



***REPORT***

Rome, Italy  
7-11 November 2011

# **Standards Committee November, 2011**

Produced by the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention



## CONTENTS

1.	OPENING OF THE MEETING .....	4
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat .....	4
1.2	Election of the Rapporteur .....	4
1.3	Adoption of the Agenda .....	4
2.	ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS .....	4
2.1	Documents list.....	4
2.2	Participants list.....	4
2.3	Local information.....	4
3.	UPDATES FROM OTHER RELEVANT BODIES .....	5
3.1	CPM Bureau.....	5
3.2	SPTA.....	5
3.3	Focus group on improving the standard setting process .....	5
3.4	Report of the IPPC Secretariat .....	8
4.	STANDARDS COMMITTEE.....	12
4.1	SC May 2011 Report.....	12
4.2	SC-7 May 2011 Report .....	12
4.3	Outstanding Items .....	12
4.4	Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (April to October 2011).....	13
5.	DRAFT ISPMs FROM THE SC-7 AND TPS.....	14
5.1	Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade (2005-002) .....	14
5.2	Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (2004-022).....	17
5.3	Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) .....	19
5.4	Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (2005-008).....	20
6.	TECHNICAL PANELS .....	21
6.1	Urgent issues .....	21
6.2	TP membership .....	21
7.	TOPICS AND PRIORITIES FOR IPPC STANDARDS .....	24
7.1	Update on the topics for IPPC standards.....	24
14.	OTHER BUSINESS .....	28
15.	ADOPTION OF THE REPORT.....	28
16.	CLOSE OF THE MEETING.....	28

**LIST OF APPENDIXES**

APPENDIX 1: Agenda.....	29
APPENDIX 2: Documents list.....	32
APPENDIX 3: Participants list .....	34
APPENDIX 4: Criteria for the prioritisation of diagnostic protocols .....	41
APPENDIX 5: Summary of the SC e-decision .....	42
APPENDIX 6: Draft ISPM for Integrated measures for the production of plants for planting in international trade .....	44
APPENDIX 7: Draft ISPM for Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae).....	60
APPENDIX 8: Draft amendments to ISPM 5 <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i> .....	66
APPENDIX 9: Draft revision of Supplement 1 of ISPM 5.....	72
APPENDIX 10: List for topics for IPPC standards.....	77
APPENDIX 11: Standards Committee request for CPM decisions .....	99

## **1. OPENING OF THE MEETING**

### **1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat**

- [1] The Secretary of the IPPC welcomed the participants. He noted the continuing difficult situation of the IPPC with regards to financial and human resources. To respond to this, some countries have contributed in various ways both financially and through in-kind contributions for standard-setting (providing staff) from Canada, Japan, New Zealand and the USA. Such resources are essential, in particular for the standard setting area. Several meetings had been cancelled in 2011, including most technical panels. Among the recent developments within the IPPC, the Informal Working Group on Strategic Planning and Technical Assistance (SPTA) had discussed the resource mobilization strategy and the Strategic Framework for the IPPC, and papers would be presented to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM). In addition, the Secretary mentioned the very positive feedback received from CPM member regarding the Online comment system (OCS). Finally, the Secretary introduced Mr Fedchock, who had just joined the IPPC Secretariat as Coordinator.
- [2] The Chair thanked the Secretary for his opening remarks. She welcomed the new Coordinator and hoped that he would have a positive impact on standard setting. In relation to resources, she regretted the lack of staff resources and the cancellation of meetings. On a positive note, she was pleased that coffee breaks had been maintained as valuable interpretation time and money would be lost if SC members had to disperse to find coffee.
- [3] The Chair welcomed the participants, and especially two new members Mr Asghari (Iran) and Mr Ngatoko (Cook Islands). Ms Forest (Canada), Mr Bakak (Cameroon) and Mr Al-Sayani (Yemen) had sent apologies as they were not able to attend the meeting. The Chairperson also welcomed two observers, from Costa Rica and South Africa.

### **1.2 Election of the Rapporteur**

- [4] The Standards Committee (SC) elected Mr Rossel (Australia) as Rapporteur.

### **1.3 Adoption of the Agenda**

- [5] The SC adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

## **2. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**

### **2.1 Documents list**

- [6] The Secretariat presented the list of documents (Appendix 2) and informed the SC of additional documents and minor changes and revisions.

### **2.2 Participants list**

- [7] The list of participants is attached as Appendix 3. The Secretariat reminded participants to update their contact details on the IPP (<https://www.ippc.int/>).

### **2.3 Local information**

- [8] The Secretariat provided a document on local information<sup>1</sup> and invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating or was missing.

---

<sup>1</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_04

### 3. UPDATES FROM OTHER RELEVANT BODIES

#### 3.1 CPM Bureau

- [9] The Bureau in June 2011 had reviewed the list of topics presented by the May 2011 SC and had approved it. It had also considered the SC request that the SC could present decisions to the CPM. It was agreed that the SC could prepare a CPM document, which the Bureau would review.
- [10] The Secretariat also reported that the Bureau in October 2011 had allocated funds to hold meetings of the Technical panel for the glossary (TPG), the Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT) and the Technical panel to develop diagnostic protocols (TPDP) in 2012. An expert working group on sea containers might also take place in 2012.

#### 3.2 SPTA

- [11] The SPTA had agreed a draft Strategic Framework for the IPPC, which would be presented to CPM-7 (2012). The Secretariat noted that, based on the adopted Strategic Framework, the standard setting group of the IPPC Secretariat will develop a draft strategic plan for standard setting in conjunction with the SC. In addition, the SPTA had also discussed the recommendations of the Focus Group for improving the standard setting process (see agenda item 3.3).

#### 3.3 Focus group on improving the standard setting process

- [12] The Secretariat introduced the outcome of the Focus group on improving the standard setting process<sup>2</sup>. The SPTA had subsequently reviewed the recommendations of the Focus Group, and had made its own recommendations on these<sup>3</sup>. It was noted that, where they differed, recommendations from the Focus Group, SPTA and SC would all be presented to the CPM.
- [13] The Secretariat recalled the main five major recommendations of the Focus group. In addition, the Focus group had made detailed recommendations. The SC reviewed these as well as the SPTA recommendations.

##### *Recommendations 1 to 5 on the member consultation process*

- [14] In relation to the Focus group recommendation 2 on a 60-day consultation period between the SC working group (SC-7) and the SC November meeting, the Secretariat noted that this consultation was aiming at gathering substantive comments in order to help the November SC to determine if the standard was broadly acceptable or should be substantively modified. The SC felt that although this consultation could be open to all types of comments, it should not become a second member consultation. The SC discussed in particular the following elements of the consultation proposed:
- The SC discussed whether comments received during such consultation should be reviewed by SC members of the region or by stewards. SC members are more aware of regional issues and may be better placed to review the comments. In addition, if only the steward was involved, this would be a similar process to the 100-day member consultation. Depending on the region, such review could be done by one or several SC members, and SC members from one region would have to organize between them as appropriate for their own region.
  - It was also noted that regional workshops on draft ISPMs take place in the period of the year when such consultation would take place, and could contribute to the process. If comments were available before regional workshops, SC members of that region could use regional workshops as a forum to discuss the SC-7 drafts.
  - Regarding the tools to be used, the SC agreed that the OCS could be used to collect comments. The SC members for a region could screen comments prior to the SC November meeting. One member was concerned that the use of the OCS would have resource implications for the Secretariat, but it was noted that it would not be significant. Ideally, the OCS could be used with

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776>

<sup>3</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_06\_rev1

minimal involvement of the Secretariat provided SC members were given access to comments from their region. One member noted, however, that it would put more pressure on SC members.

- The SC suggested that there is no need to specify the duration of the consultation, which could vary depending on regional processes used. However, indicative dates guiding the consultation could be: 31 July for CPM members to submit their comments; 15 September for regional SC members to forward important comments to the steward with suggestions on how to address them; 10 October for the steward to prepare a response to substantive comments and a revised draft ISPM for presentation to the SC in November.

[15] The SC:

(1) *endorsed* recommendations 1, 3, 4 and 5

(2) *proposed* to modify recommendation 2 as follows:

2. The existing opportunity to review SC-7 revisions of draft ISPMs should be formalized. This process will allow CPM members to review SC-7 approved draft standards and it should focus on substantial comments. All comments should be submitted via the OCS and made available to regional SC members by 31 July. The regional SC members should review comments submitted, and forward those comments deemed to be most important to the steward, accompanied by suggestions on how to address them. The steward would review the comments and prepare responses to the comments and a revised draft ISPM, both to be submitted to the IPPC Secretariat for presentation to the November SC. The SC would review the substantial comments submitted, revise the draft standard and communicate its reasoning to CPM members.

***Recommendations 6 to 11 on re-examining and streamlining the approval process under the special process.***

[16] The Focus group had provided two options for the adoption of diagnostic protocols in recommendation 9, and one member noted that the SPTA had favored option 9A, whereby the CPM delegates its authority to the SC to adopt diagnostic protocols on its behalf. The SC agreed with the SPTA.

[17] The SC endorsed recommendations 6 to 8, 9A, 10 and 11.

***Recommendations 12 to 16 on selection of topics and development of specifications***

[18] Regarding recommendation 15 on using the IPPC Strategic Framework when reviewing submissions of topics, the SPTA had noted that the current criteria were also still meant to be used (elements pertaining to procedures in place had not been mentioned in the recommendations). As this was not a change to the existing standard setting procedures, there was no need to modify the recommendation. The SC agreed with the SPTA but requested that the recommendation clearly stated that the criteria are used.

[19] Regarding recommendation 14, concerns were expressed that the submitter of topics might not be able to identify resources for standard development and that this should not hinder further development of the standard. The recommendation was modified.

[20] The SC:

(1) *endorsed* recommendations 12, 13, 16

(2) *proposed* to modify recommendations 14 and 15 as follows:

14. If possible, the submitter of the topic is encouraged to identify resources for the development of the proposed standard.

15. The SC should use the IPPC Strategic Framework and the *Criteria for justification and prioritization of proposed topics* when reviewing submissions of topics. As a result, the submitted topics will no longer be presented to the SPTA.

**Recommendation 17 on a framework for ISPMs**

[21] The SC *endorsed* recommendation 17.

**Recommendation 18 on the Standards Committee: size, regional coordination, training, authorization and other concerns**

[22] The SC *noted* that expert working group members could also assist the lead steward and modified the SPTA-modified recommendation 18.

[23] The SC *proposed* to modify recommendation 18 as follows:

18. The SC should be encouraged to assign a lead steward and two assistants (these two assistants could be from outside the SC, such as potential replacement members, former SC members, technical panel members or expert working group members) for each topic.

**Recommendations 19 to 26 on new efficiencies and expedited ways of achieving standard setting work and other possibilities for improving and streamlining the IPPC standard setting process**

[24] The SC:

- (1) *endorsed* recommendations 19, 20, 24, 26
- (2) *proposed* to modify the SPTA modification of Focus group recommendations 21 and 22 (i.e. replacement of these two recommendations by one reworded recommendation 21) as follows:  
21. The CPM would be requested to encourage regions to consider assigning one or more SC members from each region to help play a lead role in facilitating the communication between the SC and countries within their region.
- (3) *endorsed* the SPTA modification of recommendation 23
- (4) *endorsed* the SPTA proposal to delete recommendation 25.

**Recommendations 27 to 30**

[25] Several members expressed concerns about recommendation 27 on sponsorship of topics. The standards should be developed following the priorities developed by the CPM, and not depending on the availability of resources. Otherwise the CPM would lose its independence and standards would be developed for those who had resources. However, the SC also noted that recommendations 27 to 28 relate to resource mobilization, and not to the modification of standards setting procedures, and should be deleted.

[26] One member noted that recommendations 29 and 30 relating to the development of the environmental statement for standards are very intensive, and wondered in particular about the proposed consultation with external experts. The Secretariat noted that the USDA had offered a collection of guiding questions that may help expert drafting groups to develop these statements. Several SC members thought that expert drafting groups should nevertheless have the expertise to develop such statements. In any case, the SC did not want consultants to be hired for this task.

[27] The SC:

- (1) *proposed* to delete recommendations 27 and 28
- (2) *recommended* that, if recommendation 27 is used as part of resource mobilization, the concerns expressed by the SC should be considered
- (3) *proposed* to merge recommendations 29 and 30, with minor modifications to recommendation 29, as follows:  
29/30. The SC to develop a set of questions for expert drafting groups to provide guidance on biodiversity and environmental considerations\* and ensure concerns had been addressed. The SC will consult with external experts as needed.

\*Note from the Secretariat: the wording “biodiversity and environmental considerations” were added to specify the context of the recommendation, and is in line with the task in specifications.

### 3.4 Report of the IPPC Secretariat

#### *Standard setting*

- [28] The Secretariat outlined major points of the Secretariat report<sup>4</sup> on standard setting activities:
- Work continues on the development of a standard on the topic *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade* (2008-001). A preliminary draft will be further developed by a small group of experts who have substantially contributed to the preparation of the draft.
  - The open-ended IPPC workshop on the international movement of grain, hosted by NAPPO, will take place in early December 2011. The Secretariat was disappointed that there were few applicants from the Africa and the Near East FAO regions.
  - The SC in 2009 had agreed to reformatting adopted standards. Ink amendments noted by CPM-5 (2010) and CPM-6 (2011) were also being incorporated into standards. All reformatted standards will be posted on the IPP as individual PDF files, and also assembled into three PDF books, for standards, diagnostic protocols and phytosanitary treatments. One member asked that standards also be made available on the IPP as Word files, but the Secretariat noted that posting more files required resources and it could therefore not be done at this stage.
  - In answer to a request, the Secretariat noted that the IPPC Style Guide is mostly intended for internal use by the IPPC Secretariat. It is still under development and most parts will be of relevance only for the Secretariat. However some sections will be made available in the future, for example pertaining to guidance for expert drafting groups.
  - The Secretariat presented the organizational chart of the standard setting group<sup>5</sup>. There are currently only two full-time FAO staff in the group and the work relies mostly on in-kind contributions and consultants. In addition interviews for the vacant P3 standard setting position had been held. He noted that the current human resources make it difficult to run the standard setting programme, including Technical panels, Standards Committee and publications.
  - The Secretariat reported on the OCS, which had been well received and used. Some members had made requests for improvement and these had been implemented. For example, some members wanted experts in one country to use multiple languages; this change was made but the contact point has to submit comments in only one language. A new sharing function had also been added to allow for the sharing of comments before submitting them. Finally, a new function had been created with similar permissions as for the contact point, except that only the contact point can submit comments. One member noted that many identical comments were repeated in resulting tables, and this could be addressed in the future.
  - The Secretariat informed the SC that the Bureau had also approved USD 60 000 to improve the OCS in 2012, including the development of a module for stewards. The Secretariat would discuss with stewards which elements they would want included. The OCS would also be used for the 14-day consultation prior to CPM.
- [29] The SC recognized the work done by the Secretariat on the OCS, the positive results of its use in the 2011 member consultation and the reactivity of the Secretariat in answering queries, providing assistance and solving issues.

#### *Information exchange*

- [30] The information exchange officer presented recent developments. He noted a high volume of updates for contact point information, which also impacted the OCS. Several websites are being maintained in parallel to the IPP, such as the Implementation Review and Support System (IRSS). A website was also being developed for the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the IPPC in 2012.

