

Report of the Inter-agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species on its 6th meeting

**International Maritime Organization
London, 1-2 April 2015**



Contents

1. Opening and organizational matters	3
2. Review of the report of the fifth meeting of the Inter-agency Liaison Group, Nairobi, Kenya, 13 to 15 January 2014	3
3. Highlights of recent major meetings of the organizations	3
4. Discussion on progress and future activities	11
A. Addressing gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework relevant to invasive alien species	11
B. Next steps to address trade in wildlife as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food	12
C. Other ways forward	13
5. Other matters	16
6. Date and venue of the next meeting	17
7. Closure of the meeting	17

Annexes

I. Statement of Mr Stefan Micallef, Director of the Marine Environment Division of the International Maritime Organization	18
II. List of participants	19
III. Provisional agenda	22

1. Opening and organizational matters

1. The meeting opened on Wednesday, 1 April 2015, at the offices of the International Maritime Organization (IMO).
2. Mr. Stefan Micallef, Director of the Marine Environment Division of IMO, opened the meeting and welcomed all participants (for his statement, see annex I). He informed the participants that, by taking the lead in addressing the transfer of invasive aquatic species through ships, IMO was at the forefront of international efforts. With the adoption of the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments in 2004 (BWM Convention),¹ IMO Member States had made a clear commitment to minimizing the transfer of invasive aquatic species originating from shipping, specifically through ships' ballast water. A further milestone had been made in 2011 when the Guidelines for the control and management of ships' biofouling to minimize the transfer of invasive aquatic species (Biofouling Guidelines) had been adopted by the IMO Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) through resolution MEPC.207 (62). In addition, the IMO Maritime Safety Committee (MSC) had become involved in matters related to invasive species through its work on the IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU Code), which had been approved by MSC 93 in 2014. He stressed that all the organizations represented at the meeting worked for the same Member States. The intent was to facilitate, through the respective contact points of the Member States, better coordinated action among the various stakeholders at the national level, which enhances the effectiveness of the efforts for the prevention, control and eradication of invasive alien species.
3. After brief self-introductions by all participants (for the list of participants, see annex II), including representatives of the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) participating remotely, the Group selected Mr. Markus Helavuori and Mr. David Cooper as co-chairs and Ms. Junko Shimura as rapporteur for the meeting.
4. The provisional agenda was approved with a slight adjustment to the timing of the presentation on the IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU code) due to the availability of the corresponding officer.

2. Review of the report of the fifth meeting of the Inter-agency Liaison Group, Nairobi, Kenya, 13 to 15 January 2014

5. The Co-chairs had invited participants at the 5th meeting of the Liaison Group to work on the draft report and had requested them to provide feedback by the end of April 2015. CABI and IUCN would then circulate the report to the entire Group and post it on the CBD webpage (<https://www.cbd.int/invasive/lg/>) in due course.

3. Highlights of recent main meetings of the organizations

International Maritime Organization

6. A representative of the IMO Secretariat presented a brief history of the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM Convention). Currently, 44 countries had ratified, representing 32.86% of the world's merchant tonnage. Entry into force required 30 States and 35% of world's gross tonnage.
7. He also presented on the voluntary guidelines addressing ships' biofouling, including the following:

(a) "*Guidelines for the control and management of ships' biofouling to minimize the transfer of invasive aquatic species*" (MEPC.207(62));²

¹ International Maritime Organization, document BWM/CONF/36, annex.

² http://www.imo.org/blast/blastDataHelper.asp?data_id=30766

(b) “Guidance for minimizing the transfer of invasive aquatic species as biofouling (hull fouling) for recreational craft, (MEPC 64 in October 2012 and circulated as MEPC.1/Circ.792);³

8. He mentioned the assistance and technical cooperation provided to the Member States by IMO. Regarding the implementation of the guidelines under IMO, he mentioned that the involvement of the private sector (multilateral entities, ship owners and operators), which has an observer status in the IMO process, was a critical matter for effective implementation, though it was also a challenge to fully engage the private sector. He indicated that, if Member States successfully involved that sector (for example, Australia and New Zealand), implementation of the IMO guidelines could progress significantly.

9. The Liaison Group highlighted the fact that awareness in fishery sectors and other stakeholders might further facilitate the implementation of the IMO guidelines, although cost implications constituted a major obstacle in many parts of the world. IMO further stressed that efforts to improve awareness on measures to prevent bio-fouling were beneficial to increasing fuel efficiency and reducing the financial burden of ship/boat owners.

10. Regarding reporting obligations, the BWM Convention mandated Parties to notify IMO and mariners of outbreaks, infestations or populations of harmful aquatic organisms and pathogens (for example, toxic algal blooms). Information with regard to the occurrence of species in various regions might potentially also be gathered as a result of applying the Guidelines for risk assessment under regulation A-4 of the BWM Convention (G7, resolution MEPC.174(58)), although those voluntary guidelines did not include any provisions for sharing such information.

11. Another representative of the IMO Secretariat presented the IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU code), which is voluntary guidance on the safe packing of cargo transport units (CTUs) for those responsible for packing and securing cargo, and for those whose task it is to train people to pack/unpack such units. Among other things, the code contains provisions to ensure that containers are free from plants, plant products, visible pests, animals and other invasive alien species.

12. Contaminants that are found at the arrival check of the sea containers need to be cleaned. The example of contaminations include:

- (a) Soil;
- (b) Plants/plant products/debris;
- (c) Seeds;
- (d) Moths, wasps and bees;
- (e) Snails, slugs, ants and spiders;
- (f) Mold and fungi;
- (g) Frass (insect excrement) and Guano (bird droppings);
- (h) Egg sacs;
- (i) Animals (including frogs), animal parts/blood/excreta and reproductive components or parts thereof;
- (j) Other contamination that shows visible signs of harbouring pests or invasive alien species (including alien species which carry risks of becoming invasive at the site of arrival of CTU’s).

13. The Secretariat of IPPC informed the Group that the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures at its tenth session had adopted a recommendation on sea containers (CPM-10/2015).⁴ The CPM had also encouraged the IPPC Secretariat to work with IMO, the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) to raise awareness among their members of the risks arising from the international movement of sea containers and the benefit of ensuring that sea containers are clean. Likewise, CPM had requested the IPPC Secretariat to write to the secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE) requesting that they endorse the CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers with the aim of minimizing the movement of pests through sea containers, and to consider developing, in parallel, their own recommendations regarding organisms with which they were concerned with similar involvement of their members and industry.

