity to support developing countries to develop national invasive alien species strategies and action plans by holding workshops and providing policy guidance and tools.

ITEM 5. DISCUSSION OF FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES

68. The liaison group took note of upcoming events, including:

- (a) COFI Sub-Committee on Aquaculture session in September 2010;
- (b) Tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, in October 2010;
- (c) WTO SPS Committee meeting in October 2010;
- (d) COFI meeting in February 2011;
- (e) Sixth meeting of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM6) of the IPPC, in March/April 2011;
- (f) OIE Global Conference on Wildlife, in February 2011.

69. It emerged that OIE had drafted a memorandum of understanding and had sent it to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity in 2002. OIE and the Secretariat agreed that this would need to be reviewed to reflect developments over the past eight years, but that signature of a formal agreement would be desirable. The Secretariat would review the text, as appropriate, and would resume the process to sign the updated memorandum of understanding as soon as possible.

70. It was agreed that participation of the FAO Animal Production and Health Division (FAO-Animal Health) was highly relevant to the discussion on invasive alien species. The OIE and FAO-Animal Health were in collaboration under the "One Health Initiative". The liaison group agreed that it would be valuable to exchange information on IAS with all relevant departments of FAO.

71. Mr. Cooper (CBD) informed the liaison group that this first face-to-face meeting was aimed at dealing specifically with decision IX/4 A and in particular how to make progress in the implementation of decision IX/4 A among the international organizations mentioned in this decision.

72. Mr. Yokoi (IPPC) informed the group that FAO would be interested in hosting the next meeting of the liaison group, in April 2011, at the earliest, after the sixth meeting of the IPPC's Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM6) to be held in March, suggesting that such a meeting would benefit from

⁹ <http://globallast.imo.org>.

¹⁰ www.gisp.org.

the possible wider participation from relevant FAO divisions.

73. Ms. Wolff (WTO) mentioned that the WTO Secretariat agreed to explore the possibility of hosting a future meeting of the liaison group. In addition, the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) might decide to organize a workshop on IAS back-to-back with one of the meetings of the SPS Committee in 2011, possibly in June.

74. The liaison group welcomed the offer by FAO.

75. Mr. Cooper (CBD) welcomed the offers from IPPC and WTO secretariats and mentioned that the next meeting should preferably be held earlier than in April 2011, possibly by the end of 2010.

76. The liaison group agreed to continue to discuss actions to take and the timing of the next meeting via e-mails.

ITEM 6. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

77. Mr. Cooper (CBD) thanked the OIE for hosting the first physical meeting of the liaison group and asked the attendees to maintain contact.

78. The first meeting of the inter-agency liaison group on invasive alien species was closed at 1 p.m. on 18 June 2010.

Annex I

AGENDA OF THE MEETING

1. Opening of the meeting:
 - 1.1 Welcome: Mr. Bernard Vallat, Director General of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE);
 - 1.2 Selection of co-chairs and approval of the agenda.
2. Introduction and overview of the objectives and programme for the meeting:
 - 2.1 Briefings on decisions VIII/27 and IX/4 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity;
 - 2.2 Report on the third IPPC-CBD joint secretariat meeting (International Plant Protection Convention-Convention on Biological Diversity);
 - 2.3 Tour de table: briefings on relevant activities.
3. Addressing the gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework for invasive alien species:
 - 3.1 Discussion on addressing the gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework:
 - 3.1.1. Identifying issues on invasive alien species within and beyond the mandate of each organization;
 - 3.1.2. Identifying existing instruments to address the issues of invasive alien species:
 - (a) Inclusion of aquatic plant pests by IPPC;
 - (b) Broadening the mandate of OIE;
 - (c) International standards/codes of conduct by WTO-SPS and COFI-FAO covering invasive alien species that are not pests of plants;
 - (d) Appendix I and II of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES);
 - (e) International Maritime Organization (IMO) and International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) on marine/aquatic invasives;
 - (f) Possible Convention on Biological Diversity guidelines on pets, aquarium terrarium species, live bait and live food.
4. Capacity development and promoting collaboration at national level to address the issue of invasive alien species:
 - 4.1 Report from chair about the outcome of the day 1;
 - 4.2 Discussion on possible collaboration for capacity development and promoting collaboration at national level.
5. Follow-up activities.
6. Closure of the meeting.