---

<sup>4</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_10

<sup>5</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_07

- [31] SC members have the opportunity to present their profile on the IPP, and the information exchange officer encouraged SC members to make use of this facility. The forum and poll systems for SC e-decisions work well, and several other tools were being developed for standard setting, in such a way that they could also be used by other groups in the IPPC Secretariat. He noted that some recent difficulties in using the IPP (login or downloading of documents) were due to the use of the new version of Internet Explorer. He also invited SC members to encourage their contact points to make more use of the IPP, especially for pest reporting, but also to maintain this information up-to-date once posted. He informed the SC that a new interface is being developed for pest reports. Finally a communication strategy will be presented to CPM-7 in 2012.
- [32] One member suggested networking the IPPC community using Facebook. The information exchange officer noted that “IPPC news” profile had been created and would be launched during the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Twitter and LinkedIn were also being investigated. The Secretariat noted that maintaining presence on such social networks required resources.
- [33] One member noted that IPP is a good tool to maintain updated information and provide updates to countries within a region, for example on outbreaks of pests, or update trading partners.
- [34] The SC urged the Secretariat to post the CPM recommendations in a prominent place on the IPP.

#### *Dispute settlement*

- [35] There was no progress to report given the current difficult resource situation of the IPPC, but more progress would be made in 2012. The SC noted that a paper on implementation issues had been passed to the SBDS. The Secretariat confirmed that this was a paper presented to CPM-6.

#### *Capacity development*

- [36] The implementation officer presented recent developments under capacity development. An EWG had developed a work plan and associated budget to implement the strategy approved by CPM. The SPTA had provided comments, and the work plan will be presented to CPM-7. The EWG had also proposed an oversight body, possibly a technical committee of the IPPC, to oversee activities under the IPPC in capacity development.
- [37] Following the recommendations of CPM-5 (2010) and the work agreed in the EWG, the Secretariat is developing a phytosanitary resources page that is going to be able to make available databases on projects and activities, a roster of experts, diagnostic protocols, training materials, E-learning courses, manuals, SOP’s, photos and videos appropriate for developing the phytosanitary capacity of IPPC member countries.
- [38] A call for contracting parties to provide technical resources (for example manuals, e-learning courses, etc.) had been launched and 300-400 submissions had been received to date. This call is performed before adopting decisions on which resources should be developed by the EWG in the framework of a Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF) funded project.. The first IPPC capacity development e-learning course on PRA has also been developed, in association with the same project; translation into English is going ahead and French is being considered. Finally, she reported that the IPPC Secretariat is currently collaborating in 35 national, regional or global projects.
- [39] Regarding regional workshops on draft ISPMs, she reported that seven regional workshops were held in 2011. For the first time an entire region had agreed on how to pay for the workshop without IPPC/FAO contributions. Cooperation between FAO and donors was expected next year for some regions. Clear rules and a standardized programme for regional workshops were being developed and will be presented to CPM-7 (2012), with the understanding that there should be some flexibility to take account of the different needs and specificities of regions. One member noted that regional workshops are also useful for regional bodies organizing them, and that they should not be under the control of the IPPC if they are not funded by the IPPC. Another member noted that it was important that SC members should attend regional workshops to help increase the understanding of the draft ISPMs under member consultation.

### ***Implementation review and support system (IRSS)***

- [40] The IRSS officer informed the SC that the EU had committed to additional funding, allowing the IRSS programme to continue until 2014. He summarized the current activities. A general IRSS questionnaire was being prepared, as well as an IRSS web page, which will in particular present the tools available to countries (manuals, courses etc.). Several IRSS studies had started. An analysis of the implementation of ISPM 6:1997 is being launched, and regional workshops will be held to discuss the challenges of implementation of ISPM 6:1997, tools available in regions and how to improve the standard. Studies are also being prepared on Internet trade of plants, in collaboration with the Mississippi State University, and on aquatic plants. A study on equivalence has also started. He invited the SC to provide input on two aspects: first to envisage what topics the IRSS should focus on after March 2012, when the activities above will have been completed; secondly to identify a SC member to be part of the IRSS triennial review group, which will monitor the IRSS.
- [41] One member questioned the studies on Internet trade of plants and aquatic plants, and how they relate to the approved IRSS programme. The Secretariat noted that these studies had been decided by the Bureau. The IRSS falls under Goal 7 of the Strategic Plan on the review of plant protection in the world and should also work on emerging issues. The IRSS is not intended to analyse only the implementation of standards, but also implementation of the convention. In addition, most resources are spent on ISPM implementation and not on the other two studies.
- [42] The Chair proposed that feedback on ISPM 6:1997 workshops could be reported to the SC in May 2012.
- [43] The SC nominated its Chair, Ms Chard, as SC representative on the IRSS triennial review group. There was no time to discuss further studies for the IRSS for 2012 onwards, but discussion would take place through a forum.

### ***E-certification***

- [44] The information exchange officer reported on the activities related to e-certification. An open-ended working group on electronic certification was held in June 2011. Three working groups had been created to work on different aspects of the system, and a draft would be available by the end of December. Field-testing was expected to happen in January and February 2012, and an update would be presented to CPM-7. One member suggested that the system be demonstrated at CPM-7. However the Secretariat felt that it would be difficult as the system worked through an electronic exchange between countries.
- [45] Regarding field-testing of the system, the information exchange officer believed that this would be carried out by members of the different working groups who together represent most countries currently using e-certification.

### ***International liaison***

#### ***International Forest Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG)***

- [46] The Secretariat reported on IFQRG activities. Regarding the *Revision of ISPM 15 specifically: Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010), IFQRG, in response to a SC request, had provided research information to modify the pest lists in the draft. It was also studying the necessity of probit 9 for ISPM 15:2009 treatments. The SC invited the steward to consider the information provided by IFQRG, as well as comments by the TPPT and Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ), and requested him to revise the draft ISPM accordingly for presentation to the SC in May 2012. The SC would then decide whether to proceed for another round of member consultation, as the text is likely to change substantially .
- [47] A fundamental issue had arisen with regards to the dielectric heat treatment as an Annex of ISPM 28:2007 and as part of Annex 1 of ISPM 15:2009, which had been sent for member consultation in 2011. While there was no dispute on the science behind the treatment, some member comments

requested more operational guidance. The treatment had been reviewed by IFQRG and member comments considered by the TPPT and the steward. All noted that the treatment is scientifically sound but that it was not possible to provide operational instructions as commercial facilities applying this treatment are not known. The TPPT therefore requested direction from the SC. One possibility would be to recommend that CPM adopts the treatment as an alternative to methyl bromide, and consider how to develop operational guidance later (in the standard setting or capacity development frameworks).

- [48] Several members supported that the treatment should be adopted as soon as possible as it provides a needed alternative to methyl bromide and is supported by sound scientific data. It was envisaged that it could be presented to adoption to CPM-7. However, the treatment is proposed both as an Annex to ISPM 28:2007, and as a treatment in Annex 1 of ISPM 15:2009, and one member was concerned that the treatment might not meet the criteria specified in ISPM 28:2007 for phytosanitary treatments, especially with regard to commercial use and their prior approval in countries. Some SC members felt that the treatment could still be presented for adoption at CPM-7 (2012) as part of ISPM 15:2009 alone, if it was considered to not meet all criteria of ISPM 28:2007, with an explanation that operational guidance cannot be provided at the current stage. This would require the treatment to be approved by an SC e-decision for presentation to CPM-7. In addition, it was noted that countries are unlikely to approve wood packaging treatments prior to their inclusion in ISPM 15:2009, as ISPM 15:2009 now forms the basis of regulation of wood packaging material. It would also mean adopting a treatment only for internal domestic use only and this was unlikely.
- [49] One member opposed presenting for adoption a treatment that has not been used in commercial operations and is not approved in any country. He noted the danger of recommending a treatment for which there is no practical experience, and noted that this might raise legal issues. Another member agreed that standards should reflect practice. The Secretariat noted that it had been tested on commercial scale in trials. One member raised concerns that this was introducing new requirements that treatments should be used in large-scale operations before being adopted. There was hesitation to accept this approach in the SC.
- [50] The SC concluded that the procedure could not be accelerated. The draft would be considered in the normal time frame, i.e. it would be presented to the SC-7 in May 2012. The issue would also be reported to CPM as part of the document containing requests by the SC for CPM decisions (agenda item 11). It would reflect that the SC strongly wished to proceed with the treatment, but also explain that practical experience was lacking. It would also be noted that there will be difficulties in providing full operational guidance prior to adoption of the treatment, and this is likely to be the case for other future ISPM 15:2009 treatments (see Section 11).
- [51] The SC:
- (1) *Requested* relevant parties, possibly IFQRG, TPPT and TPFQ, to help provide guidance on other systems using dielectric heat on a large scale to facilitate discussions when this topic is reconsidered by the SC.

*Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)*

- [52] Regarding liaison with the CBD, the Secretariat had participated in a CBD meeting on pests, aquarium and terrarium species. He also informed the SC that a meeting of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific Technological and Technical Advice (SBSTTA) would be taking place the week of the SC meeting in Montreal and forewarned the SC that the CBD would be requesting the IPPC to address certain issues. In addition, the Secretariat noted that the IPPC may be asked to develop a guide similar to the forestry guide for invasive alien species, and that the Cartagena Protocol was also interested in a document explaining its terminology in relation to the glossary of phytosanitary terms, as had been done with CBD terminology in Appendix 1 of ISPM 5.

## 4. STANDARDS COMMITTEE

### 4.1 SC May 2011 Report

[53] There was no comment on the report<sup>6</sup>.

### 4.2 SC-7 May 2011 Report

[54] The Chair of the SC-7 reported<sup>7</sup> that two drafts had been reviewed by the SC-7: *Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies* (2004-022) and *Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade* (2005-002). He indicated the major points raised during the discussions.

[55] The steward's comments on the Revision of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*): *criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade* (2006-010) were also considered but no revised draft ISPM was presented. A few issues had been forwarded to the TPFQ, TPPT and IFQRG for their consideration. It was also noted that the steward would be able to assist with redrafting.

[56] The SC thanked the SC-7 for the amount of work done.

[57] The Secretariat sought guidance regarding the terms of reference of the SC-7. The SC agreed that the SC-7 should make all efforts to move standards forward and, if necessary, the Secretariat in consultation with the SC-7 and SC Chairs should decide which issues need to be subject to an e-decision by the SC. The SC noted that no modifications to the terms of reference of the SC-7 were needed.

### 4.3 Outstanding Items

#### *Specification tasks to help address implementation issues*

[58] The SC in May 2011 had requested Mr Hedley to draft a new task on the implementation of standards, to be added to all specifications. He presented a document<sup>8</sup> outlining tasks to consider, and noted that implementation of standards is one of the major objectives of the IPPC and all involved should contribute to their implementation. In particular, expert drafting groups could have useful input into identifying implementation issues. In addition, it was noted that the SC had been making efforts to enhance the cooperation with other areas of activity of the IPPC Secretariat to help ensure that ISPMs are relevant to contracting parties.

[59] There was reluctance to request expert drafting groups to carry out extensive work on implementation, as their main task is to produce a technically- and scientifically-sound standard. However, expert drafting groups could give useful input in these matters. Implementation issues considered by the expert drafting groups would be reported in their reports and reviewed by the SC when receiving the draft standard. The SC would then communicate and collaborate with the groups of the IPPC Secretariat working on the IRSS and capacity development on implementation issues.

[60] The discussion on the implementation task would be reported in the SC paper to CPM for noting by the CPM (see agenda item 10).

[61] The SC:

(1) *Agreed* to add the following task to specifications:

Consider implementation of the standard by contracting parties including potential operational and technical implementation issues. Recommend, if appropriate, the development of supplementary material to aid implementation by contracting parties.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355>

<sup>8</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_15rev1

- (2) *Requested* the Secretariat to include this in all specifications for which drafting has not started.

***Proposed revision to the criteria for the prioritisation of diagnostic protocols***

[62] The Secretariat introduced the changes proposed to the criteria for the prioritization of diagnostic protocols<sup>9</sup>. It was proposed that the TPDP reviews the current working priorities based on these criteria.

[63] The SC:

- (1) *Supported* the revised Criteria for the prioritization of diagnostic protocols (Appendix 4).
- (2) *Requested* the TPDP to consider at its next meeting the list of working priorities as drawn up by the Secretariat in view of the criteria.
- (3) *Invited* the SC to provide information via the Secretariat to help the TPDP apply the criteria to the pests on the list of DPs prior to the next SC meeting.

***Other issues***

[64] The Chair noted that, for several standards under development, the SC in May 2011 had decided on special processes to produce revised drafts of some standards, such as small groups interacting with the steward, or comments to be sent to stewards. The following updates were presented:

- *Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations (Tephritidae) (2006-031)*. A revised draft of the ISPM had been circulated to the small group with the deadline for further comments of 15 November 2011.
- *Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (2005-003)*. The steward reported that comments had been received, but the two main positions on pre-clearance would be difficult to reconcile. For example, some countries use pre-clearance as part of permanent programmes and others want it to be a temporary measure. The SC agreed that the steward would send the redrafted text to the SC members who provided comments, for them to provide further suggestions and possibly for a final review before the draft is submitted to the Secretariat. One member asked whether all comments received could be made available to those reviewing the new draft, and this was agreed.
- *Import of germplasm (2004-001)*. Comments were received and the standard has been redrafted.

[65] For the three standards above, the stewards are requested to submit their drafts to the Secretariat by 1 December 2011, and it is foreseen that these drafts will be presented to the SC in May 2012.

- *Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (2005-004)*. Comments have been sent to the steward, but the redraft is not available.
- *Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (Appendix to ISPM 5) (2009-001)*. Comments were received from one member. The steward proposed that the topic be removed from the work programme as the topic had been given low priority on the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, and as that there are only few terms and explanations had proved to be difficult to develop satisfactorily. Deletion was proposed (see agenda item 7.1).

#### **4.4 Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (April to October 2011)**

***Summary of Standards Committee e-Decisions update October 2011***

[66] The Secretariat presented updates on e-decisions since May 2011 (consolidated in Appendix 5). There was a discussion on whether SC members should be required to respond to all e-decisions, in order to provide more involvement of SC members. It was noted that it was important that SC members participate in e-decisions, but members should not be forced to respond. It was agreed that SC should

---

<sup>9</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_08

be encouraged to participate in e-decisions, and participation would be re-evaluated at the next meeting.

[67] The SC noted that the e-decision process might need to be reconsidered in relation to adoption of standards if the CPM agreed to the proposal from the Focus group that the SC would adopt diagnostic protocols on its behalf, as agreement on a quorum may be needed.

[68] The SC:

- (1) *Urged* SC members to participate more actively in the e-decision making process and in the polls.

## **5. DRAFT ISPMS FROM THE SC-7 AND TPS**

### **5.1 Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade (2005-002)**

[69] The steward presented the standard<sup>10</sup> and noted that the SC-7 had discussed issues raised in member consultation. In particular, some countries that are members of COSAVE had submitted some general comments with no specific proposals for text modification which made it difficult for the steward to revise the draft standard. The SC-7 had attempted to address these general comments.

[70] One member noted that some countries that are members of COSAVE are of the opinion that the standard is not ready to be forwarded to the CPM. The standard still refers to a systems approach and furthermore it seems to apply to domestic policies on propagation material and these should not be included in an ISPM.

[71] Several members expressed their general satisfaction with the draft, noting that this standard has been in development for many years. It was noted that it is in line with the specification and additional SC instructions and recommendations outlined in several SC meeting reports. They also felt that the concern that the text relates to domestic pests in the country of export is a misunderstanding, as the standard relates to making commodities ready for export so that they meet phytosanitary import requirements.