³ <http://www.imo.org/en/OurWork/Environment/Biofouling/Documents/MEPC.1-Circ.792.pdf>.

⁴ CPM Recommendation on Sea Containers, CPM-10/2015/ :<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/80914/>.

Convention on Biological Diversity

14. A representative of the Secretariat of CBD presented recent decisions on invasive alien species. She highlighted the fact that the “Guidance on devising and implementing measures to address the risks associated with the introduction of alien species as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food”,⁵ adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting, filled a gap in the international regulatory framework relevant to invasive alien species that had been recognized by the Conference of the Parties in 2006. The guidance is voluntary; States, organizations or industry could apply it to manage the live species transferred across biogeographic boundaries, including in-country movement, selling and purchasing via e-commerce and hybrid taxa.

15. Regarding trade in wild species introduced (or which might be introduced) as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food (PATBF), the Conference of the Parties had requested the Executive Secretary to explore ways and means to address the potential risks to biodiversity. In response to that decision, the CBD representative had consulted with the secretariats of CITES and the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement). The Group was invited to comment on the concept note prepared by the CBD Secretariat on the ways and means to address the pathway of wildlife trade, particularly in live specimens of species that were already available in the international market (including e-commerce) without necessarily having been subjected to a risk assessment for biological invasiveness.

16. With regard to unreported trade in wildlife mentioned in the CBD Conference of the Parties decision, the CITES Secretariat informed the Group that the publicly available CITES Trade Database was regularly updated with Parties’ annual report submissions if the specimens were of the species listed in the CITES appendices. However, trade occurring in violation of the Convention (that is, without an appropriate and valid CITES permit or certificate) was likely to be untraceable. Moreover, some annual reports were not submitted by the reporting deadline, which meant that the data contained in them were not publicly available until the reports were submitted and the data incorporated into the CITES Trade Database. In addition, CITES covers approximately 35,000 species and those species outside the scope of CITES may or may not be subject to trade regulation through a national or international body. The CITES Secretariat, in collaboration with other relevant organizations, had been working on ways to link the CITES permitting system to the Single Window system for international trade. That was something that should be further promoted as a useful means for addressing traceability issues related to the wildlife trade.

17. The representative of CBD made a presentation on future work related to invasive alien species requested by the Conference of the Parties. Such work would include activities in collaboration with relevant organizations:

(a) To develop decision support tools for assessing and evaluating social, economic and ecological consequences of invasive alien species; cost-benefit analyses for eradication; management and control measures; and tools for examining impacts of climate change and land use change on biological invasions;

(b) To explore alerting suppliers and potential buyers to the risk posed by invasive alien species sold via e-commerce;

(c) To develop a user-friendly guide to decisions of the Conference Parties on invasive alien species and the relevant guidance and standards developed by other relevant organizations, as requested in paragraphs 3 and 17 of decision IX/4 B;

(d) To compile information on the experiences of biocontrol agents against invasive alien species, in particular the release of alien species into the environment for that purpose.

⁵ Conference of the Parties decision XII/16 on invasive alien species: management of risks associated with the introduction of alien species as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food, annex (available at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-12/cop-12-dec-16-en.pdf>).

18. The Liaison Group was informed that the assessment on invasive alien species to be conducted by Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) would be finalized in 2019, and speedy feedback from experts was needed if the Group intended to contribute to a report on the tools and case studies for the 20th meeting of Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, in 2016. In that context, CABI stressed that some guidance on biocontrol agents was published earlier and that duplication of efforts should be avoided, the focus should be on updates of the existing information. In addition, CABI informed the participants that a report on the quantitative impacts of invasive alien species on rural livelihoods in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia would be published (later in 2015 or in early 2016), and suggested that the Secretariat of CBD to refer to the publication.

International Plant Protection Convention

19. A representative of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) reiterated that efforts at the national level to facilitate communication between the National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) and the CBD focal point could be improved in many countries. The work of NPPO does not only concern border areas, and the environment sector should recognize that collaboration with their NPPO helps invasive alien species prevention and management in the environment.

20. At the tenth session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (Rome, 16-20 March 2015), the Secretariats of CBD and WTO SPS Committee had made presentations on their activities and collaborations with the IPPC Secretariat. An important recommendation on sea containers had been adopted, and it had been highlighted that effective implementation should be facilitated at the national level by keeping relevant contact/focal points informed. To facilitate the application of the CTU code, the IPPC Secretariat informed the Liaison Group that the Secretariat of IMO would be invited to the eleventh session of the CPM in April 2016.

21. The Commission on Phytosanitary Measures at its tenth session had also agreed to support the proposal of Finland to the Council of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) that 2020 be proclaimed the International Year for Plant Health. If the Council agreed, then additional steps would be taken for the International Year for Plant Health to be proposed to the United Nations General Assembly.

22. The Liaison Group welcomed the outcomes of the tenth session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures. For the purpose of improving public awareness of plant protection and plant pests, a photo contest had been organized on the margins of the tenth session of the Commission. The winner's photos had been published in *National Geographic* magazine⁶ and were available on the Phytosanitary Resources page for download and use.⁷

23. The Secretariat of CBD emphasized that the period from 2011 to 2020 represented the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity,⁸ and although 2020 was a little too close to the end of the Decade, collaboration in the publication of documents and the organization of events with mutual interests was possible. It requested the IPPC Secretariat to keep the Group informed on its progress.

24. Implementation and capacity development were recognized as a critically important area by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures at its tenth session. The IPPC Secretariat was currently developing a system for the exchange of electronic phytosanitary certification data (e-Phyto), and a side session on the topic had been organized on the margins of tenth session of the Commission. The system would also facilitate international trade in developing countries where electronic certification had not been in place previously.

25. The IPPC Secretariat further informed the Liaison Group that an implementation pilot on surveillance would start in 2015 for IPPC contracting Parties and other collaborators. That would be a

⁶ See http://www.nationalgeographic.it/fotografia/2015/04/02/foto/parassiti_senza_frontiere_i_vincitori_del_concorso-2551944/1/?ref=HRESS-38.

⁷ IPPC Photo contest winners on the Phytosanitary Resources page (<http://www.phytosanitary.info/final-selection>).