Annex II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Name	Organization
Bernard Vallat	World Organisation for Animal Health
Sarah Kahn	World Organisation for Animal Health
Wim Pelgrim	World Organisation for Animal Health
Yukio Yokoi	International Plant Protection Convention
Christiane Wolff	World Trade Organization - SPS Committee
Matthias Halwart	FAO Committee on Fisheries
Dandu Pughiuc	International Maritime Organization
Marceil Yeater	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)
David Cooper	Convention on Biological Diversity
Junko Shimura	Convention on Biological Diversity
Geoffrey Howard	International Union for Conservation of Nature
Sarah Simons	Global Invasive Species Programme

Annex III

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE INTER-AGENCY
LIASION GROUP ON INVASIVE ALIEN SPECIES**

(a) The IPPC Secretariat is developing a discussion paper on the application of IPPC standards to the aquatic environment, which is being prepared for alternative consideration by the Commission for Phytosanitary Measures in response to paragraph 2 of decision IX/4 A and paragraphs 14 and 60 of decision VIII/27;

(b) In response to paragraph 3 (a) of decision IX/4 A and paragraph 14 of VIII/27, in consultation with interested stakeholders, OIE agreed to consider the disease listing criteria, based on relevant expertise, and to advise whether organisms causing diseases in wildlife are adequately considered and specifically, whether an organism that causes disease in wildlife but not in domestic species could satisfy the current criteria for listing;

(c) The OIE will develop a paper examining the issues relevant to broadening its mandate to address invasive species that are not currently listed disease agents. In the case of animals and animal pathogens, OIE could have a comparative advantage as it already provides advice to Governments and international organizations that regulate international animal movements. Both this response and that in (b) above would take into account the global “One Health” initiative, in response to paragraph 3 (b) of decision IX/4;

(d) Any WTO member could initiate a discussion in the SPS Committee regarding national plans taken to address risks from IAS associated with international trade, or regarding gaps in the mandates of the standard-setting organizations referenced in the SPS Agreement. Relevant information has been made available to WTO members, in response to paragraph 4 of decision IX/4 A;

(e) In response to the invitation in paragraph 5 of decision IX/4 A and paragraphs 20-24 of decision VIII/27, the FAO Secretariat could explore bringing this issue to the attention of COFI (February 2011) and its Sub-Committees on Aquaculture and Fish Trade, for consideration and guidance of members. One option could be to review and update relevant provisions of existing FAO Technical Guidelines under the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF), including the “Precautionary approach to capture fisheries and species introductions”(FAO 1996)¹¹ and “Aquaculture Development 3. Genetic resource management” (FAO 2008)¹² and other relevant material, for harmonization and more comprehensive coverage addressing aquatic animal introductions for aquaculture and fisheries, in all environments;

(f) In response to paragraph 11 of decision IX/4 A, paragraph 21 of decision IX/4 B and in relevance to paragraphs 25-33 of decision VIII/27, IMO Secretariat provided information about the work carried out by IMO to address the issue of bio-fouling of ships, which is identified as a current gap in the international regulatory framework for preventing the transfer of invasive species. The correspondence group established in this respect will report on its work to the 15th session of the IMO Sub-Committee on Bulk Liquids and Gases that will take place in February 2011 and the first set of guidelines for the control and management of ships’ bio-fouling to minimize the transfer of invasive aquatic species is expected to be approved by the Marine Environment Committee in July 2011. IMO will continue to collaborate with the Secretariat of the Convention and other interested organizations to address the issue of invasive species in ships’ ballast water and support its Member States in their efforts to implement the existing international regulatory framework.

¹¹ FAO 1996. Precautionary approach to capture fisheries and species introductions. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No. 2. Rome, FAO. 54 pp. Also available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/w3592e/w3592e00.htm>.

¹² FAO. 2008. Aquaculture development. 3. Genetic resource management. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No. 5, Suppl. 3. Rome, FAO. 125 pp. Also available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/011/i0283e/i0283e00.htm>.

(g) In response to paragraph 11 of IX/4 A, CITES continues its collaboration with the Convention on Biological Diversity to explore additional means to address invasive alien species of relevance to international trade in CITES-listed species, including the CITES's legally-binding regulatory scheme for ensuring that trade is legal, sustainable and traceable; CITES trade database; Information and Knowledge Management initiative for assisting States-Parties to multilateral environmental agreements; national policy and legislative support provided to CITES Parties under the Convention; and cooperation within the Biodiversity Liaison Group as well as the Environment Management Group.