[72] To try and progress the draft, the SC reviewed the text to identify the remaining substantive issues. A working group met to discuss these issues. The steward reported on the outcome of the working group, which had discussed both the concept of the standard and reviewed the whole text. The revised draft was reviewed again in detail in plenary, and remaining comments addressed.

[73] The following issues were raised during the discussions, and answers provided are given when available (paragraph and bullet numbers refer to the version as sent for member consultation on 20 June 2011):

- The NPPO of the exporting country is involved in overseeing the set up and implementation of integrated measures. When the plants are to be exported, phytosanitary certificates are issued and it is the NPPO of the exporting country that is responsible for issuing phytosanitary certificates. This was clarified in, for example, paragraphs 13 and 95.
- There are two main situations in which integrated measures are used. Either the importing country specifies the integrated measures in its phytosanitary import requirements, or the importing country sets general phytosanitary import requirements (e.g. the plants should be free from a specific pest) and the NPPO of the exporting country decides to specify integrated measures as a suitable and effective means to meet these requirements. This is a basic concept of the standard and is detailed in paragraph 26. The previous text referred to the “country” in both situations, and not to the “NPPO of an exporting/importing country”. In the first situation, this is correct as it is the country that sets requirements. In the second situation, the importing country sets its requirements and it is the NPPO of the exporting country that decides how to

---

<sup>10</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_2005-002, <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889>

- meet them. In addition, a sentence on equivalence was added to paragraph 26 to cover the case where the exporting country wishes to propose integrated measures that they have as equivalent to the phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country.
- There was agreement that the text should explicitly say that the measures should meet the phytosanitary import requirements and should be modified if necessary – The steward noted that this is covered in paragraphs 40, 48 and 92.
  - The standard is intended to be used in the context of international trade, and integrated measures are only used to meet the phytosanitary import requirements of importing countries. This was clarified in paragraph 28 by deleting “for example”. In that paragraph, the deletion of the last sentence was proposed, but the sentence was kept in order to emphasize the responsibilities of the NPPO of the exporting country in approving producers that conform to requirements for integrated measures.
  - Sections 2.1 and 2.2. The difference between general integrated measures and additional integrated measures in higher risk situations is not clear, as well as who defines the level of risk. It was clarified that the risk is assessed by the importing country, but the steward noted that it was for each country to decide which level of integrated measures to use and this cannot be defined in the standard. It is based on the outcome of PRA. In addition, it was suggested that the term “high pest risk situations” be avoided as there is a continuum of risk, i.e. where is the limit between high and low risk? The use of “higher pest risk” was proposed.
  - In some cases, the text should read “non conformance” instead of “non-compliance”, i.e. when it relates to any non conformance with the procedures in the exporting country during the production of the material, i.e. covering manuals, measures, etc.
  - Deletion of “upon request” in relation to provision of information by the NPPO of the exporting country was proposed in several cases, but it was noted that the NPPO of the importing country might not want detailed information. This was reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

[74] Specific issues were discussed as follows:

[75] *References.* The reference to ISPM 14:2002 should be deleted as the current standard does not follow ISPM 14:2002.

[76] *Background*

- The text deals mainly with the limitations of inspection for plants for planting, but integrated measures may be appropriate and other measures should be mentioned. It was suggested that a paragraph could be added on other measures that may be available, and why they also might not be appropriate or feasible or available for a particular trade. It was also thought that the text on inspection could be condensed.
- The reference to plants collected from the wild was questioned, and deletion was proposed. It was noted that plants collected in the wild could be used as propagating material. Decision was taken to simplify the text with a simple statement, and to mention risks such as to the environment and biodiversity in Annex 1.

[77] *Section 2.1*

- One member noted that the decision to apply general measures or measures targeting higher risks situations depends on the phytosanitary import requirements, and is not directly based on the risk. The reference to pest risk was removed.
- The exporting country might approve a part of a place of production when it is a very large place of production, and reference to “part” was proposed. This change was not incorporated.
- It is not clear if the actions described are carried out by the NPPO or the place of production, and this was adjusted where relevant. It was noted that some paragraphs (35 and 36) should not be requirements; however it was also noted that they provide guidance to NPPOs on how the system can be applied.

[78] *Section 2.1 and 2.2.* It is recognized that there is some repetition between the general measures and the integrated measures in higher risk situations. The SC acknowledged that there is duplication, but was important to keep the text complete.

[79] *Section 2.2.*

- Regarding the manual developed by the place of production and the pest management programmes, NPPOs should have a more active role in their preparation, especially where it relates to phytosanitary import requirements. The steward noted that there might be many places of production and types of plants for planting for export in a country, and the NPPO would probably not be in a position to prepare all of them, or be actively involved in the pest management, but it would approve them.
- Corrective actions are not taken “in cooperation” with the NPPO. They are under the responsibility of the NPPO and are taken under its supervision/control.
- There was uncertainty on whether section 2.2.2 on non-conformity refers only to non-conformity in case of higher risk situations or also for general requirements. The steward noted that this section was intended to cover both cases. The section was changed to 2.3 and the title modified for clarity.

[80] *Section 3*

- Reporting on pest outbreaks is an obligation for all contracting parties to the IPPC and did not need to be mentioned. It was noted that this relates to the pests that relate to the integrated measures considered.
- The text of 3.4 seems to express that there might not be a phytosanitary certificate issued in circumstances where the frequency of export inspections is reduced. The standard should state that the exporting country issues a phytosanitary certificate in conformity with the phytosanitary import requirements.

[81] *Section 4.*

- It was suggested that for higher risk material, the NPPO of the importing country may wish to apply additional measures, for example surveillance of the plants, as well as trace-back previously included in section 4.1. It was noted that importing countries have the sovereign right to take measures at or after import, and mentioning measures specifically would place an impossible obligation on importing countries. It was concluded that the responsibility of the importing country is to communicate cases of non-compliance and findings upon import or at a later date, and that there is no need to specify how the importing country does this.

[82] *Appendix 1: Factors that affect the pest risk of plants for planting.* The SC agreed to change appendix 1 into an annex.

- A mention was made to indicate that most of the factors included in this appendix were in ISPM 11. However, it was agreed that more detailed and specific guidance was provided in this appendix.
- A mention of aquatic plants had been added among the types of plant material. Deletion was proposed as aquatic plants are not a type of propagation material, and they are covered under the other categories. The steward noted that aquatic plants were added based on a CBD comments and members agreed that aquatic plants should be mentioned. A sentence on aquatic plants was added. It was considered whether to mention aquatic plants in the background section, but this was not considered appropriate.
- Replacement of “meristem tissue culture” by “germplasm” was considered, as “meristem tissue culture” is not commonly traded and there is a standard that will be developed on germplasm. It was noted that “meristem tissue culture” is correct here as it refers to material which presents a low risk of containing pests, including viruses. “Germplasm” is not the correct term as it covers very different types of material. “meristem tissue culture” was maintained.

- One member queried whether “living modified organisms” should be mentioned. It was clarified that in the IPPC world the only LMOs of concern are those for which a PRA has been done and the LMO is considered as presenting a pest risk or potential pest risk. Other cases are outside the scope of the IPPC.

[83] *Appendix 2. Examples of pest management measures to reduce the pest risk of plants for planting at a place of production*

- The appendix covers measures applied at the place of production so it should be limited to them. References to pest free areas should be removed because they do not belong to measures taken at the place of production.
- One member felt that the standard lacks measures on the movement of plants, mode of transportation, packing etc. It was noted that there is a section on packaging and transportation within the place of production. When leaving the place of production, plants for planting have received a PC and they are subject to requirements for certified commodities.

[84] Having completed the detailed review of the text, the SC discussed whether the text should be presented to CPM. The Secretariat asked the SC to remember that the CPM has repeatedly asked the SC to exercise the right to send the drafts back for a second consultation when there are substantial changes to a draft.

[85] Many members recognized the efforts made to solve issues and supported that the text should be presented to CPM-7 (2012), and the following arguments were given:

- the concept has not changed, and issues have been resolved
- it is recognized that the text is likely to attract comments as it has been substantially changed, but all efforts have been made to address all technical issues raised
- this standard had made great progress since the original draft, and was clearly focused on integrated measures at places of production, and was in line with all guidance given for its development by the SC
- if there proved to be any unresolved concerns, the SC would need more input to modify the text further.

[86] One member had strong reservations about sending the text to CPM, as it may still attract many comments and has been substantially changed as a result of member consultation. On the other hand, she acknowledged that a second round of consultation might not help solve the issues.

[87] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* the draft Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade (2005-002) for submission to CPM-7 for adoption (Appendix 6).

## **5.2 Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (2004-022)**

[88] The steward reported that most member comments had been incorporated and the Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies (TPFF) had suggested further adjustments<sup>11</sup>. In answer to a SC request, the TPFF had also considered the use of some terms, in particular tolerance level. The following general comments were made:

- One member noted that systems approaches for fruit flies were sometimes linked to an officially established area of low pest prevalence. This was not reflected in the text, apart from the mention of areas of low pest incidence. The steward noted that the standard recognizes the possibility to have areas of low pest prevalence by referring to areas of low pest incidence, but does not specifically refer to areas of low pest prevalence as the systems approach does not always require an area of low pest prevalence to be established.

---

<sup>11</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_2004-022 <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889>

- The standard gave lists of possible measures that may be used in a systems approach. One member noted that these lists were not explanatory and would not provide help in establishing systems approach, unless an explanatory document or a technical manual is developed. The steward noted that some indications on measures are also given in the overarching standard on systems approaches, ISPM 14:2002. The specific standard for fruit flies lists those measures that are in use in countries and it provides a list of possible measures that can be used when considering developing a fruit fly systems approach. One member noted that measures that are not considered appropriate as part of the systems approach should be deleted.

[89] The SC reviewed the text in detail and the following was discussed:

[90] *Background*

- Removing the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence of paragraph 17: “Treatments used in an FF SA are those not considered sufficiently efficacious to be applied as a single measure”. The steward noted that this was necessary because treatments that are efficacious on their own would not be part of the systems approach; they would be a measure on their own, equivalent to the systems approach. Other references to treatments were adjusted.

[91] *Section 1.1*

- It was noted that systems approaches are already designed to meet the appropriate level of protection, so the reference to appropriate level of protection was deleted. Finally “target fruit fly management measures” was replaced by “pest risk management measures” for clarity.
- Paragraph 24 was adjusted. In particular, while the phytosanitary import requirements are set by the importing country (and not its NPPO), it is the NPPO of the exporting country that may decide to implement a systems approach to meet these phytosanitary import requirements.
- Several instances of “area” were replaced by “fruit production area” as the systems approach focused on these areas.
- Last sentence of paragraph 28. One member suggested to delete the reference to trade opportunities as it is not relevant to phytosanitary issues. Another member felt that the decision to implement a systems approach is not only related to the target fruit fly species and fruit production area, but is also often associated with trade opportunities as systems approach are expensive, and trade opportunities determine whether systems approaches are developed and implemented. However, this is not part of the requirements and was moved to the background section.

[92] *Section 1.2*

- There was some discussion on the use of “pest incidence”, but it was decided to use this glossary term, and consultations with fruit fly experts indicated that this was an acceptable term.
- It was requested that control points should be mentioned in paragraph 33. The steward noted that the original text included such mention, but member comments asked for deletion as control points are not used in practice for fruit flies. It was not clear what such control points could be for fruit flies, and could not be implemented if the concept is not clear. Reference to control points was not introduced.
- It was suggested that “work plans” should be added to paragraph 33. The steward noted that the wording “work plans” had been modified to “operational procedures” in the 2nd bullet.
- In response to a question on possible inconsistency between the duration of record keeping in this standard and in other ISPMs, the steward noted that the duration indicated in this standard is consistent with other ISPMs on fruit flies.

[93] *Section 2.1*

- In paragraph 43, a compromise was found to delete the bullet point relating to buffer zones and include areas of low pest prevalence as an example in relation to the selection of sites with low pest incidence. It is recognized that an ALPP is not a pre-requisite for a systems approaches for fruit flies, but it is one option that may be used, as also indicated in ISPM 30.

- In paragraph 44, one member noted that sanitation should not only focus on mature fruits. Although it is acknowledged that the mature fruits present more risk for fruit flies, this change was made.
- In paragraph 46, waxing and water dipping were not treatments for fruit flies and were deleted. “Positive pressure between processing and receiving areas” was also proposed as an additional safeguarding activity, but this was not added as these are only examples and the list does not need to be exhaustive.
- In paragraph 47, deletion of the first bullet was proposed as it relates to measures implemented by the importing country at arrival. It was noted that this refers to cases where developing countries may not be able to apply all measures required, and in some cases measures are applied in the importing country and the text was moved to the end of [42].
- In paragraph 48, deletion of the bullet on movement control of host fruit into the area was suggested. One argument was that it had more to do with the delimitation and maintenance of an area, such as a PFA or an ALPP, than with systems approach. Another argument was that there are many types of host fruits for one fruit fly species and control of the movement is therefore very difficult and needs control stations; only awareness is generally possible. The steward noted that this was proposed as an alternative to ensure that the area is not at risk from arrival of fruit flies. It could be used for example on an island. Another member noted that movement control is commonly used in systems approaches. The text was maintained.

[94] *Section 2.2*

- One member noted that the original term of “specified pest population level” had been replaced by “tolerance level”, and was referred to in a footnote. As “specified pest population level” is the term generally accepted by fruit fly specialists, this term should be used in the text and the footnote could refer to “tolerance level”. The steward noted that the term “specified pest population level” is used widely on fruit fly publications, and refers to fruit flies per trap per day. However, when the TPF and fruit fly specialists were consulted, they said that tolerance level was acceptable. The steward of the TPF agreed the way tolerance level is used in this standard is correct. Several views were expressed that the glossary term “tolerance level” should be used. ISPMs are directed to NPPOs, and not to fruit fly experts, so it is more important to communicate clearly to NPPOs. The term was not changed but the footnote was transferred into the paragraph to give it more prominence. The text of the footnote was adjusted for clarity.

*Section 3*

- It was clarified that this section related to non-conformity with any procedure of the systems approach. In case of non-conformity, it may be possible to suspend the movement of fruit from a part of the area subjected to systems approach. This was included as a means of promoting the use of FF SA, with the assurance that it is not necessarily the whole area or all producers under systems approach that would suffer suspension in case of non-conformity.

[95] *The SC:*

- (1) *Approved* the draft Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (2004-022) for submission to CPM-7 for adoption (Appendix 7).

### **5.3 Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001)**

- [96] The steward informed the SC that the Secretariat had convened a special short meeting of the TPG on 4-5 November, to review members comments on amendments to the glossary<sup>12</sup>; in addition they were able to review the steward’s redraft of Supplement 1 to ISPM 5 as drafted in response to members comments.

<sup>12</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_1994-001, 2011\_SC\_Nov\_18

[97] Regarding the amendments to the glossary, the TPG had suggested that the terms *exclusion* and *consignment in transit* needed further work; they had been withdrawn from the paper presented to the SC.