⁸ The United Nations Decade on Biodiversity was proclaimed by the General Assembly in its resolution 65/161 on the Convention on Biological Diversity.

collaborative effort to focus on implementing surveillance as a key first step to prevent the introduction and spread of pests. In addition, there were resources, such as a Pest Risk Analysis training e-course and the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation (PCE) tool. Many other resources to facilitate the implementation of the International Standards on Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs) were in development, including a guide to strengthening the relationship between national plant protection organizations and stakeholders. The IPPC Secretariat stressed that capacity development might not be sufficiently accomplished in a short period of time and trainings should be components of a long-term programme to develop capacities sustainably. To do effective capacity development, the IPPC Secretariat, with input from the IPPC Capacity Development Committee was focusing on a long-term (10 years) capacity development plan based on an agreed strategy.

26. The ongoing and future work in standard setting included: growing media in association with plants for planting; international movement of seeds; grains; air containers; wood; used vehicles and equipment; waste and cut flowers and branches. The next call for topics for IPPC standards would be in June 2015 and the Group was requested to encourage their members to submit topics through their national plant protection organization.⁹

27. The Liaison Group suggested to the IPPC Secretariat that setting indicators for monitoring progress on implementation of the ISPMs, in particular by the environment sector, would be helpful to facilitate achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 9. Such monitoring with clear indicators might help production of tangible reports/publications for the International Year for Plant Health, ideally with collaborative activities for the United Nations Decade on Biodiversity, among the organizations of the Group. The IPPC Secretariat noted that its Implementation Review and Support System project operated an activity to explore indicators of the extent and impact of implementation of IPPC and expressed an interest in contributing to activities related to indicator development for the Aichi targets.

World Trade Organization

28. A representative of the World Trade Organization (WTO) summarized the principles of WTO for facilitating international trade and its Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), regarding how governments can apply measures to protect food safety and animal and plant health (SPS measures). The SPS Agreement sets out the basic rules for WTO members on harmonization of measures on the basis of international standards, but also allows governments to introduce other measures based on risk assessments.¹⁰ She also explained the Standard and Trade Development Facility (STDF), a partnership of WTO, FAO, the World Bank, OIE and WHO, which supports developing countries in building their capacity to implement SPS standards, guidelines and recommendations and to gain access to international markets.¹¹ In 2015, WTO would provide technical assistance, and trainings and workshops in Asia and the Pacific, the Caribbean and Arab countries were planned. The e-learning course on the SPS Agreement and other technical trainings were available. The Liaison Group suggested that WTO should share the information on the opportunities of technical assistance to national focal points/contact point of the relevant Conventions.

29. She also informed the Liaison Group that collaboration between the secretariats of CBD and STDF on capacity-building for small island developing States in 2015-16 was possible and under consideration, although it was subject to the availability of funding.

30. She informed the Liaison Group about a new trade facilitation agreement (TFA)¹² which promoted faster and more efficient customs procedures, for example through effective cooperation between customs and other appropriate authorities. It also contained provisions for technical assistance and capacity-building in that area, and now it was on the way to being formally accepted by WTO members. SPS border agencies should be encouraged to be involved in the implementation of the new agreement, and benefit from the technical assistance available for that purpose.

⁹ IPPC national official contact points: <https://www.ippc.int/en/countries/>.

¹⁰ More information about the SPS Agreement is available at: www.wto.org/sps.

¹¹ More information is available on the STDF website: www.standardsfacility.org.

¹² More information about the new WTO Trade Facilitation Agreement and technical assistance in this area is available at: www.wto.org/tradefacilitation.

31. With regard to alerting suppliers and potential buyers of live species via e-commerce and the risk of escapes in shipping and handling of live species in the international market, she informed the Group that the WTO SPS Agreement states that, based on an assessment, as appropriate to the circumstances, members can take measures which may include appropriate labelling of the risk of escape and its consequences on the health of plants and animals or humans.

World Organisation for Animal Health

32. A representative of the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) informed the Liaison Group that, in 2014, OIE had celebrated its ninetieth anniversary, and as a standard-setting activity, the World Assembly of Delegates had adopted updated texts in its normative publications, including 28 new or revised chapters in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code¹³ and 14 new or revised chapters in the Aquatic Animal Health Code¹⁴ during the eighty-second General Session, held in May 2014.

33. He also informed the Liaison Group of the recent public release of a newly developed Web application named WAHIS–Wild Interface, which was accessible on the OIE website.¹⁵ The interface contained information on non-OIE-listed diseases of wild animals, collected annually on a voluntary basis by OIE member countries. A specific surveillance procedure dedicated to wildlife had been defined by a working group of experts from several member countries. Those experts had identified 53 priority infectious and non-infectious diseases to be monitored on the basis of their importance for wildlife and to protect animal and human life. He indicated that the contents of the WAHIS-Wild Interface should not be used as a reason to impose any trade restriction on animals or animal products.

34. OIE continued its capacity-building activities to support member countries wishing to strengthen veterinary services and aquatic animal health services (AAHS) through the OIE Performance of Veterinary Services (PVS) Pathway. In April 2014, OIE had organized a training seminar for PVS evaluators to update them on recent revisions to the PVS Pathway tools. The OIE PVS Pathway tools are designed to assist veterinary services and AAHS to establish their current level of performance, to identify gaps and weaknesses in their ability to comply with OIE international standards, to form a shared vision with stakeholders (including the private sector) and to establish priorities and carry out strategic initiatives.¹⁶

35. He also informed the Liaison Group that, in the upcoming World Assembly of OIE Delegates in May 2015, the OIE would adopt its sixth strategic plan, for the period 2016 to 2020, which would reaffirm its commitment to providing member countries with science-based guidance and standards, as well as measures to protect biodiversity and wildlife populations.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

36. A representative of IPPC presented updates of the activities of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) related to invasive alien species.

37. The forestry department of FAO provided a free e-learning course entitled Trade in Forest Commodities and the Role of Phytosanitary Measures. FAO also provided an opportunity for capacity-building in harmonization of risk analysis on forest invasive plant species in South-East Asia. Furthermore, FAO supported the Asia-Pacific Forest Invasive Species Network to develop a new work plan for enhancing forest pest management capacity in the region.

38. The Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA) and FAO Fisheries and Aquaculture Department initiated a process towards a first report on the *State of the World's Aquatic Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture* (SoWAqGR) where countries' National Focal Points prepare national reports on farmed species and their wild relatives in areas within national jurisdiction. Farmed aquatic species have been introduced around the globe and many of them today play an important role for national

¹³ Terrestrial Animal Health Code: <http://www.oie.int/international-standard-setting/terrestrial-code/access-online/>.

¹⁴ Aquatic Animal Health Code: <http://www.oie.int/international-standard-setting/aquatic-code/access-online/>.

¹⁵ WAHIS-Wild: http://www.oie.int/wahis_2/public/wahidwild.php.

¹⁶ http://www.oie.int/fileadmin/Home/eng/Support_to_OIE_Members/pdf/PVS_A_Tool_Final_Edition_2013.pdf

food security and income generation and within the Aquaculture component play an important role in FAO's global Blue Growth Initiative (BGI). From initial feedback it was evident that there would be much valuable information on aquatic introduced species reported in country reports which are due by end 2015. FAO looks forward to partner with relevant institutions in the process towards the SoWAqGR, and extends its invitation to the Executive Secretary of the CBD and other relevant partners to attend the forthcoming 8th Session of the Committee on Fisheries (COFI) Sub-Committee on Aquaculture to be held in Brasilia from 5 to 9 October 2015.

Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora

39. A representative of the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) informed the Liaison Group that the Conference of the Parties to CITES at its 16th meeting (Bangkok, 2013) had discussed issues related to e-commerce (see Decisions 15.57 and 16.62 on e-commerce of specimens of CITES-listed species).¹⁷ However, the CITES Standing Committee, at its 65th meeting (Geneva, July 2014) had decided to not extend the mandate of the Working Group on e-Commerce.

40. The CITES Secretariat informed the Liaison Group about projects related to the tracking and tracing of species in international trade, including a project to track and trace python skins. The Secretariat was also studying the elements required to implement a track-and-trace system for shark fins. A challenge for CITES includes linking ministries responsible for the development of electronic trade documentation and procedures, including Single Window environments, with CITES Management Authorities to assist in making CITES trade paperless. Another challenge was in building the capacity of Customs to identify species in trade accurately. Projects were under way to address both of those challenges.

41. Customs authorities face another challenge: ascertaining if the information on permits/certificates for and labels on consignments of specimens of CITES-listed species indicate their scientific and common names.

42. IPPC noted the CITES activities and commented that the effort was very similar to that of IPPC. After a brief discussion, the two Conventions agreed to put their respective electronic certification experts in touch to explore possible synergies in the future.

43. The CBD Secretariat mentioned that the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) covers one million taxa scrutinized by taxonomic experts with the latest taxonomic revisions, which was important for the single window systems to work properly. Some advanced regions had information sets on pests that are of regional interest, but such information sets would not be sufficient to help the global needs of taxonomy. GBIF should be encouraged by the global community to make the valuable set of taxonomic names available for systems that are outside GBIF.

Ramsar Convention on Wetlands

44. A representative of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands informed the Liaison Group that the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Ramsar Convention had recognized invasive alien species as major drivers of wetland biodiversity loss and that its draft fourth Strategic Plan 2016-2024 incorporated a target for Contracting Parties to complete an inventory of invasive alien species and prepare and implement management responses by 2021. That target was aligned with Aichi Biodiversity Target 9 of CBD.¹⁸

45. She also called for reviewing by the Liaison Group on "Ramsar Briefing Note No. 8 – Wetlands and Invasive Alien Species: A Guide to Available Guidance" which had been prepared by the Scientific and Technical Review Panel of the Ramsar Convention to raise awareness of invasive alien species and management tools for Ramsar Contracting Parties and partners. The Liaison Group requested that the

¹⁷ Available at <https://cites.org/eng/dec/valid16/208>.

¹⁸ For the adopted text, see resolution XII.2 of the Contracting Parties to the Ramsar Convention, available at http://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/documents/library/cop12_res02_strategic_plan_e.pdf.

secretariats of organizations whose guidance was explicitly referenced in Ramsar Convention guidance materials be formally consulted.

International Union for Conservation of Nature

46. A representative of the Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) made a presentation on the IUCN method of ranking invasive species by their impact, which had been developed with the participation of the world's biological invasion scientists. He indicated that the project supported countries in prioritizing invasive alien species based on the scientific evidence of the impact and facilitated achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 9 globally. The method would be applied to the addition of new datasets to the Global Invasive Species Database (GISD) and would be dynamically presented on the GISD website with a new interface. He added that the activity was supported by the IUCN Species Survival Commission and the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species to address invasive alien species. The data would be collected voluntarily by ISSG experts.

47. The representatives of IPPC and CBD welcomed the new activities of IUCN and expressed the need to be clear that that kind of tool would not replace the need for risk analysis. The Group recognized that the dynamic system would potentially improve surveillance of invasive alien species impacting on biodiversity and encouraged the IUCN to continue to report back to the Group on its progress.

CABI

48. A representative of CABI stressed that CABI remained committed to addressing the issues of invasive alien species and had invested a considerable amount of resources in the preceding year to raise the profile of the invasive alien species issue, and that investment would continue throughout 2015.

49. He introduced CABI key ongoing activities and new initiatives:

(a) The CABI Invasive Species Compendium, which continues to be free to access with new updates;

(b) Existing projects to address invasive species funded under bodies such as the GEF;

(c) A new global programme (under development) on the worst invasive species. This would include in a first phase East and Southern Africa and/or South-East Asia to reduce the negative impacts of invasive alien species on crop and pasture production, water resources, human and animal health, the environment and economic development; the solutions would be based on the three-stage hierarchy approach of:

(i) Prevention – for example, awareness raising; pest risk analysis; climatic modelling; invasive species audit, diagnostic support for border control, SPS in trade, knowledge management, reference resources, neighbour country relations/collaboration, quarantine facility advice (optional);

(ii) Early detection and eradication – for example, building monitoring networks, awareness raising, field survey, citizen science input, authentication of reports, remote identification, trained rapid response teams;

(iii) Control – decision trees for optimum intervention; full biocontrol/integrated pest management; research and implementation support; and restoration.

50. He indicated that the new programme would be built on partnerships – national, regional and global; for example, it might be useful for the IPPC initiative to support surveillance on pests.

Global Biodiversity Information Facility

51. A representative of the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) made a presentation on current coverage of GBIF: 528,000,000 records; 14,000 datasets; 652 data-publishing institutions; and its role in facilitating access to data used by scientists. Of 357 peer-reviewed publications citing www.gbif.org as a data source in 2014, 59 papers (16.5%) related to research on invasive alien species.