[98] The main changes were presented as follows:

- *Confinement*. The term and definition had been modified to take member comments into account. The term now specifically applied to regulated articles, and its definition referred to phytosanitary measures.
- *Absorbed dose*. The definition was modified to remove (in gray) based on several member comments.
- *Phytosanitary certificate*. The definition was modified to replace “patterned after” with “consistent with”, which is used in ISPM 12. Some countries had also objected to the use of “attested” but it was felt preferable to maintain this term.
- *Quarantine station*. The original definition only included plants and plants products, and it was broadened to regulated articles and beneficial organisms. Several member comments recommended to reduce the list of items mentioned and not to mention beneficial organisms, but the TPG thought important to mention beneficial organisms to make a link to ISPM 3:2005.
- One member noted that regulated articles covered not only plants and organisms, but also, for example, conveyances. The definition should be limited to plants, plant products and other organisms in line with ISPMs 3:2005 and 34:2010. The steward noted that quarantine stations are used in practice for various regulated articles, such as baggage, pots or soil, and he favoured keeping the definition broad, and not limited to plants and organisms. In addition, it is not for the definition to specify what countries should do. Countries might have different practices regarding regulated articles. In addition, the definition mentioned “quarantine”, which includes “regulated articles” in its definition. SC members generally agreed that the definition should be broad. However, there was no consensus and the term was therefore returned to the TPG for further work. One member suggested that the definition could be modified to refer to “regulated articles, especially plants, plants products and ...”.
- One member proposed the term phytosanitary quarantine station. It was recalled that all glossary terms are defined in the context of the IPPC and give a specific use of a term in the phytosanitary context. The word phytosanitary is therefore generally not needed.

[99] The steward noted that few comments had been received on the proposed deletions (certificate, gray, hitch-hiker pest, legislation, plant pest, antagonist, competitor, control point, dosimeter and dosimetry). Based on the comments received, the TPG maintained the recommendation to delete these terms. In the case of *plant pest*, it has been noted that there are some occurrences of this term in the IPPC to refer to *pest*. The TPG proposed that a note to that effect be added to the definition of *pest*, instead of maintaining *plant pest* in the glossary. Regarding *hitch-hiker pest*, deletion was still proposed but the TPG would propose to the SC in May 2012 that the review of the definition of *contaminating pest* be added to the List of topics for IPPC standards. The SC had no comments on the proposal.

[100] The SC:

- (1) Requested the TPG to reconsider the definition of *quarantine station*.
- (2) Approved the draft *Amendments to the glossary (1994-001)* as modified for submission to CPM-7 for adoption (Appendix 8).

#### **5.4 Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (2005-008)**

[101] The steward of the draft<sup>13</sup> reported on the consideration of the member comments and the steward of the TPG concurred with her comments. One member comment had been addressed to the TPG and on

<sup>13</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_2005-008, 2011\_SC\_Nov\_19

the need to revise the definition of official control with regards to endangered area. Many suggested, within individual sections, to regroup text relating to each concept. The TPG had further proposed to introduce sub-sections for clarity. The TPG had reviewed the steward's proposal and suggested further reorganization and a few further changes to the original text on official control. The steward of the TPG noted that the reorganization was aimed at creating a coherent text. Some sections had also been moved.

[102] One member noted that the Spanish version of the definition of *quarantine pest* did not contain the Spanish equivalent of the expression "not widely distributed". In addition to being an error, it would also cause difficulties in relation to this draft.

[103] The SC:

- (1) *Approved* the draft *Revised supplement 1 to ISPM 5 (2005-008)* for submission to CPM-7 for adoption (Appendix 9).
- (2) *Noted* the issue of the Spanish version of the definition of *quarantine pest* and *requested* the Secretariat to explore how this can be corrected, and if possible correct it.

## 6. TECHNICAL PANELS

### 6.1 Urgent issues

[104] The urgent TP issues related only to the Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments (TPPT). The Secretariat noted that the TPPT has started to develop guidance on some types of phytosanitary treatments that it is developing. This was noted by the SC in May 2011, but there was now another group within the Secretariat working on implementation and capacity development. The Secretariat clarified that the TPPT guidance would broadly mention the key issues that are critical to the operation of a treatment, and need to be addressed by countries if they apply such treatment. The TPPT would not develop detailed guidance for each specific treatment. This task was also in line with the new task on implementation that has been allocated to expert drafting groups under agenda item 4.3. The Secretariat sought guidance from the SC on how to avoid duplication of work between different groups and ensure that the appropriate experts do this work. The SC felt that the TPPT experts would be able to easily identify what type of guidance was needed and also have some of the expertise available develop this guidance. It therefore felt it important for the TPPT to continue this work.

[105] The Secretariat also noted that CPM-6 had approved four topics for types of treatments, and informed the SC that a call for treatment submissions would be made. The submission form would be modified to ensure that submitters justify that an international standard is needed and bring it in line with the criteria for topics. The call was to take place as soon as possible to ensure that data submissions are received by September-October 2012 to be considered by the TPPT meeting in December 2012.

[106] The SC:

- (1) *Agreed* that the TPPT may continue to develop guidance for phytosanitary treatments and pass this information on to the SC.

### 6.2 TP membership

[107] The Secretariat recalled that the SC in May 2011 had noted that the terms of many TP members were expiring in 2013, and had asked for strategies to be developed to allow renewal of some members while ensuring continuity in the membership<sup>14</sup>.

#### *Technical panel on forest quarantine*

[108] All terms were expiring in 2013, and the SC at its May 2011 meeting had decided that the terms would be renewed until the end of the current work, which would continue virtually. It was now proposed that the technical panel of forest quarantine (TPFQ) members be renewed for five year terms, in line

---

<sup>14</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_05\_Rev1, 2011\_SC\_Nov\_17

with the TP procedures, and that the work be conducted virtually. Several members did not agree that terms should be renewed for five years and others indicated that the membership should be refreshed.

[109] One member noted that the decision should allow for the possibility that a new topic of relevance to the TPFQ be assigned to the panel by the SC if needed. This was agreed to. If the SC decided to assign more work to the TPFQ in the future, it may need to work in a meeting.

[110] One member supported that TPs should not be terminated once they finished their work, but could be made “dormant”. Others believed, as expressed at the May 2011 SC meeting, that the TPFQ and TPFQ should be disbanded once the current work is completed.

[111] The Secretariat noted that renewing all members for five years or until they complete their work was a pragmatic approach given the expected work of both the TPFQ and the TPFQ, and the fact that they would work virtually. It would save administrative work of calling and selection of new experts. The steward of the TPFQ supported that there was no need to change the membership and that the panel should work virtually at the moment. Several members noted that it would be difficult to bring in new members if the TPFQ was working virtually. The Secretariat noted that Mr Ormsby has recently left the TPFQ in order to replace Mr Sela as Secretariat’s lead. Mr Sela had originally left the TPFQ to become Secretariat’s lead, and it would be beneficial that he be reinstated as a TPFQ member.

[112] One member noted that, according to the current procedures, the SC should review the composition of TPs regularly. Therefore it is the SC that should make sure that TPs have a strong composition, and that all their members active. The terms for non-performing members should be ended as needed. However, she acknowledged the difficulties attached to this in practice for the stewards.

[113] The SC:

- (1) *Decided* that TPFQ members be renewed for five years or until the current pending work is completed, whichever comes first. The panel would work virtually, unless new topics are adopted by CPM or more work is assigned by the SC.
- (2) *Thanked* Mr Ormsby for his contribution to the work of the TPFQ.
- (3) *Noted* that Mr Sela will be invited to re-join the TPFQ following Mr Ormsby’s departure.

#### ***Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies***

[114] The Secretariat noted that this panel was in a similar situation to the TPFQ: current work was being completed and the panel will be working virtually to help provide technical advice to steward on member comments on fruit fly standards and to consider reorganization of fruit fly standards. The SC agreed to align its decision with that taken for the TPFQ.

[115] The SC:

- (1) *Decided* that TPFQ members be renewed for five-year terms or until the current pending work is completed, whichever comes first. The panel would work virtually until all the fruit fly standards are adopted and the work on reorganization of the fruit fly standards is completed, unless new topics are adopted by CPM or more work is assigned by the SC.

#### ***Technical panel on the glossary***

[116] The Secretariat presented the proposal and TPG members were invited to present their views prior to leaving the room during the discussion. The SC recognized the importance of first generation members (Mr Hedley and Mr Smith) in the work of the panel. Continuity was essential and the work of the TPG was crucial to the standard setting activities. The SC therefore supported the proposal that, at the end of their term in 2013, Mr Hedley continue on the panel and Mr Smith be invited as an invited expert. Regarding the latter, his participation would be subject to review by the SC. The SC recognized that new experts should be brought into the TPG in order to ensure that new ideas and views are considered, and transfer of knowledge. In addition to the new members already proposed, the SC decided to call for an additional member for the English language as the TPG functions in English and these discussions are the foundation of the terms and definitions in other languages.

Finally, the Secretariat noted that members of the TPG are encouraged to remain for their full term, as it is difficult for new members to contribute effectively to the work of the panel if they stay only one-two years.

[117] The SC recognized that, in particular in the TPG, long-term contributions were essential. It was noted that although members are renewed for five-year terms, this decision can be revisited by the SC at any time.

[118] The SC:

- (1) *Renewed* Mr John Hedley as a member for English for an additional term (2013-2018).
- (2) *Agreed* that, after the end of his term in 2013, Mr Ian Smith continues as a “first generation invited expert” for future TPG meetings, subject to review by the SC
- (3) *Thanked* Mr Wang Yuxi for his contribution to the work of the TPG
- (4) *Thanked* Mr Mohammad Katbeh-Bader for his continuing efforts and contribution to the work of the TPG until 2013
- (5) *Requested* the Secretariat to organize calls for four members for the following languages: Arabic, French, Chinese and English.

#### ***Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments***

[119] The Secretariat noted that the terms of seven members out of nine are ending in 2013, and there was a special need to stagger membership and the proposal reflected this.

[120] Several members expressed concerns about the strategy proposed and thought there was insufficient information to take a decision, for example on the justifications for the specializations proposed for renewal and on why the recommendations were made. More transparency was needed for the proposals.

[121] One member noted that the performance of TP members should be addressed, noting that stewards should provide feedback to the SC on TPs, and especially on why some members would be renewed and some replaced. There should be an evaluation of TP members, and it was suggested that stewards establish a system for the provision of clear objective information on what is going on in the panels. They should also advise on the specializations needed in the panels. Several members suggested that decision be postponed for a year until such information can be provided.

[122] The Secretariat explained that the proposals presented to the SC had been made in collaboration with stewards, SC Chair and Secretariat. Full consideration had been given to expertise, performance and geographic representation as necessary. He noted that the SC would have to put some trust in the review process, as not all elements could be detailed, but they had been considered. In addition, the TPPT had received extra-funding from Australia, and it would be difficult to postpone the decision as work needs to go ahead.

[123] One member wondered why two experts in fruit flies would be called for when there were some members remaining with a specialization in fruit flies. The Secretariat noted that there are different types of fruit fly treatments and experts were needed on the TPPT to cover all of these. In answer to a request for clarification, it was noted that the particular expertise related to fruit fly treatments would not be mentioned in the calls but would have to be considered by the SC based on guidance from the steward and TPPT.

[124] The Secretariat noted that renewals for three years were proposed to stagger terms, ensuring that not all members would be leaving in 2018. The SC could decide at a later stage to extend the three-year terms.

[125] There are relatively few countries actively developing treatments, and the composition may need to include more than one expert from one country. The SC recognized this.

[126] Given the expertise and experts on the panel, the SC suggested that Mr Willink would continue for an additional three-year term, and that Mr Wood would be replaced.

[127] One member noted that other regulated articles may need phytosanitary treatments. However, the current work programme contains only four topics, and the membership will need to be reviewed if new topics are added to the List of topics for IPPC standards.

[128] The SC:

- (1) *Renewed* Mr Ray Cannon, Mr Michael Ormsby, Mr Eduardo Willink and Mr Wang Yuejin as members of the TPPT for an additional three-year term (2013-2016)
- (2) *Thanked* Mr Mitsusada Mizobuchi for his contribution to the work of the TPPT
- (3) *Thanked* Ms Alice Baxter, Mr Mohammad Katbeh-Bader and Mr Scott Wood for their continuing efforts and contribution to the work of the TPPT until 2013
- (4) *Requested* the Secretariat to organize calls of two experts for five-year terms beginning in 2012 (with the following expertise: wood packaging material; fruit flies) and two experts for five-year terms beginning in 2013 (with the following expertise: soil and growing media in association with plants; fruit flies).

### ***Technical panel on diagnostic protocols***

[129] One member noted that the expertise required for the expert in invertebrates may be difficult to find. The Secretariat noted that the most important is the discipline, and that other elements would only be considered during expert selection.

[130] The SC:

- (1) *Renewed* Ms Ana Lía Terra, Mr Johannes de Gruyter and Ms Liping Yin as members of the TPDP for an additional term (2013-2018) in their respective disciplines
- (2) *Thanked* Mr Mallik Malipatil for his continuing efforts and contribution to the work of the TPDP until 2013
- (3) *Thanked* Mr Gerard Clover for his contribution to the work of the TPDP
- (4) *Request* the Secretariat to organize calls for two experts for five-year terms beginning in 2012 for the following disciplines:
  - . virology and backup for bacteriology, with quality assurance experience;
  - . invertebrates, primarily in entomology, with expertise in molecular diagnostic techniques, experience in quality assurance, and preferably with experience with barcoding.

## **7. TOPICS AND PRIORITIES FOR IPPC STANDARDS**

### **7.1 Update on the topics for IPPC standards**

[131] The Secretariat gave an overview of the *List of topics for IPPC standards*<sup>15</sup> and noted that the priorities proposed by the SC in May 2011 had been accepted by the Bureau and SPTA without comments. Some topics would be proposed for deletion, including the *Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the glossary of phytosanitary term* (as discussed under agenda item 4.3). The SPTA had also decided that only topics should be presented to the CPM and organized by strategic objective. Subjects (i.e. individual diagnostic protocols, phytosanitary treatments and glossary terms) will now be listed in separate tables as they are under the responsibility of the SC, and would only be presented to the SC and appended to the SC report. It is recognized that for diagnostic protocols, the TPDP has been assigned the task of reviewing the priorities based on the criteria noted under agenda item 4.3, and will report to the SC. Regarding glossary terms, the terms are being grouped as some are examined together.

---

<sup>15</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_14

- [132] One member noted that the topic, *Guidelines for public officers issuing phytosanitary certificates*, proposed for deletion, was intended as appendix 1 to ISPM 7:2011, recently adopted by CPM. In addition, he considered that the reasons given for the deletion of the topics 35, 37 and 38 (*Guidelines for public officers issuing phytosanitary certificates*, *Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities* and *Use of permits as import authorization*) are not applicable as these topics, although relating to national procedures, are highly relevant for international trade. The member did not consider that the development of manuals under capacity development was appropriate for such issues that are sensitive and controversial.
- [133] The SC suggested that the reasons regarding deletion of the topics 35, 37 and 38 (*Guidelines for public officers issuing phytosanitary certificates*, *Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities* and *Use of permits as import authorization*) should be modified, to clarify that although the topics are relevant for the reliability of phytosanitary certification, they would be difficult to harmonize due to major divergence of views and approaches of NPPOs/contracting parties.
- [134] The information exchange officer noted that the capacity development group had presented topics identified for deletion by the SC in May 2011 to their EWG in June 2011. A call for resources was made to see what countries have already. Many manuals already exist, and the idea was to use those and turn them into more generic documents. He noted that work might have begun on some of these topics. The SC strongly requested that there should be proper communication of activities related to implementation of standards.
- [135] It was noted that the Secretariat should clarify the documentation that would be produced on the capacity development side and the role of the SC. There was a need for coordination of the different areas of the IPPC Secretariat in relation to implementation of standards, and appropriate communication to the SC.
- [136] One member noted that the SC decided to assign strategic objectives, but the subsequent reorganization of the tables by strategic objective gave them too much prominence. It was noted that this had been a request from the SPTA. However, the remaining related decision was deferred (“*Consider if the topic presented in Row 39 (Table 1) and Technical panels and their associated topics (Table 2) need to be assigned to a Strategic Objective*”).
- [137] Regarding e-certification, the information exchange officer suggested that the topic of e-certification be deleted from the List of topics for IPPC standards. Work on e-Phyto is in progress, and after the meeting on e-certification, it was proposed that it should not be part of the standard setting process. It was proposed to present this information via a website, which would allow updating in a flexible manner, and it would not be possible to include all these details in ISPM 12. The EWG on e-certification would be making a recommendation to the CPM that the topic is deleted from the standard setting programme.
- [138] The SC noted that the revision of ISPM 12 will in any case be needed to incorporate a reference to the webpage. In addition, although the bulk of details of the global standard for electronic phytosanitary certification (ePhyto) would not be part of the appendix of ISPM 12:2011, ISPM 12:2011 gave criteria for e-certification, and the appendix should still contain general points on the system, and therefore the topic should not be deleted.
- [139] The *List of topics for IPPC standards* as modified during the meeting is presented in Appendix 10.
- [140] The SC:
- (1) *Decided* to delete the linkage of *Efficacy of measures* (2001-001) with *Appropriate level of protection* (2005-001) (SC April 2005 report section 9.5).
  - (2) *Requested* the CPM to apply the SC-proposed priority to the Topics and Strategic Objective listed in Table 1 and Table 2.
  - (3) *Requested* the CPM to delete the following topics from the List of topics for IPPC standards:

- . **Row 3:** Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade (2005-006)
  - . **Row 16:** International movement of forest tree seeds (2006-032)
  - . **Row 17:** Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5) (2009-001)
  - . **Row 32:** Appropriate level of protection (2005-007)
  - . **Row 33:** Biological control for forest pests (2009-008)
  - . **Row 34:** Forest pest surveys for determination of pest status (2006-030)
  - . **Row 35:** Guidelines for public officers issuing phytosanitary certificates (Appendix to ISPM 7 2011 *Phytosanitary certification system*) (2010-031)
  - . **Row 36:** Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures (2005-005)
  - . **Row 37:** Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities (2008-003)
  - . **Row 38:** Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20:2004 *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) (2008-006)
- (4) *Recommended* that the CPM considers whether it is appropriate to develop technical manuals for topics that are suggested for deletion because of the controversy of views that makes it difficult to agree a global harmonisation.
- (5) *Urged* the Secretariat to ensure that there is good communication with the SC on what is being done in relation to standards implementation

## 7.2 Adjustments to stewards

[141] The Chair noted that many SC members' terms would be ending in 2012 and some adjustments to stewards will be needed at the May 2012 meeting. In addition, if the Focus group proposal to have assistant stewards was accepted by CPM-7, some SC members whose terms were ending would probably be asked to become assistant stewards.

## 8. DRAFT SPECIFICATIONS

### *Draft specifications for review of member comments and approval by the SC*

#### **8.1 Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004)**

[142] The SC did not have time to discuss this specification<sup>16</sup>. The SC agreed that it be approved by e-decision, and noted that it would be the first such approval.

[143] It was also noted that the decisions to hold e-decisions would be subject to availability of resources in the Secretariat and proper consideration of the need not to overwhelm the SC.

### *Draft specifications for approval for member consultation*

#### **8.2 Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002)**

#### **8.3 Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004)**

[144] The SC did not have time to discuss these two specifications<sup>17,18</sup> in detail. At its meeting in May 2011, the SC had already decided that they be further developed for member consultation through e-decision, i.e. that the revised draft produced by the steward would be open for comment in a forum (two weeks) and a poll (one week). This process will be followed.

<sup>16</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_2008-004, 2011\_SC\_Nov\_13

<sup>17</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_2009-002

<sup>18</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_2009-004

## 9. REVIEW OF THE STANDARD SETTING CALENDAR

[145] The Secretariat presented the calendar for 2011 and 2012<sup>19</sup> and informed the SC that the up-to-date calendar for IPPC activities is posted on the IPP at <https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110501>.

## 10. AGENDA ITEMS DEFERRED TO FUTURE SC MEETINGS

[146] At the last SC meeting, it had been suggested that, for the SC May meetings, the Agenda should be shorter with more in depth discussions and draft standards with the highest profile or those that were more “ready” could be included on the agenda. The Secretariat presented a list of standards and their current stage. There are potentially seven draft ISPMs that may be ready for the SC April 2012 meeting. In addition, four phytosanitary treatments and two diagnostic protocols would also be ready for member consultation.

[147] The SC will have to consider the priorities for member consultation and the volume that can be addressed by countries during member consultation. It was noted that with the OCS system the Secretariat may be able to send a larger number of drafts for member consultation than recently, but members may not be able to deal with many draft ISPMs.

[148] The SC agreed that a forum would be organized once it is confirmed which drafts will be presented (1 March) and the SC has had time to consider them to gather views on the standards and determine the priority for those that should be discussed at the April 2012 meeting.

## 11. SC DECISIONS FOR CPM-7 (2012)

### *Issues for CPM decision*

[149] The Chair recalled that issues from the SC for CPM decision would be included in a CPM document (see agenda item 3.1). She outlined the issues identified prior<sup>20</sup> and during the meeting (see agenda items 3.4, 4.3, 7.1). The SC modified the proposal to remove the item on priorities for funding SC meetings, which had arisen from the November 2010 discussion on the 2011 funding crisis. The SC noted that it would be possible to make a specific proposal to the CPM on priorities for funding SC meetings if such a crisis occurred again. The resulting proposal is given in Appendix 11.

## 12. DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT SC MEETING

[150] The next meeting has been confirmed by FAO on 23-27 April 2012 (subject to further rescheduling). The Secretariat informed the SC that the CPM agreed for the IPPC Secretariat to go paperless in 2012, and no printed documents will be provided. There will be limited distribution of documents during meetings, and systems will be in place to allow members to download their own documents. The SC urged the Secretariat to reconsider the possibility of supplying paper copies of documents generated during the SC meeting, noting that it was necessary to see paper copies of drafts during the standard setting process, and that it might be difficult for members to arrange for printing of copies.

## 13. EVALUATION OF THE MEETING PROCESS

[151] The following issues were raised:

- One member suggested that the reports of the SC and SC-7 should be focused on substantive points and contain fewer details, especially regarding discussions on standards. The Secretariat recalled that some contracting parties, through the CPM, had requested more detailed reports with regards to discussions on standards, and a counter decision would require CPM approval. Another member noted that the detail was useful for those who do not attend the meetings but need such background to review the drafts.

---

<sup>19</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_12

<sup>20</sup> 2011\_SC\_Nov\_09

- One member noted that the SC had detailed discussions on drafting of standards and technical details, while there had been strong requests in the past that the SC should focus on substantial and strategic issues. He hoped that the SC would find a balance in the future. He also suggested that the standard setting process be adjusted incrementally as a result of the Focus Group recommendations, and that not all changes be made at the same time.
- One member noted that long-term consideration of standards and standard setting was needed. There was no consistent approach to how standards are constructed and reviewed. For example one of the drafts considered at this meeting contained many details on requirements (plants for planting) while the other (fruit fly systems approaches) provided more of an outline with limited details.
- One member noted that one essential element for the success of setting standards, irrespective of how much the standard setting process is improved by the Focus Group proposals, is that CPM members send their comments at early stages of standard development, and send specific comments and proposals for rewording during member consultation.

[152] There was no time to continue the discussion, but the Secretariat invited SC members to send any further comments on this agenda item by email.

#### **14. OTHER BUSINESS**

[153] The steward of *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade* outlined activities regarding the development of this draft standard. He noted that this is a complex issue and the scope might have to be restricted (possibly excluding conveyances and initially only deal with empty containers). In addition he felt it would be prudent to also try to help contracting parties deal with their responsibilities in regards to biodiversity at entry points. A small group of experts from the expert working group would discuss the topic in the following week, and he invited SC members to send him contributions and views on these issues.

#### **15. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT**

[154] The SC adopted the report.

#### **16. CLOSE OF THE MEETING**

[155] The Chair thanked all those who had contributed to the success of the meeting, especially SC members, interpreters and the Secretariat staff. She reminded the SC that many SC members would be replaced at CPM-7 as their terms would end in 2012. She expressed the SC's appreciation of the work these members have done, some of them for many years. On behalf of the SC, one member thanked the Chair for her efficient, kind and patient guidance throughout the meeting.

**APPENDIX 1: Agenda****AGENDA****COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES****STANDARDS COMMITTEE****7-11 November 2011****German Room C-269, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy**

7 November start time: 10:00 hrs (coffee at 09:30hrs)

Daily Schedule:

Monday 10:00-13:00 and 14:30-17:30 and the rest of the week 09:00-12:00 and 14:00-17:00

Coffee: Monday welcome coffee 9:30, rest of the week am at 10:30 and pm at 15:30

Wednesday **Dinner** 19:30 (Le Tavernelle, Via Panisperna 48).

(Updated: 18 November 2011)

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	--	LARSON
1.2 Election of the Rapporteur	--	CHARD
1.3 Adoption of the Agenda	2011_SC_Nov_01	CHARD
<b>2. Administrative Matters</b>		
2.1 Documents List	2011_SC_Nov_02	LARSON
2.2 Participants List	2011_SC_Nov_03	LARSON
2.3 Local Information	2011_SC_Nov_04	LARSON
<b>3. Updates from other relevant bodies</b>		
3.1 CPM Bureau	--	LARSON
3.2 SPTA	--	LARSON
3.3 Focus group on improving the standard setting process		
❖ Focus Group Meeting Report	<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776</a>	DUBON
❖ SPTA Recommendations	2011_SC_Nov_06_rev1	DUBON
3.4 Report of the IPPC Secretariat	2011_SC_Nov_10_rev1	
❖ Standard Setting	--	LARSON
• Organizational chart of the Standard setting group	2011_SC_Nov_07	DUBON
• Online Comment System		
❖ International Liaison	--	LARSON

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
❖ Information Exchange	--	NOWELL
❖ Capacity Development	--	PERALTA
• Regional Workshops on Draft ISPMs	--	
❖ IRSS	--	SOSA
<b>4. Standards Committee</b>		
4.1 SC May 2011 Report	<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355</a>	CHARD
4.2 SC-7 May 2011 Report	<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355</a>	HOLTZHAUSEN
4.3 Outstanding Items	--	LARSON
❖ Specification tasks to help address implementation issues	2011_SC_Nov_15	HEDLEY
❖ Proposed revision to the criteria for the prioritisation of diagnostic protocols	2011_SC_Nov_08	GROUSSET
4.4 Update of polls and forums discussed on e-decision site (April to October 2011)	2011_SC_Nov_11_rev1	LARSON
❖ Summary of Standards Committee e-Decisions update October 2011	2011_SC_Nov_16	
<b>5. Draft ISPMs from the SC-7 and TPs</b>		
<b>5.1 Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade (2005-002)</b>	2011_SC_Nov_2005-002	HOLTZHAUSEN/ OPATOWSKI
- Steward: David OPATOWSKI, high priority		
❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response)	<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889</a> (2011 May SC-7)	
<b>5.2 Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (2004-022)</b>	2011_SC_Nov_2004-022	HOLTZHAUSEN/ GONZALEZ
- Steward: Magda GONZALEZ, normal priority		
❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response)	<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889</a> (2011 May SC-7)	
<b>5.3 Amendments to the Glossary (<i>only those that are not controversial following member consultation and TPG meeting on 4-5 November</i>) (1994-001)</b>	2011_SC_Nov_1994-001	HEDLEY/ GROUSSET
- Steward: John HEDLEY, high priority		
❖ Compiled comments (including TPG and Steward's response)	2011_SC_Nov_18	
<b>5.4 Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (2005-008)</b>	2011_SC_Nov_2005-008	ALIAGA / HEDLEY
- Steward: Julie ALIAGA, high priority		
❖ Compiled comments (including TPG and Steward's response)	2011_SC_Nov_19	
<b>6. Technical Panels</b>		

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DOCUMENT NO.</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
6.1 Urgent issues	--	LARSON
6.2 Membership of technical panels	2011_SC_Nov_05_r ev1	GROUSSET / LARSON
❖ Proposed membership strategy for the TPDP	2011_SC_Nov_17	
<b>7. Topics and priorities for IPPC standards</b>		
7.1 Update on the topics for IPPC standards	2011_SC_Nov_14	DUBON
7.2 Adjustments to stewards	--	CHARD
<b>8. Draft Specifications</b>		
<b>Draft specifications for review of member comments and approval by the SC</b>		
<b>8.1 Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004)</b>	2011_SC_Nov_2008 -004	ROSSEL
- Steward: Bart ROSSEL, normal priority		
❖ Compiled comments (including Steward's response)	2011_SC_Nov_13	
<b>Draft Specifications for approval for Member Consultation</b>		
<b>8.2 Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002)</b>	2011_SC_Nov_2009 -002	OLUSOLA- AWOSUSI
- Steward: Olufunke AWOSUSI, high priority		
<b>8.3 Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004)</b>	2011_SC_Nov_2009 -004	HEDLEY
- Steward: John HEDLEY, normal priority		
<b>9. Review of the standard setting calendar</b>	2011_SC_Nov_12_r ev1	INAFUKU
<b>10. Agenda items deferred to future SC Meetings</b>	--	CHARD
<b>11. SC decisions for CPM-7 (2012)</b>	--	CHARD
❖ Issues for CPM decision	2011_SC_Nov_09	CHARD
<b>12. Date and venue of the next SC Meeting</b>	--	LARSON
<b>13. Evaluation of the meeting process</b>	--	CHARD
<b>14. Adoption of the report</b>	--	CHARD
<b>15. Close of the meeting</b>		LARSON

**APPENDIX 2: Documents list****DOCUMENTS LIST**

COMMISSION ON PHYTOSANITARY MEASURES  
STANDARDS COMMITTEE  
7-11 NOVEMBER 2011

(Updated: 18 November 2011)

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
<b>Draft ISPMs</b>				
2011_SC_Nov_2005-002	5.1	Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade (2005-002) (OPATOWSKI)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	02 Aug. 2011
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889&amp;frompage=1110889&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2181234&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889&amp;frompage=1110889&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2181234&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0</a>	5.1	Reference: Part 1. Compiled comments with Steward's responses as presented to SC-7 May 2011 (2005-002)	SC Only	27 April 2011
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889&amp;frompage=1110889&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2181235&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889&amp;frompage=1110889&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2181235&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0</a>	5.1	Reference: Part 2. Compiled comments with Steward's responses as presented to SC-7 May 2011 (2005-002)	SC Only	27 April 2011
2011_SC_Nov_2004-022	5.2	Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (2004-022) (GONZALEZ-ARROYO)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	02 Aug. 2011
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889&amp;frompage=1110889&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2181236&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110889&amp;frompage=1110889&amp;tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2181236&amp;type=publication&amp;L=0</a>	5.2	Reference: Compiled comments with Steward's responses as presented to SC-7 May 2011 (2004-022)	SC Only	27 April 2011
2011_SC_Nov_1994-001	5.3	Amendments to the Glossary ( <i>only those that are not controversial following member consultation and TPG meeting on 4-5 November</i> ) (1994-001) (HEDLEY / GROUSSET)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	07 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_2005-008	5.4	Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (2005-008)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	07 Nov. 2011
<b>Draft specifications</b>				
2011_SC_Nov_2008-004	8.1	Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages (2008-004) (ROSSEL)	SC Only	19 Oct. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_2009-002	8.2	Revision of ISPM 4 – Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas (2009-002) (AWOSUSI)	SC Only	19 Oct. 2011