52. To facilitate free and open access to biodiversity information, GBIF encourages data publishers to adopt the most open licence possible, ideally the equivalent of “no rights reserved”. Creative Commons licence, CC0, and in the course of 2015 would mandate all providers to select one of three machine-readable licences (CC0, CC-BY or CC-BY-NC). GBIF encourages users to credit the primary providers in citation of data accessed through GBIF, and that was now facilitated through the use of Digital Object Identifiers (DOI) for all datasets and data downloads. In the near future, that system would allow users of GBIF to deposit cleaned data as derived datasets to the Data ONE repository (with a DOI attached), enhancing the re-usability and transparency of data underlying biodiversity research.

53. Thanks to the financial support of the European Union through the CBD Secretariat, GBIF had been coordinating the work of the Global Invasive Alien Species Information Partnership (GIASI Partnership) as a priority, and an interface for a list of invasive alien species per country had become available on the GIASI Partnership Information Gateway. The gateway brings together data on invasive alien species from a variety of sources through the Global Registry of Introduced and Invasive Species (GRIIS) of IUCN-ISSG with data contributions from the CABI Invasive Species Compendium, GISD and species occurrences through GBIF. It was a useful tool for CBD Parties to Achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 9 and report on invasive alien species.

54. The representative of GBIF also informed the Liaison Group of a new project funded by the European Union for 2015-2018, called Biodiversity Information for Development (BID), which was aimed at mobilizing biodiversity information under free and open access conditions from Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. The project would help identify priority needs for data, especially relating to invasive alien species, threatened species and protected areas, and support the use of these data in decision making for sustainable development in those regions.

4. Discussion on progress and future activities

55. The Group was reminded of decision XII/16⁵ of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in which the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora and relevant organizations, to explore ways and means to address the risks associated with trade in wildlife introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food, noting that some trade was unregulated, unreported or illegal, including by enhancing cooperation with authorities responsible for the control of wildlife trade and to report to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at a meeting prior to the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

A. Addressing gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework relevant to invasive alien species

Trade in wildlife introduced as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food

56. The Group commented on a concept note circulated in that meeting to explore ways and means to address the introduction of alien species as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food (PATBF).

57. The Secretariat of CBD drew attention to a broad range of wildlife taxa that are already in trade as PATBF without correctly identified species name or an assessment of their risk of biological invasiveness. These species continue to be in the market and appropriate measures need to be developed to identify, assess and manage their risk of biological invasiveness. The Liaison Group suggested that the Secretariat of CBD should prepare a short document on the scale of such markets and species, including e-commerce, in particular animal species. Such e-commerce in plant species had already been covered by the desktop studies

conducted by the IPPC Secretariat, to which reference could be made. The Group concluded that it wished to review and comment on the possible options to address the potential risks of trade, including e-commerce, in wildlife as PATBF prior to the submission of the pre-session document to the review process of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. The Group expressed an interest in moving beyond discussions of gaps and in future meetings focusing more on implementation of existing frameworks and guidance.

B. Next steps to address trade in wildlife as pets, aquarium and terrarium species, and as live bait and live food

58. The CITES Secretariat suggested that the International Consortium for Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) should be consulted on how illegal trade in wildlife as PATBF might be addressed; the CITES Secretariat would take that issue to ICWC, which was currently conducting a global research study on illegal trade in wildlife led by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

59. The CITES Secretariat would inform the Secretariat of CBD of a contact point in the International Air Transport Association (IATA) to further discuss existing or possible future labelling of consignments of live species; it also advised the Liaison Group that the CITES Standing Committee might discuss collaboration with the Secretariat of CBD in the area of invasive alien species.

60. The Liaison Group requested that, measures related to trade in domesticated wildlife species, domesticated hybrids of wildlife species and captive bred wildlife species be considered in addition to SPS measures in efforts aimed at addressing trade in wildlife introduced as PATBF. The IPPC Secretariat reiterated that the CPM-9 (2014) decision on e-commerce and the CPM recommendation (CPM-9/2014/2¹⁹) on Internet Trade (eCommerce) in Plants and other Regulated Articles should be referred to as ways and means under the SPS framework that can be applicable in order to address the introduction of wildlife as PATBF.

61. Notifications on shopping websites to inform buyers of national regulation of the species sold on the website would be a possible approach. It was suggested that relevant industries be encouraged to develop codes of conduct with labelling (or “pop-up”) alerts on related websites.

Biocontrol agent used to control invasive alien species

62. The Liaison Group was reminded of decision XII/17²⁰ of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in which the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to compile, in collaboration with the International Union for Conservation of Nature and through the Global Invasive Alien Species Information Partnership, information from Parties, scientific institutions, and other relevant organizations, on experiences in the use of biological control agents against invasive alien species, in particular the release in the wild of alien species for that purpose, including positive and negative cases and cases of the application of risk assessment, and to submit a synthesis of that information to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice prior to the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and to make that information available through the Clearing-House Mechanism.

63. The Secretariat of CBD informed the Liaison Group that a notification would be sent to Parties calling for the submission of relevant information. An expert meeting was planned to be held in 2015, subject to the availability of funding, inviting relevant organizations to collect and review relevant information. CABI and the IUCN-ISSG indicated that they were willing to lead a small group to compile information on biocontrol agents against invasive alien species, particularly from a conservation perspective, and would submit the results to the Group for its review. The expert meeting would consider the information reviewed by the Group within the scope of the SPS framework.

¹⁹ Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Recommendation on Internet Trade (eCommerce) in Plants and other Regulated Articles. Available at <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/governance/cpm-recommendations/ippc-aquatic-plants-trade-commerce/>.

²⁰ Conference of the Parties decision XII/17 on invasive alien species: review of work and considerations for future work (available at <https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-12/cop-12-dec-17-en.pdf>).

64. The meeting could be timed to be held back-to-back with the nineteenth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice, in November 2015, and the experts could organize a side event on biocontrol agents on the margins of the meeting of the Subsidiary Body prior to the consideration of that matter by the Subsidiary Body at its twentieth meeting.

65. ISPM 3 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*) provide guidance on biocontrol agents, however it was lacking concrete tools. Case studies for conservation purposes representing an opportunity to overcome prejudices and clarify its use. The IPPC and CABI emphasized that much guidance and studies have been developed on that topic in the past and the existing information should be used as a basis for anything new developed.

C. Other ways forward

Sea containers

66. A representative of the IMO Secretariat explained the history and updates of the IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU code), which had been approved by the IMO Maritime Safety Committee at its ninety-third session, in May 2014, as a voluntary measure. At its ninety-fourth session, the Committee had agreed to publish the CTU Code by means of circular MSC.1/Circ.1497. IPPC informed the Liaison Group that the discussion on sea containers standard might continue, based on the CTU code, and if CPM-11 (2016) decided to continue the development of the draft ISPM on sea containers, that could also be considered by an IPPC expert working group. If that standard was approved for member consultation by the IPPC Standards Committee, the earliest it could go for member consultation would be July 2017.