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	LEVEL OF ACCESS	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
2011_SC_Nov_20 09-003	8.3	Revision of ISPM 6 – Guidelines for surveillance (2009-004) (HEDLEY)	SC Only	19 Oct. 2011
<b>Other documents</b>				
2011_SC_Nov_01	1.3	Agenda (Secretariat)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	18 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_02	2.1	Documents list (Secretariat)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	18 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_03	2.2	Participants list (Secretariat)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	11 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_04	2.3	Local information (Secretariat)	CPs, RPPOs and SC	07 Oct. 2011
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=207776</a>	3.3	Focus Group Meeting Report	Public	Available on IPP
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355</a>	4.1	SC May 2011 Report	Public	Available on IPP
<a href="https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355">https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=13355</a>	4.2	SC-7 May 2011 Report	Public	Available on IPP
2011_SC_Nov_05 _rev1	6.2	Membership of technical panels	SC Only	24 Oct. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_06 _rev1	3.3	Focus group on improving the standard setting process - SPTA Recommendations	SC Only	21 Oct. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_07	3.4	Organizational chart of the Standard setting group	SC Only	21 Oct. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_08	4.3	Proposed revision to the criteria for the prioritisation of diagnostic protocols	SC Only	21 Oct. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_09	11	Issues for CPM decision	SC Only	21 Oct. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_10 _Rev1	3.4	IPPC Secretariat Update for the SC November 2011	SC Only	10 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_11 _rev1	4.4	Summary of E-decisions	SC Only	26 Oct. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_12 _rev1	9.0	IPPC Standard Setting Meeting and Action Calendar for 2011	SC Only	11 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_13	8.1	Compiled comments on Specification for the Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages with Steward's responses	SC Only	24 Oct. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_14	7.1	Update on the list of topics and priorities for IPPC standards	SC Only	28 Oct. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_15	4.3	Specification tasks to help address implementation issues	SC Only	7 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_16	4.4	Summary of Standards Committee e-Decisions update October 2011	SC Only	7 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_17	6.2	Proposed membership strategy for the TPDP	SC Only	7 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_18	5.3	Compiled comments on Amendments to the Glossary (1994-001) with TPG responses	SC Only	7 Nov. 2011
2011_SC_Nov_19	5.4	Compiled comments on Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (2005-008) with Steward's and TPG responses	SC Only	7 Nov. 2011

**APPENDIX 3: Participants list**

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.  
Members not attending have been taken off the list.

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Africa Member	<b>Mr Lahcen ABAHA</b> Regional Directorate of the Sanitary and Food Safety National Office - Souss-Massa Drâa Region - BP 40, Agadir Principal, Hay Assakam <b>MOROCCO</b> Tel: (00212) 673 997 855 / 673 997 889 Fax:(00212) 528-237874	lahcen.abaha@onssa.gov.ma; abahalahcen@yahoo.fr;	CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years	2012
✓	Africa Member	<b>Ms Olufunke Olusola AWOSUSI</b> Head, Post Entry Quarantine Inspection and Surveillance Nigeria Agricultural Quarantine Service Moor Plantation, P.M.B. 5672 Ibadan <b>NIGERIA</b> Tel: +234 805 9608494	awosusifunke@yahoo.com;	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014
✓	Africa Member  SC7	<b>Mr Mike HOLTZHAUSEN</b> Deputy Director Agricultural Products Inspection Services Private Bag X258 Pretoria 0001 <b>SOUTH AFRICA</b> Tel: (+27) 12 309 8703 Fax: (+27) 12 309 8775	netmike@absamail.co.za ; mikeh@nda.agric.za;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Asia Member	<b>Mr Antarjo DIKIN</b> Director, Institute of Applied Research on Agricultural Indonesian Agricultural Quarantine Agency Ministry of Agriculture Jl Raya Kampung Utan – Setu, Desa Mekar Wangi Kec. Cikarang Barat Kab. Bekasi 17520, West Java <b>INDONESIA</b> Tel/Fax:(+6221) 82618923	antario_dikin@yahoo.com;	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Asia Member  Vice-Chair	<b>Mr Motoi SAKAMURA</b> Director, Operation Department, Kobe Plant Protection Station, Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries 1-1,Hatobacho, Chuouku, Kobe 6500042 <b>JAPAN</b> Tel: (+81) 78 331 3430 Fax: (+81) 78 391 1757	sakamuram@pps.maff.go.jp;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Asia Member	<b>Mr Udorn UNAHAWUTTI</b> Senior Expert in Plant Quarantine Department of Agriculture 50 Phaholyothin Road, Chatuchak Bangkok 10900 <b>THAILAND</b> Tel:(+66) 2579 8516; Cell: (+66) 9892 2415 Fax:(+66) 2579 4129	unahawut@yahoo.com;	Replacement for Mr. Prabhakar CHANDURKAR CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Asia Member  SC7	<b>Mr Fuxiang WANG</b> Director Plant Quarantine Division National Agro-Technical Extension and Service Center Ministry of Agriculture No 20 Mai Zi Dian Street, Chaoyang District 100026 Beijing <b>CHINA</b> Tel: (+86) 10 5919 4524 Fax: (+86) 10 5919 4726	wangfuxiang@agri.gov.cn;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Europe Member  Chair	<b>Ms Jane CHARD</b> SASA, Scottish Government Roddinglaw Road Edinburgh EH12 9FJ <b>UNITED KINGDOM</b> Tel: (+44) 131 2448863 Fax: +44 131 2448940	jane.chard@sasa.gov.uk;	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014
✓	Europe Member  SC7	<b>Mr Ebbe NORDBO</b> Head of Section Danish AgriFish Agency Skovbrynet 20 DK - 2800 Lyngby <b>DENMARK</b> Tel: (+45) 45 263 891 Fax: (+45) 45 263 613	eno@pdir.dk; eno@naturerhverv.dk; fropla@naturerhverv.dk;	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Europe Member	<b>Mr David OPATOWSKI</b> Head Plant Biosecurity Plant Protection and Inspection Services (PPIS) P.O. Box 78 Bet Dagan 50250 <b>ISRAEL</b> Tel: (+972) 3 968 1585; 506 241 745 Fax: (+972) 3 968 1571	davido@moag.gov.il; dopatowski@yahoo.com;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Europe Member	<b>Mr Jens-Georg UNGER</b> Head of Institute Institute for National and International Plant Health Julius Kuehn Institute Federal Research Institute on Cultivated Plants Messeweg 11/12 38104 Braunschweig <b>GERMANY</b> Tel: (+49) 531 299 3370 Fax: (+49) 531 299 3007	jens-georg.unger@jki.bund.de ;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	<b>Ms M. Soledad CASTRO DOROCHESSI</b> Director, Plant Protection Division Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero Av. Bulnes 140, Piso 3 Santiago, <b>CHILE</b> Tel: (+562) 3451200 Fax: (+56 2) 3451203	soledad.castro@sag.gob.cl;	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member  SC7	<b>Ms Magda GONZÁLEZ ARROYO</b> Directora del Servicio Fitosanitario del Estado Ministry of Agriculture Apartado 1521-1200 San José, Costa Rica Centro America <b>COSTA RICA</b> Tel:+ (506) 2549-3565 Fax:+ (506) 2549-3599	mgonzalez@sfe.go.cr; direccion@sfe.go.cr;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	<p><b>Ms Beatriz MELCHO</b> Sub-Director, Plant Protection Division Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries General Direction of Agricultural Services Plant Protection Division Avda. Millan 4703 CP 12900 Montevideo <b>URUGUAY</b> Tel: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 165 Fax: (+598) 2 309 8410 ext 267</p>	<p>bmelcho@mgap.gub.uy; bemelcho@hotmail.com;</p>	<p>CPM-2 (2007) CPM-5 (2010) 2nd term / 3 years</p>	2013
✓	Latin America and Caribbean Member	<p><b>Mr Guillermo ROSSI</b> Director de Certificación Fitosanitaria, DNPV - Senasa Paseo Colón 315 4º piso A Capital Federal (C1063ACD) <b>ARGENTINA</b> Tel: +54 11 41215097 Fax: +54 11 41215179</p>	<p>grossi@senasa.gov.ar; ffgrossi@gmail.com;</p>	<p>CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years</p>	2012
✓	Near East Member	<p><b>Mr Mohammad Reza ASGHARI</b> Plant Protection Organization, No.2 Plant Protection Organization Charman Highway Yaman Street Tehran <b>IRAN</b> Tel.:+98-21-23091119; +98-21-22402712; +98-21-22402046-9 Fax.:+98-21-22309137 Mobile: +98-912-1044851</p>	<p>asghari@ppo.ir; asghari.massoud@gmail.com</p>	<p><i>Replacement</i> CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years</p>	2012
✓	Near East Member	<p><b>Mr Khidir GIBRIL MUSA</b> General Manager Plant Protection Directorate P.O. Box 14 Khartoum North <b>SUDAN</b> Tel: (+249) 1 8533 8242/9121 38939 Fax: (+249) 1 8533 9423</p>	<p>khidrigibrilmusa@yahoo.com; khidirgme@hotmail.com;</p>	<p>CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years</p>	2012

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
✓	Near East Member	<b>Mr Imad NAHHAL</b> Head of the Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture Bir Hassan Embassies Street Beirut <b>LEBANON</b> Office Tel: +961 1 849639 Tel: +961 3 894679	imadn@terra.net.lb; inahhal@agriculture.gov.lb;	CPM-6 (2011) 1st term / 3 years	2014
✓	North America Member  SC7	<b>Ms Julie ALIAGA</b> Program Director, International Standards Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, Unit 140 Riverdale, MD 20737 <b>USA</b> Tel: (+1) 301 734 0763 Fax: (+1) 301 734 7639	julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov;	CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years	2012
✓	Pacific Member  SC7	<b>Mr John HEDLEY</b> Principal Adviser International Organization, Policy Branch, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry P.O. Box 2526 Wellington <b>NEW ZEALAND</b> Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0736	john.hedley@maf.govt.nz;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012
✓	Pacific Member	<b>Mr Ngatoko NGATOKO</b> Director Biosecurity Service, Ministry of Agriculture P.O.Box 96, Rarotonga <b>COOK ISLANDS</b>	nngatoko@agriculture.gov.ck; biosecurity@agriculture.gov.ck;	Replacement for Mr Timothy TEMUKON CPM-4 (2009) 1st term / 3 years	2012
✓	Pacific Member	<b>Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL</b> International Plant Health Surveillance Program Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer, Biosecurity Services Group Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry <b>AUSTRALIA</b> Tel:+61 2 6272 5056 / 0408625413 Fax:+61 2 6272 5835	bart.rossel@aqis.gov.au; bart.rossel@daff.gov.au;	CPM-6 (2011) 1st term / 3 years	2014

*Non attending*

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term Expires
	Africa Member	<b>Mr Marcel BAKAK</b> Head, Plant Quarantine Ministry of Agriculture Minader, Yaoundé <b>CAMEROON</b> Tel: +23799961337 FAX: + 23722310268	Mandjek4@yahoo.fr;	CPM-5 (2010) 1st term / 3 years	2013
	North America Member	<b>Ms Marie-Claude FOREST</b> International Standards Advisor Office of Chief Plant Health Officer Export and Technical Standards Section Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 <b>CANADA</b> Tel:(001) 613-773-7235 Fax:(001) 613-773-7204	marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca; ippc-contact@inspection.gc.ca;	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2nd term / 3 years	2014
	Near East Member  SC7	<b>Mr Abdullah AL-SAYANI</b> Director General of Plant Protection General Directorate of Plant Protection Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation P.O. Box 26, Zaied Street Saná <b>YEMEN</b> Telephone:(+967) 1 250956 Fax:(+967) 1 228064	plant-protection@yemen.net.ye;	CPM-1 (2006) CPM-4 (2009) 2nd term / 3 years	2012

**Others**

	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership confirmed	Term Expires
✓	Observer, Costa Rica	Mr Guillermo <b>SIBAJA</b> Laboratorios de Diagnostico Fitosanitario Estacion MAG. Aerop. Juan Santamaria State Phytosanitary Service Ministry of Agriculture of Costa Rica <b>COSTA RICA</b>	gsibaja@sfe.go.cr		
✓	Observer, South Africa	Mr Mashudu <b>SILIMELA</b> Deputy Director: International Plant Health Matters Directorate Plant Health South African Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries Private Bag x 14 0031Gezina, Pretoria, RSA <b>SOUTH AFRICA</b> Tel: +27 12 319 6241	MashuduS@daff.gov.za		

✓	Secretariat	<b>Mr Brent LARSON</b> Standards Officer	Brent.Larson@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	<b>Ms Stephanie DUBON</b> APO	Stephanie.Dubon@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	<b>Ms Fabienne GROUSSET</b> Support	Fabienne.Grousset@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	<b>Ms Eva MOLLER</b> Administrative support staff	Eva.Moller@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	<b>Ms Sayuri Inafuku</b> Visiting scientist	Sayuri.Inafuki@fao.org	N/A	N/A
✓	Secretariat	<b>Mr Koji Onosato</b> Visiting scientist	Koji.Onosato@fao.org	N/A	N/A

#### **APPENDIX 4: Criteria for the prioritisation of diagnostic protocols**

(Status: agreed by the TPDP, submitted to and modified by the SC in November 2007, minor editorial at TPDP 2010 (Annex 8 of report), submitted to, modified and noted by the SC in November 2011)

*The criteria are not in order of priority.*

Need for international harmonization of the diagnostic techniques for the pest (e.g. due to difficulties in diagnosis or disputes on methodology)
Relevance of the diagnosis to the protection of plants including measures to limit the impact of the pest.
Importance of the plants protected on the global level (e.g. relevant to many countries or of major importance to a few countries).
Volume/importance of trade of the commodity that is subjected to the diagnostic procedures (e.g. relevant to many countries or of major importance to a few countries).
Other criteria for topics as determined by CPM that are relevant to determining priorities
Balance between pests of importance in different climatic zones (temperate, tropics etc) and commodity classes.
Number of labs undertaking the diagnosis.
Feasibility of production of a protocol, including availability of knowledge and expertise.

## APPENDIX 5: Summary of the SC e-decision

The topics of SC e-decision from May to November 2011 are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1: SC e-decisions 01-07 presented between May and November 2011**

No. e-decision (2011_eSC_Nov_XX)	Title	Numbers of	
		Forum Comments	Polls Yes/No
Forum 01 Poll 02 <sup>21</sup>	How to continue the revision of ISPM 15 ( <i>Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade</i> ), specifically on the criteria for treatments of wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)	2	8/0
Forum 02 Poll 01*	Discussion on the replacement of an expert for the Sea container EWG	4	10/0
Forum 03 Poll 03	SC recommendation on eight Fruit Fly cold treatments under the topic Fruits Fly Treatment (2006-024) as Annexes to ISPM 28:2007	6	3/2
Forum 04 Poll 04	Explanatory document for ISPM 5 <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>	2	(N/A)
Forum 05 Poll 05	SC recommendation for draft diagnostic protocol for Plum Pox Virus as Annex XX to ISPM 27	2	11 /0
Forum 06 Poll 06	SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol for <i>Guignardia citricarpa</i> as Annex XX to ISPM 27	2	5/0
Forum 07 Poll 07	SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol for <i>Tilletia indica</i> as Annex XX to ISPM 27	3	5/0

### 01. How to continue the revision of ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) in regards to the criteria for treatments of wood packaging material in international trade (2006-010)

#### *Poll (02) – closed 15 August 2011*

Question: Do you agree to the recommendation by SC-7?

#### *SC decision*

Ask the Secretariat to request IFQRG to discuss the technical issues identified by the SC-7 and provide their recommendations to the appropriate technical panel (TPFQ and/or) TPPT through the Secretariat.

### 02. SC discussion on the replacement of an expert for the Sea container EWG

#### *Poll (01) – closed 15 August 2011*

Question: Do you agree to the recommendation that Ms Nancy Kummen (Canada) is to be nominated as a replacement expert for this EWG?

#### *SC Decision*

Ms Kummen (Canada) was selected as a new expert for EWG on “Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade (2008-001)”.

<sup>21</sup> Numbered in the order they were presented to the SC on the IPP.

**03. SC recommendation of eight Fruit Fly cold treatments under the topic Fruits Fly Treatment (2006-024) as Annexes to ISPM 28:2007**

*Poll (03) – closed 27 October 2011.*

Question: Do you recommend these following five draft phytosanitary treatments be presented to the CPM-7 for adoption? 206E, 206F, 206G, 210 and 212.

**SC decision**

The Cold treatments on *Citrus limon* (2007-206G and 2007-206C) are to be returned to TPPT for further discussion in regards to the possible damage to the fruit by the cold treatment. Two cold treatments (2007-206A, 2007-206B) are pending SC e-decision until the correct ED values are obtained. The SC recommends four cold treatments (2007-206E, 2007-206F, 2007-210 and 2007-212) to the CPM. The draft phytosanitary treatments will be revised by the TPPT in response to SC comments prior to it being presented to the CPM.

**04. Explanatory document for ISPM 5 Glossary of phytosanitary terms (August –September 2011)**

*Forum (04) summary and the result*

All comments provided by the SC were forwarded to the author.

*Poll: There was no poll conducted for this e-decision*

**05. SC recommendation for draft diagnostic protocol for Plum Pox Virus as Annex XX to ISPM 27:2006 to CPM-7 (October 2011)**

*Poll (05) closed – 12 October 2011*

Question: Do you recommend this draft diagnostic protocol to the CPM-7 for adoption?

**SC decision**

The SC recommends the draft diagnostic protocol on *Plum Pox* virus to CPM-7 (2012).

**06. SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol for *Guignardia citricarpa* as Annex XX to ISPM 27:2006 for member consultation**

*Poll (06) closed - 27 October 2011*

Question: Do you approve this draft diagnostic protocol for member consultation?

**SC decision**

The SC approves this draft diagnostic protocol for *Guignardia citricarpa* for member consultation. The draft DP should be revised by the TPPT in response to SC comments prior to it being sent for member consultation.

**07. SC approval of the draft diagnostic protocol for *Tilletia indica* as Annex XX to ISPM 27:2006 for member consultation**

*Poll (07) closed - 27 October 2011*

Question: Do you approve this draft diagnostic protocol for member consultation?

The Secretariat reviewed responses from SC members and found no objection.

**SC decision**

The SC approves the draft diagnostic protocol for *Tilletia indica* for member consultation. The draft DP should be revised by the TPPT in response to SC comments prior to it being sent for member consultation.

## APPENDIX 6: Draft ISPM for Integrated measures for the production of plants for planting in international trade

<b>Date of this document</b>	2011-11-16
<b>Document category</b>	Draft ISPM
<b>Current document stage</b>	Draft for CPM7 to be edited. Edited.
<b>Origin</b>	ICPM-7 (2005) added topic 2005-002: Plants for planting (including movement, post-entry quarantine and certification programmes).
<b>Major stages</b>	<p>SC 2006-05 approved specification 34</p> <p>EWG 2006-09 drafted ISPM</p> <p>EWG 2007-02 revised draft ISPM</p> <p>SC-7 2008-05 revised draft ISPM via e-mail consultation based on SC-7 recommendation</p> <p>EWG 2008-12 revised draft ISPM</p> <p>SC 2010-04 approved draft ISPM to go for MC</p> <p>2010-06 member consultation</p> <p>SC-7 2011-05 revised draft ISPM</p> <p>2011-11 SC revised in meeting</p>
<b>Notes</b>	File template: IPPCStyles_2011-08-11. Formatted for SC 2011-11 (OCS formatting).

## INTRODUCTION

### Scope

This standard outlines the main criteria for the identification and application of integrated measures at the place of production for the production of plants for planting (excluding seeds) for international trade. It provides guidance to help identify and manage pest risks associated with plants for planting as a pathway.

### References

**ISPM 2.** 2007. *Framework for pest risk analysis*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 5.** *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 11.** 2004. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

- ISPM 12.** 2001. *Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- ISPM 13.** 2001. *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- ISPM 17.** 2002. *Pest reporting*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- ISPM 20.** 2004. *Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- ISPM 21.** 2004. *Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- ISPM 24.** 2005. *Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.
- ISPM 32.** 2009. *Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

### **Definitions**

Definitions of phytosanitary terms used in the present standard can be found in ISPM 5 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

### **Outline of requirements**

Plants for plantings are generally considered to pose a higher pest risk than other regulated articles. For many plants for planting integrated measures may be necessary to manage pest risks. Integrated measures may be used to manage the pest risks that plants for planting pose as a pathway for regulated pests and to ensure they meet phytosanitary import requirements. The use of integrated measures involves national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) as well as producers<sup>1</sup>, and relies on pest risk management measures applied throughout the production and distribution processes.

Integrated measures may be developed and implemented where specifically required by the NPPO of an importing country, or where the NPPO of the exporting country deems such measures to be effective to meet phytosanitary import requirements. General integrated measures may include requirements such as keeping a plan of the place of production, examination of plants, keeping records, treating pests and sanitation. Where the risk identified justifies the use of additional integrated measures, additional elements such as a place of production manual including a pest management programme, appropriate training for personnel, specific packing and transportation requirements, and internal and external audits may be required.

The NPPO of the exporting country should provide adequate information to the NPPO of the importing country to support the pest risk assessment, approve and oversee places of production using integrated measures, and inspect plants and issue phytosanitary certificates that attest to the consignment as meeting the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country. The NPPO of the importing country should clearly communicate its phytosanitary import requirements.

### **BACKGROUND**

Several ISPMs provide general guidance on pest risk management (e.g. ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004, ISPM 21:2004, ISPM 32:2009). The conclusions from pest risk analyses (PRAs) should be used to decide the appropriate measures to reduce the pest risk to an acceptable level for the importing country.

Plants for planting are generally considered to pose a higher pest risk than other regulated articles and therefore additional specific guidance on pest risk management is needed to meet this higher pest risk.

Integrated measures may be used at places of production to manage the risk of regulated pests, especially those that are difficult to detect based on import or export inspections because:

- some pests do not have distinct visual symptoms, particularly at low pest incidence
- symptoms of infestation may be latent or masked at the time of inspection (e.g. as a result of pesticide use, nutrient imbalances, dormancy of plants at time of dispatch, presence of other non-regulated pests or by removal of symptomatic leaves)

- the type of packaging, size and physical state of the consignment can influence the effectiveness of inspection
- alternative or supplementary detection methods for many plant pests, particularly pathogens, may not be available.

Using integrated measures for pest risk management may provide an alternative to import prohibition or post-entry quarantine to meet the phytosanitary import requirements. The application of integrated measures for pest risk management requires not only the participation of the NPPO of the exporting country but also the participation of producers throughout all the stages of production of the plants for planting.

Integrated measures are designed to manage pest risks from regulated pests, and also have the advantage of managing other pests at the place of production.

It is expected that the standard will contribute to the protection of biodiversity and the environment by setting up integrated measures that will contribute to minimizing international spreading of pests.

## **REQUIREMENTS**

### **1. Basis for regulation**

The importing country may establish and shall communicate its technically justified phytosanitary import requirements for plants for planting (refer to ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004 and ISPM 21:2004). Annex 1 outlines factors to be taken into account when the NPPO of the importing country conducts a PRA for plants for planting.

The NPPO of the exporting country should develop and set up measures that meet the phytosanitary import requirements. Integrated measures may be developed and set up in two different cases as follows:

- The importing country, in its phytosanitary import requirements, specifies integrated measures to be used in the exporting country.
- The importing country does not explicitly require integrated measures to be used, but the NPPO of the exporting country deems that using integrated measures would be a suitable and effective means of achieving the importing country's phytosanitary import requirements and, therefore, decides to specify integrated measures to be applied by producers wishing to export plants for planting to that particular importing country.

If in the latter case the NPPO of the exporting country deems that "integrated measures" that they have put in place are equivalent to phytosanitary import requirements of an importing country, the exporting country should seek formal approval of equivalence of these measures with the importing country (ISPM 24:2005).

A producer wishing to participate in using integrated measures, in order to qualify to export plants for planting to particular countries, should seek approval from its NPPO. Subsequently, the NPPO of the exporting country may approve producers conforming to requirements for integrated measures set up by that NPPO.

### **2. Integrated Measures**

This standard describes two main levels of integrated measures. Section 2.1 (General integrated measures) describes a set of integrated measures that are widely applicable to all plants for planting. Section 2.2 (Additional integrated measures in higher pest risk situations) describes additional elements designed to manage pest risks in higher pest risk situations. It may not be necessary to require all these elements. Furthermore, for certain production systems not all elements may be applicable (e.g. physical barriers for field grown plants). Therefore, only some of the elements described in section 2.2 may be appropriate. NPPOs may consider these options in addition to pre-export or port of entry inspections in order to manage pest risks.

## **2.1 General integrated measures**

The NPPO of the exporting country may approve a place of production that complies with requirements on general integrated measures that are applicable to all types of plants for planting and types of pests.

### **2.1.1 Approval of places of production**

The following conditions should form part of the approval process for producers seeking to use the general integrated measures:

- maintaining an updated plan of the place of production as well as records of when, where and how plants for planting were produced, treated, stored or prepared for movement from the place of production (including information on all plant species at the place of production and the type of plant material such as cuttings, *in vitro* cultures, bare root plants)
- keeping records for three years (or longer, if justified) that verify where and how plants for planting were purchased, stored, produced, distributed and any other relevant information on their plant health status
- access to a plant protection specialist with a well-established working knowledge of pest identification and control
- designating a person as a contact person for the NPPO of the exporting country.

### **2.1.2 Requirements for the place of production**

The following may be adequate to meet the phytosanitary import requirements:

- conducting visual examinations of plants and places of production by designated personnel as necessary, at appropriate times and according to information and protocols provided by the NPPO of the exporting country
- keeping records of all examinations, including a description of pests found and corrective actions taken
- taking specific measures where necessary (e.g. to keep the plants free from pests regulated in the country of destination) and documenting these measures
- notifying the NPPO of the exporting country if any pests regulated in the country of destination are observed
- establishing and documenting a system of sanitation and hygiene.

Table 1 in Appendix 1 provides specific options for pest management measures related to pest group characteristics that are applicable for most types of plants for planting at places of production.

Table 2 in Appendix 1 provides examples of possible pest management measures that NPPOs may require for different types of plants for planting and different types or groups of pests associated with them. The examples describe frequently used measures for important pest types of the relevant type of plants for planting.

## **2.2 Additional integrated measures in higher pest risk situations**

Where general integrated measures alone are not sufficient to manage the pest risk, the NPPO of the exporting country may approve a place of production that complies with the requirements for additional integrated measures in higher pest risk situations.

### **2.2.1 Requirements for the place of production in higher pest risk situations**

Producers applying for approval to use additional integrated measures for higher pest risk situations should develop a place of production manual that includes a pest management programme and relevant information on production practices and operational systems. The NPPO of the exporting country may approve the place of production to export plants to a particular destination when it has determined the integrated measures used meet the phytosanitary import requirements of that country of destination.

The following sections provide the elements to be documented and implemented by the producer and audited by the NPPO of the exporting country.

#### **2.2.1.1 Place of production manual**

The place of production manual should describe all of the requirements, elements, processes and operational systems that make up the integrated measures for pest risk management of the plants for planting. The manual should be developed, implemented and maintained by the producer and approved by the NPPO of the exporting country<sup>2</sup>. The manual or parts thereof should be specific to particular plant species or destinations. If the manual is amended, it should be approved by the NPPO of the exporting country.

The place of production manual may include the following elements:

- a description of the organizational structure and of the responsibilities of the relevant personnel, including names of the person designated as responsible for the technical performance of the place of production and the plant protection specialist (see section 2.2.1.3) (either of these personnel may serve as the contact point between the NPPO and the producer, and should notify the NPPO of the exporting country upon detection of pests regulated in the country of destination)
- a plan and description of the place of production, which is kept up to date and which records when, where and how the various species and types of plants for planting are produced, treated, stored or prepared for movement from the place of production (including information on plant species, source of plant material and type of plant material such as cuttings, *in vitro* cultures, bare root plants)
- a pest management programme (see section 2.2.1.2)
- a description of dispatch and receiving locations within the place of production
- handling procedures for incoming plant material, including procedures to ensure segregation of incoming plant material from material already on site
- a description of subcontracted activities and the process for approval
- a description of documentation procedures to maintain evidence of the source and origin of propagation material
- a description of how internal audits will be conducted, including the frequency and who is responsible
- procedures for recall of plants when non-conformity is detected, if appropriate
- procedures for visitors.

#### **2.2.1.2 Pest management programme**

The pest management programme, included in the place of production manual, should describe procedures or processes approved by the NPPO of the exporting country and designed to either prevent infestations or control pests. It should include a description of the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing countries for each plant species and type of plant material. Table 2 in Appendix 1 provides examples of possible measures that NPPOs may require for different types of plants for planting and different types or groups of pests associated with them.

The pest management programme should include the following elements:

- sanitation and hygiene – contributing to preventing the introduction of pests to the place of production and minimizing spread within a place of production, for example:
  - . regular removal of infested plants and plant debris
  - . disinfection of tools and equipment
  - . removal of weeds and non-crop plant material
  - . treatment of water
  - . management of surface water

- . personal hygiene (e.g. hand washing, foot baths, coveralls or aprons)
- . limited access
- . routines for use of packaging material and packaging facilities
- pest control – products, procedures and measures (see Appendix 1) to prevent or treat pests such as:
  - . physical barriers (e.g. screens, double doors)
  - . disinfection of growing media and containers used to grow plants
  - . crop protection product applications (e.g. chemical, biological)
  - . disposal of infested plants
  - . mass trapping of both pests of concern and possible vectors
  - . climate control
  - . hot water or heat treatment
- handling of incoming plant material – methods and documentation for managing pest risks associated with incoming plant material, with descriptions of:
  - . measures to ensure that all plants for planting entering the place of production are free of pests regulated by the importing countries, possible pest vectors and practically free of other pests, and that the risk of introducing and transmitting plant pests is mitigated
  - . procedures to be followed if pests are detected
  - . records to be kept, including the date, the name of the person carrying out the examination, any pests, damage or symptoms found, and any corrective actions taken
- examination of plant material (see section 2.2.1.5) and production sites – methods, frequency and intensity used to examine all plant material in the place of production (e.g. by visual examination, sampling, testing and trapping), including details of any laboratories used to identify pests found and methods used
- examination of plants for planting prior to export – methods, frequency and intensity used to examine plants when exports are being prepared
- identification and management of infested product, with descriptions of:
  - . how an infested plant will be identified and treated
  - . measures to ensure that non-compliant plants are not exported
  - . disposal of removed plant material in a manner that prevents buildup and spread of pests
- keeping records of the application of crop protection products and other pest management measures.

### **2.2.1.3 Plant protection specialist**

Producers implementing additional integrated measures in higher pest risk situations should have access to a specialist with a well-established working knowledge of pest identification and control in order to ensure that sanitation, pest monitoring and pest control measures are implemented, as described in the place of production manual. The plant protection specialist may serve as the contact person with diagnosticians who may be needed for pest identification.