67. The Secretariat of CBD suggested that the twentieth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice should contain an agenda item on progress in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Under Target 9 on invasive alien species, the adoption of the CTU code could be highlighted as progress on guidance setting, and information on countries that apply the CTU code would represent a case for achieving of Target 9 on that pathway.

Air containers

68. The IPPC Secretariat informed the Liaison Group that work on an IPPC standard for air containers, which had previously been discussed by the secretariats of IPPC, IATA and ICAO and which could help reduce the risk of pest introduction via that pathway, had been put on hold pending the outcome of the work on the sea container standards. It was noted that a manual for handling air containers, produced by IATA, could provide a way of disseminating that type of information to those involved in the day-to-day handling air containers, and information that might help reduce the risk of introduction and spread of invasive alien species could be communicated via such a manual.

69. The CITES Secretariat encouraged the Secretariat of CBD to communicate on that matter, through a contact point within IATA, and to liaise with the IPPC, IATA and ICAO in order to move more quickly towards exchanging information on air containers.

eCommerce

70. The group was reminded of decision XII/17²⁰ of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, in which the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to explore with relevant partners, including the standards-setting bodies recognized by the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS Agreement), the International Plant Protection Convention, the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), and the Codex Alimentarius Commission, and other members of the Inter-agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species, methods of alerting suppliers and potential buyers to the risks posed by invasive alien species sold via e-commerce,²¹ and report on progress to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice prior to the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

²¹ See Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, Recommendation CPM-9/2014/2 - Internet Trade (E-Commerce) in Plants and other

71. The IPPC Secretariat informed the Liaison Group that it had carried out desktop studies on e-commerce. In order to respond to that developing situation, the CPM Recommendation on Internet Trade (eCommerce) in Plants and other Regulated Articles encouraged:

- (a) NPPOs and RPPOs to:
 - (i) Develop mechanisms for identifying e-commerce traders based within their countries and regions;
 - (ii) Establish mechanisms to identify products of concern that may be purchased via e-commerce, with a focus on potential high-risk pathways such as plants for planting, soils and growing media, living organisms etc. and to explore options ensuring they comply with appropriate phytosanitary regulations based on risk assessment;
 - (iii) Promote compliance by customers and traders operating through e-commerce with the phytosanitary import requirements of importing countries and provide adequate information on the risks posed by bypassing such requirements;
 - (iv) Strengthen coordination with postal and express courier services to ensure that relevant information of the phytosanitary risks and phytosanitary measures are conveyed to e-commerce traders;
 - (v) Investigate the phytosanitary risks posed by all forms of distance selling and if necessary to include these purchasing methods in their risk management activities;
- (b) NPPOs, RPPOs and the IPPC Secretariat to:
 - (i) Raise awareness of the risks of bypassing phytosanitary regulations.

72. Regarding the work done by CITES on electronic permitting, the CITES Secretariat had aligned its standard permit/certificate format with the World Customs Organization data model, which supported the “single window framework/systems” for the physical transboundary movement of CITES-listed species. The United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) had been working on that for the purpose of trade facilitation. This may also have an effect on the wildlife species in trade that are of the CBD’s concern, as CITES management authorities needed or would soon need to comply with the single window framework, and legal international trade would be captured and tracked when the single window systems are well in place. The CITES Secretariat added that the standard for tracking of specimens in wildlife trade has been under discussion. Regarding shark fin trade, there was ongoing work for the tracking of such specimens.

73. The Group responded that the ongoing single window systems under UN/CEFACT, and the single window systems already developed and implemented in various countries are very welcome. The Secretariat of the CBD mentioned that harmonization of taxonomic nomenclature was critical to make the systems interoperable and useful for border control and management to identify the specimens.

Guide to explain the application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures for the environment sector

74. The CBD Secretariat reiterated that the Conference of the Parties at its eleventh meeting had requested the Executive Secretary, in collaboration with the relevant international organizations that set international standards, guidelines and recommendations, to develop, subject to the availability of financial resources, a practical, non-prescriptive toolkit for Parties on applying existing international standards, guidelines and recommendations, and to disseminate it.

75. IPPC, OIE and WTO had been working on the production of a brief explanation on how the existing regulatory frameworks could be used to manage invasive alien species. Once finalized, that document would be circulated among the membership for comments.

76. The IPPC Secretariat reiterated that there was a strong need of an explanatory booklet for the environment sector to apply SPS measures. The “Guide to the implementation of phytosanitary standards in forestry” produced by the FAO Forestry Department was a good model, and similar style and content and an extensive consultation process were expected.

77. The Group responded that good practices of implementation of SPS standards to address invasive alien species in Australia, Canada and New Zealand and their experiences, would provide useful information for the environment sector to have. The progress of implementation made by the Republic of Korea or Viet Nam would also be good examples of countries in fast-growing economies to be included in such a book. Regarding effective communication between SPS measures, implementing agencies and the environment sector was discussed at a workshop organized by the European and Mediterranean Plant Protection Organization and IUCN. The workshop report should be appropriate to include in the explanatory book.

78. CABI suggested including the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP) products in the explanatory book.

79. Fund-raising was needed in collaboration with the biodiversity financial mechanism, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF) for the production of those materials.

80. The Secretariat of CBD would explore with interested Parties where also capacity development needs existed in order to learn about SPS measures; it would invite the Parties or a region to include a project to develop such guidance as a component of the GEF proposals, as appropriate. IPPC emphasized that extensive consultation with those involved with the existing guidance would be necessary in order to maintain technical consistency in a document of that kind.

Promotion of inter-sectoral cooperation and capacity-development activities

81. The group emphasized the need for strengthened cooperation between National Focal Points, especially those for CBD, with phytosanitary focal points (NPPOs) in order to facilitate cooperation at the national level.

82. Additionally, it was suggested to explore the ways in which FAO national offices could help facilitate cooperation.

The IPPC capacity development strategy

83. The Secretariat of IPPC explained that the IPPC National Phytosanitary Capacity Development Strategy was designed to foster the coordination of activities in that area with a view to contributing to long-term goals. Tools available include various documents and a website for phytosanitary resources, including training and awareness-raising materials, pest risk analysis and other information that national plant protection organizations could use (www.phytosanitary.info). She pointed out that capacity took a long time to develop and that IPPC had shifted to long-term capacity development in order to fill the gap in capacity identified by the capacity evaluation process.

84. Regarding the area of joint work with the Secretariat of CBD, the IPPC Secretariat had participated in three capacity-building workshops during the previous year for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 9 in the Arab region, the Central and Eastern European region and in small island developing States. The workshops provided opportunities for national plant protection organizations and the environment sector, although the participants tended to focus on eradication of already established invasive species. For future workshops, it would be useful to focus on implementation of preventive measures and to incorporate workshops into a long-term, strategic approach for developing capacity.

Capacity-building workshops for small island developing States

85. The Secretariat of CBD informed the Liaison Group of plans for follow-up workshops for small island developing States to be held in the Pacific in 2015 and in the Caribbean in 2016. The workshops would be composed of: (a) border control capacity-building for Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety focal points (agriculture sector) and invasive alien species experts (environment sector); and (b) project development to address invasive alien species inviting both sectors and donors. The representative of the CBD Secretariat mentioned that preparation for the work was ongoing in kind collaboration with the Standard and Trade Development Facility (STDF) and other relevant organizations.

86. The GBIF Secretariat reiterated that the Pacific, Caribbean and African regions were the targeted regions of Biodiversity Information for Development (BID) and GBIF would join the project development workshops to support invasive alien species data management in small island developing States. IPPC reiterated the need to work strategically to develop capacity. CBD suggested that strategic approaches to capacity development be a major point of discussion at the next meeting of the Liaison Group.

Raising awareness across multiple sectors of the impacts of invasive alien species and of best practices for addressing the issue

87. The Liaison Group discussed possible priority actions for effective awareness-raising and agreed that the next meeting of the Group should include an agenda item on the International Year for Plant Health to raise awareness across the multiple sectors on invasive alien species.

88. The Liaison Group also identified the following priority actions for awareness-raising:

- (a) Development of awareness-raising material for national financial ministries;
- (b) Letters to be sent by the IPPC Secretariat to call for awareness-raising materials on pests and invasive alien species to the Secretariat of CBD, NPPOs and RPPOs and relevant non-governmental organizations;
- (c) Joint message on the International Year for Plant Health from CBD and FAO (IPPC).

5. Other matters

89. It was suggested that the FAO regional conference might take up the role to promote joint work on biodiversity in the context of the FAO strategic plan on natural resource and agriculture. The FAO representative in country offices could facilitate further joint work on biodiversity. To initiate such activity, the Executive Secretary of CBD was invited to exchange letters with the Director General of FAO.

90. The Secretariat of CBD requested WTO to provide an opportunity to present the guidance on PATBF to the SPS community, and WTO responded that it might be able to invite CBD to an informal session on the margins of a future SPS Committee meeting, as similar events had taken place in the past.

91. IUCN suggested that GRIIS and impact classification could be powerful tools that CBD Parties could use for setting national indicators, and also early warning on biological invasions. IUCN requested the Secretariat of CBD to send a notification to Parties inviting them to submit information on invasive alien species to GRIIS. In addition, the meeting of the Ad hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) on Indicators for the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 to be held in June 2015 was welcome to make full use of GRIIS and the IUCN impact classification system.

92. The Secretariat of CBD expressed thanks to IUCN for the data contribution to AHTEG in advance and acknowledged with gratitude that some relevant dataset of the Database for Introduced Aquatic Species (DIAS) of the FAO had been included in GRIIS in 2014.

93. The GBIF Secretariat stressed that data gathering at the national level was critically important to evidence-based decision making for a country. The Liaison Group recognized that data gathering in

collaboration between NPPO and CBD-related institutions was an important area for facilitating its implementation.

94. IUCN asked the Secretariat of CBD about the process of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) for assessing invasive alien species and how the Liaison Group could interact. The Secretariat of CBD responded that the full members of the platform governed the assessment process. Nevertheless, the biodiversity-related conventions and United Nations agencies could send comments to the IPBES Secretariat on the assessment process.

6. Date and venue of the next meeting

95. The Liaison Group agreed to have a meeting, preferably in Brussels, inviting the World Customs Organization to host the meeting in January 2016. The Group also considered organizing a round table with the European Commission in Brussels.

96. The Liaison Group agreed that another option for hosting the next meeting would include ICAO/CBD in Montreal or IATA in Geneva in January 2016.

7. Closure of the meeting

97. The meeting closed at 16:00 on 2 April 2015.

Annex I

Statement of Mr. Stefan Micallef, Director of the Marine Environment Division of the International Maritime Organization

I would like welcome to you all to London, and in particular to the headquarters of the International Maritime Organization. This is the first time that IMO is involved with hosting a meeting of the Inter-agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species, in that case co-hosting it with the CBD. As you of course are very much aware, invasive alien species are recognized as one of the greatest threats to the ecological and the economic well-being of the planet. They are frequently causing enormous damage to biodiversity and the valuable natural resources we all depend on. Direct and indirect health effects are becoming increasingly serious and the damage to the environment is often irreversible. In addition, invasive alien species have globally significant consequences on the economy through their impacts on human activities such as industry, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism as well as shipping.

The introduction of invasive aquatic species to new environments by ships has been identified as a major threat to the world's oceans and to the conservation of biodiversity. Thousands of aquatic species, carried either in ships' ballast water or on ships' hulls, may survive to establish a reproductive population in the host environment, becoming invasive, out-competing native species and multiplying into pest proportions.

IMO is the United Nations specialized agency with responsibility for the safety and security of shipping and the prevention of marine pollution by ships. It is therefore natural that IMO be at the forefront of the international effort by taking the lead in addressing the transfer of invasive aquatic species through ships.

The problem of invasive species carried by ships has intensified over the last few decades due to the expanded trade and traffic volume and, since the volumes of seaborne trade continue to increase, the problem may not yet have reached its peak. Unfortunately, data suggests that the rate of bio-invasions is continuing to increase at an alarming rate and new areas are being invaded all the time.

With the adoption of the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments, 2004 (BWM Convention), IMO Member States made a clear commitment to minimizing the transfer of invasive aquatic species by shipping, specifically through ballast water. A further milestone was reached in 2011 when the Biofouling Guidelines were adopted by IMO's Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC). In addition, IMO's Maritime Safety Committee has become involved in matters related to invasive species through its work on the IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU Code), which was adopted last year. The challenge we face now is to implement these instruments, but more information on this will be provided under agenda item 4 of this meeting.

Ships are only one of the numerous vectors through which invasive alien species are transferred and IMO is only one of the many UN agencies involved in preventing their spread. Collaboration between agencies can bring important synergies in this work and the Inter-agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species plays an important role in trying to achieve this in practice. Indeed, as also specified in the terms of reference of the group, it should aim to address the gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory framework and to promote inter-sectoral cooperation and capacity building activities. The terms of reference also call for cooperation at the national level through each organization's national and regional focal points or equivalents.

This brings me to an important point. It is key to remember that all the organizations represented at this meeting work for the same Member States. Through our contact points in the Member States we may facilitate a better coordinated action among the various stakeholders at national level, which may enhance the effectiveness of the efforts for the prevention, control and eradication of invasive alien species.

Finally, I hope your meeting will be useful, not only in sharing information among agencies, but also in providing a fertile ground for new ideas on how to improve cooperation on this very important matter. I can assure you that IMO will always be open for new suggestions and we will do our best to contribute to the work of the group. I wish you the best of success and an enjoyable stay in London.

Annex II

List of participants

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Title and address</i>	<i>Email and phone</i>
International Maritime Organization	Markus Helavuori	Technical Officer Sub-Division for Protective Measures, Marine Environment Division International Maritime Organization 4 Albert Embankment London SE1 7SR United Kingdom	mhelavuo@imo.org +44 20 7463 4021
	Stefan Micallef	Director Marine Environment Division International Maritime Organization 4 Albert Embankment London SE1 7SR United Kingdom	smicalle@imo.org
	Loukas Kontogiannis	Technical officer Maritime Safety Division International Maritime Organization 4 Albert Embankment London SE1 7SR United Kingdom	lkontogi@imo.org
	Theofanis Karayannis	Technical Officer Marine Environment Division International Maritime Organization 4 Albert Embankment London SE1 7SR United Kingdom	tkarayan@imo.org
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity	David Cooper	Principal Officer Science, Assessment and Monitoring Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity 413, Saint Jacques Street, Suite 800 Montreal QC H2Y 1N9 Canada	David.cooper@cbd.int +1 514 287 8709

Report of the Inter-agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species on its 6th meeting

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Title and address</i>	<i>Email and phone</i>
	Junko Shimura	Programme Officer, Taxonomy and Invasive Alien Species Science, Assessment and Monitoring Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity 413, Saint Jacques Street, Suite 800 Montreal QC H2Y 1N9 Canada	Junko.shimura@cbd.int +1 514 287 8706
Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention	Craig Fedchock	Coordinator International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat (IPPC) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy	Craig.fedchock@fao.org +39 0657052534
	Brent Larson	Standard Officer International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat (IPPC) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy	Brent.arson@fao.org +39 06-570-54915
	Sonya Hammons	Capacity development programme officer International Plant Protection Convention Secretariat (IPPC) Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy	Sonya.hammons@fao.org
World Trade Organization	Christiane Wolff	Counsellor Agriculture & Commodities Division SPS Section World Trade Organization Centre William Rappard, Rue de Lausanne 154, CH-1211 Geneva Switzerland	Christiane.Wolff@wto.org +41 22 739 5536
World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE)	Jae Myong Lee	Chargé de mission International Trade Department World Organisation for Animal Health 12, rue de Prony 75017 Paris, France	j.lee@oie.int

<i>Organization</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Title and address</i>	<i>Email and phone</i>
Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)	Marceil Yeater	Chief, Legal Affairs & Trade Policy	Marceil.yeater@cites.org (contact point)
	Marcos Silva	Chief, Knowledge Management and Outreach Services	Marcos.silva@cites.org +41 22 917-8120
	Haruko Okutsu	Capacity building coordinator,	Haruko.okutsu@cites.org
CABI	Sean T. Murphy	CITES Secretariat International Environment House 11 Chemin des Anémones CH-1219 Châtelaine, Geneva Switzerland	
		Global Programme Executive, Invasive Species CABI, Bakeham Lane, Egham, Surrey, TW209 TY, United Kingdom	s.murphy@cabi.org +44 (0)1491 829071
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	Piero Genovesi	Chair of IUCN Invasive Species Specialist Group	Piero.genovesi@isprambiente.it
Ramsar Convention	Carolina Hazin on behalf of Marcela Bonells, Ramsar Convention Secretariat	Global Biodiversity Policy Coordinator BirdLife International	Carolina.hazin@birdlife.org
Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF)	Tim Hirsch	Deputy Director, Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) Secretariat Universitetsparken 15DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø Denmark	thirsch@gbif.org

Annex III

Provisional agenda

- 1 Welcome remarks by the International Maritime Organization
 - 2 Organizational matters
 - 2.1 Selection of co-chairs
 - 2.2 Selection of a rapporteur for the meeting
 - 2.3 Adoption of agenda
 - 3 Review of the report of the fifth meeting of the Inter-agency Liaison Group in Nairobi, Kenya, from 13 to 15 January 2014
 - 4 Highlights of recent main meetings of the organizations
 - 4.1 Secretariat of the IMO - The IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (IMO) and others
 - 4.2 Secretariat of the CBD – Guidance on pets...live food, and
 - 4.2 Secretariat of the IPPC
 - 4.3 Secretariat of the WTO
 - 4.4 Secretariat of the OIE
 - 4.5 FAO
 - 4.6 Secretariat of the CIETS (remote participation via videoconference)
 - 4.7 Ramsar Convention
 - 4.8 IUCN - development of a method to rank invasive species based on their impact
 - 4.9 GBIF - Open data in IAS research and monitoring -Work currently under way to develop Essential Biodiversity Variables on IAS
 - 4.10 CABI
 - 5 Discussion on progress and future activities
 - 5.1 To address the gaps and inconsistencies in the international regulatory frameworks for the prevention, control and eradication of invasive alien species;
 - 5.2 To promote inter-sectoral cooperation and capacity-development activities for the prevention, control and mitigation of invasive alien species;
 - 5.3 To raise awareness across the multiple sectors on the impacts of invasive alien species and on the best practices for addressing the issue;
 - 5.4 To promote cooperation at all levels, and specifically at the national level, through each organization's national and regional focal points or the equivalents;
 - 5.5 To promote cooperation in the gathering, access and use of relevant and reliable information.
 - 6 Other matters
 - 7 Date and venue of next meeting
 - 8 Closure of meeting
-