### **2.2.1.4 Training of personnel**

Personnel should be trained to detect pests, especially those regulated by the importing country, and to follow a formal reporting system to communicate information on pest findings. Training should also include methods to handle material to reduce pest risk.

### **2.2.1.5 Examination of plant material**

All plant material produced in a place of production (including plants destined for domestic markets and other production sites) should be examined for the presence of pests on a regular schedule by designated personnel according to established methods and corrective action applied as necessary.

### **2.2.1.6 Packaging and transportation**

The following considerations apply to packaging and transport operations:

- Plant material should be packed in a manner to prevent infestation by regulated pests.
- Packaging material should be clean, free of pests and meet the phytosanitary import requirements.
- Conveyances used to move plant material from the place of production should be examined and cleaned as necessary prior to loading.
- Each lot of a consignment should be identified in a way that can be traced back to the place of production.

### **2.2.1.7 Internal audits**

Internal audits should be conducted to ensure that the producer is in compliance with its place of production manual. Internal audits should focus on whether the manual and its implementation meet the requirements of the NPPOs of the exporting and importing countries. For example, the internal audit may evaluate the competency of place of production personnel in identifying and controlling pests, carrying out duties and responsibilities and whether the record keeping of the producer is adequate to keep track of the origin of plant material, labels, etc.

Internal audits should be carried out by personnel who are independent of the people directly responsible for the audited activity. The results of the audits and any non-conformities (see section 2.3 and Appendix 2) should be recorded and presented to the producer for review. Corrective action regarding any non-conformities discovered should be implemented promptly and effectively and documented.

If the audit identifies any critical non-conformities (see section 2.3), the producer should immediately notify the NPPO of the exporting country in writing and ensure that non-conforming plants for planting are not exported. Immediate corrective actions should be taken under the supervision of the NPPO of the exporting country.

### **2.2.1.8 Records**

Up-to-date records should be maintained and made available to the NPPO. The place of production manual should clearly identify individuals responsible for maintaining various records, and the location and manner in which such records are maintained. Records should be maintained for three years (or longer, if justified). Records should include date, name and signature of the person who carried out the task or prepared the document. Examples of records that may be required include:

- invoices, phytosanitary certificates and other information that substantiate the origin and the phytosanitary status of incoming plant material
- results of the inspection of incoming plant material
- results of audits
- records of examination during production including any pests, damage or symptoms detected and corrective actions taken
- records of pest management measures taken to prevent or control pests (including method of application, product applied, dosage and date of application)
- records of examination of outgoing plant material, including type, quantity of material exported and country exported to
- copies of phytosanitary certificates for plant material exported by the producer
- records of non-conformities identified and the corrective or preventative actions taken

- records of personnel responsible for applying pest management measures
- records of personnel training and their qualifications
- copies of the forms used for internal audit reports and checklists
- records necessary to maintain forward and backward traceability of plants for planting from the place of production.

### **2.3 Non-conformity with requirements for the place of production**

A non-conformity is any failure of products or procedures to adhere to the integrated measures set up by the NPPO of the exporting country.

The NPPO of the exporting country should distinguish between two types of non-conformities as follows, taking into account the severity of the non-conformity:

- Critical non-conformities are incidents that compromise the efficacy of the integrated measures utilized at the place of production or increase the risk of infestation of the plants for planting.
- Non-critical non-conformities are incidents that do not immediately compromise the integrated measures or increase the risk of infestation of the plants for planting at the place of production.

Non-conformities can be detected during internal audits, external audits conducted or administered by the NPPO of the exporting country, or as a result of examinations of plant material.

The place of production (or relevant parts thereof) should have its approval withdrawn and exports should be immediately suspended if the NPPO of the exporting country:

- finds a critical non-conformity
- repeatedly identifies non-critical non-conformities
- identifies multiple non-critical non-conformities
- finds that the producer fails to carry out the required corrective actions within the specified time period.

Reinstatement should occur only once corrective action has been put into place and an audit by the NPPO of the exporting country has confirmed that the non-conformities have been corrected.

The corrective actions may require a change to the integrated measures and should include measures to prevent recurrence of the failures identified.

The NPPO of the exporting country should inform the NPPO of the importing country of any suspension and reinstatement.

A list of examples of non-conformities can be found in Appendix 2.

### **3. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Exporting Country**

The NPPO of the exporting country is responsible for:

- communicating import country requirements to producers
- developing and setting up the integrated measures
- approving places of production seeking participation in using integrated measures
- overseeing approved places of production
- ensuring that all plants for planting exported by approved places of production meet the phytosanitary import requirements
- carrying out export inspections and issuing phytosanitary certificates for consignments from approved places of production
- providing information on integrated measures developed to the NPPO of the importing country upon request

- granting and facilitating, where justified, visits and audits carried out by the NPPO of the importing country in accordance with section 4.1
- providing adequate information on relevant pest outbreaks to the NPPO of the importing country in accordance with ISPM 17:2002.

### **3.1 Setting up integrated measures**

In developing and setting up its integrated measures, the NPPO of the exporting country should specify the requirements to be met by a producer based on the pest risk factors described in Annex 1 and the requirements of the importing country or countries. Furthermore, the documentation and communication requirements for the producer should be specified.

### **3.2 Approval of places of production**

Requirements for the approval of places of production that comply with the general integrated measures are described in section 2.1.1.

The requirements for approval of places of production seeking to use additional integrated measures for higher pest risk situations are described in section 2.2.1 and should be based upon:

- a review of the place of production manual and an initial documentation audit at the place of production to verify that it is complying with the requirements established according to the pest risk factors of its production
- an implementation audit to verify that:
  - . the producer complies with the protocols, procedures and standards specified in their place of production manual
  - . the required supporting documentation is sufficient, current and readily available to personnel
  - . adequate records and documents are maintained
  - . internal audits are performed and corrective actions completed
  - . procedures in place are adequate to ensure that any pest problems are quickly identified and appropriate actions are taken to ensure that only plants that meet the phytosanitary import requirements of the importing country are exported
  - . either plant material within the place of production has remained free of all quarantine pests or the NPPO was duly informed about infestations of quarantine pests and appropriate measures were taken to ensure that the pest has been eradicated
- the establishment of procedures to meet tolerance levels for regulated non-quarantine pests as required.

Upon successful completion of the documentation and implementation audit, the place of production may be approved by the NPPO of the exporting country to export specific plants for planting to specific countries.

### **3.3 Oversight of approved places of production**

After authorization, the NPPO of the exporting country should oversee the place of production, in particular through monitoring or auditing of the production and operational system. The frequency and timing of monitoring or auditing should be determined according to the pest risks, phytosanitary import requirements and on the producer's record of conformity. Monitoring or auditing should include inspection and where applicable, testing of plants for planting, and verification of the documentation and management practices as they relate to the relevant integrated measures.

### **3.4 Export inspections and issuance of phytosanitary certificates**

The integrated pest risk management measures may reduce the need for growing season inspections and, may also reduce the frequency or intensity of export inspections of consignments of plants for planting. A phytosanitary certificate should be issued, and an additional declaration may be added that

refers to the application of this ISPM. This additional declaration should be in compliance with ISPM 12:2011.

### **3.5 Providing information**

The NPPO of the exporting country should provide information on the integrated measures being used to the NPPO of the importing country if required.

### **4. Responsibilities of the NPPO of the Importing Country**

The NPPO of the importing country is responsible for setting and communicating technically justified phytosanitary import requirements. In doing so, the NPPO of the importing country should, before import, consider the factors that affect pest risks specifically associated with plants for planting (refer to Annex 1). The phytosanitary import requirements should be consistent with the identified pest risks.

Plants for planting produced using integrated measures may not require intensive import inspection of every consignment. The NPPO of the importing country may decide to only monitor imported plants for planting produced using integrated measures, including testing samples for the presence of regulated pests and verifying that agreed procedures are followed.

The NPPO of the importing country should notify the NPPO of the exporting country of any non-compliances (see ISPM 13:2001).

The NPPO of the importing country may also review the system of approval of places of production presented by the NPPO of the exporting country and, where appropriate, conduct audits. The NPPO of the importing country should provide feedback on the results of the reviews, monitoring and audits to the NPPO of the exporting country, as well as any findings of non-compliance that are found upon import or at a later date in the country of destination.

#### **4.1 Auditing**

The NPPO of the importing country may request the NPPO of the exporting country to provide reports on audits undertaken by the producer and by the NPPO of the exporting country. It may also request to audit the integrated measures as developed and set up by the exporting country. This audit may consist of documentation review, inspection and testing of plants produced using integrated measures, and, where appropriate, site visits as a demonstration of the integrated measures used (see ISPM 20:2004) or provided that there is specific justification, for example in cases of non-compliance (ISPM 13:2001).

This annex is a prescriptive part of this standard.

## **ANNEX 1: Factors that affect the pest risk of plants for planting**

### **Pest-related factors that affect pest risk**

Pest-related factors that should be taken into consideration include:

- (1) whether the pest occurs in the exporting country
- (2) type of pest (arthropod, fungus, virus, bacterium etc.)
- (3) potential for establishment and spread
- (4) potential economic impact
- (5) capacity of the pest to survive and multiply during transport and storage
- (6) reproduction rate and number of generations per year
- (7) mode of transmission (e.g. vector, graft transmission, mechanical transmission)
- (8) ability to detect the pest or, where relevant, its vector, even at low pest incidence
- (9) conditions required for symptom expression
- (10) host range of the pest
- (11) presence of host plants in the country of import
- (12) pest seasonality
- (13) latency of infection
- (14) availability of control measures
- (15) feasibility of eradication or containment.

### **Plant-related factors that affect risk**

The initial plant-related pest risk factors to be considered are plant species, cultivar and area of origin. Within any given plant species, there is a range of pest risk associated with the type of plant material moved including, as broadly ranked below from lowest to highest pest risk (recognizing that these rankings may vary depending on specific circumstances):

- (1) meristem tissue culture
- (2) *in vitro* culture
- (3) budwood/graftwood
- (4) unrooted cuttings
- (5) rooted cuttings
- (6) root fragments, root cuttings, rootlets or rhizomes
- (7) bulbs and tubers
- (8) bare root plants
- (9) rooted plants in pots.

In addition, pest risk usually increases with plant age, as older plants have had longer exposure to potential pests. Pest risk also increases with size because larger plants have a larger surface area exposed to pests and may also be more difficult to inspect and treat. However, age and size are not always correlated (e.g. artificial dwarfing or pests associated with specific plant growth stages).

### **Production-related factors that affect pest risk**

How plants for planting are produced can influence the level of pest risk. These factors may include:

- (1) growing media
- (2) irrigation method and water source
- (3) growing conditions.

In general, use of soil as a growing medium is likely to pose a greater pest risk than a soil-free medium because soil is more likely to carry soil-borne pests (such as micro-organisms, arthropods, nematodes).

Sterilization, pasteurization or other effective methods for treating of the growing medium prior to planting may manage some pest risk.

The source and quality of irrigation water can affect pest risk. For certain pests spread by water, surface water may pose a greater pest risk than treated water. Likewise the method of irrigation may produce microclimates or conditions favourable for pest development and spread (e.g. overhead rather than drip irrigation).

Examples of growing conditions that may affect pest risk are listed below, broadly ranked from lowest to highest pest risk:

- (1) growth chamber
- (2) glasshouse
- (3) screen house
- (4) field grown in containers (pots, tubs etc.)
- (5) field grown
- (6) plants collected from the wild.

Enclosures such as growth chambers, glasshouses and screen houses usually provide better control over plant material and better opportunity for pest exclusion than field-grown plants. Plants grown in containers with sterilized growing medium or grown on a membrane may afford some protection from soil-borne pests. Field-grown crops are generally subject to cultural and chemical pest control. Plants collected in the wild are unprotected from pests and potentially are of higher pest risk. Also aquatic plants produced with or without any substrate may carry specific risk for the transmission of pests. Production systems may not fit into one of the above categories and may comprise a combination of several growing conditions (e.g. wild collected plants being transplanted into containers for further growing in the field before export). Certification schemes require specific combinations of these factors and may provide specific safeguards.

#### **Intended uses that affect pest risk**

Plants for planting are classified in ISPM 32:2009 as a high pest risk commodity category. Different intended uses that affect the pest risk may include whether plants are grown as annuals or perennials, whether they are grown indoors or outdoors, whether they are grown in urban areas, field or nursery etc.

#### **Other risks to be considered**

NPPOs should take particular note of the risks associated with plants for planting to biodiversity and the environment (e.g. CITES).

This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of this standard.

## APPENDIX 1: Examples of pest management measures to reduce the pest risk of plants for planting at a place of production

**Table 1.** Examples of measures to reduce the pest risk of plants for planting at a place of production categorized by pest group (Pest groups may be overlapping, e.g. groups 1 and 3, and a variety of available measures may be required to adequately address pest risk.)

Pest group	Available measures
1 Pests causing latent infections and those that are likely to be transmitted by plants for planting without signs or symptoms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Derivation from mother plants that have been tested and found free from the relevant pest</li> <li>• Isolation from sources of infestation (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel, isolation in time (e.g. growing season) from a source of infestation (temporal isolation))</li> <li>• Testing of samples of the plants for freedom from pests</li> <li>• Production within a specified certification scheme or clean stock programme that controls the relevant pests</li> <li>• Use of indicator plants</li> <li>• Production of tissue cultures (including meristem tip cultures) which may eliminate pathogens.</li> </ul>
2 Pests having stages and symptoms that are visible during the growing season	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing season inspection for freedom from pests or symptoms (e.g. at timed intervals, for example monthly for the three months before export or at different growth stages)</li> <li>• Growing season inspection of the mother plants</li> <li>• Inspection after harvest to meet a specified tolerance level for a pest (e.g. tolerance for bulb rots by fungi/bacteria)</li> <li>• Pesticide applications</li> <li>• Ensuring appropriate conditions for symptom expression</li> <li>• Production within a specified certification scheme or clean stock programme that controls the relevant pests.</li> </ul>
3 Pests spread by contact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prevention of contact with sources of infestation (e.g. other plants)</li> <li>• Hygiene measures for handling pruning tools and equipment between different batches/lots</li> <li>• Planning of activities in the place of production to work with plants of higher health first</li> <li>• Use of dedicated clothing and equipment in isolated places (e.g. screen houses)</li> <li>• Pesticide applications</li> <li>• Isolation from sources of infestation (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel, temporal isolation).</li> </ul>
4 Pests transmitted by vectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Isolation from sources of infestation (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel, temporal</li> </ul>

Pest group	Available measures
	<p>isolation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pre-planting soil testing for freedom from or to meet a tolerance for soil-borne pests or their vectors</li> <li>• Pesticide treatments for control of insect vectors of pests (e.g. aphids).</li> </ul>
5 Pests spread by wind	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Isolation from sources of infestation (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel)</li> <li>• Pesticide applications.</li> </ul>
6 Pests spread by water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of uncontaminated water sources, free of pests</li> <li>• Irrigation water to be disinfected or sterilized before use or reuse</li> <li>• Isolation from sources of infestation (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel, temporal isolation).</li> </ul>
7 Soil-borne pests able to colonize the plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Isolation from sources of infestation (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, physical isolation using a glasshouse or polytunnel, growth of plants on raised benches, temporal isolation)</li> <li>• Derivation from mother plants that have been tested and found free from the relevant pest</li> <li>• Production within a specified certification scheme or clean stock programme</li> <li>• Testing of samples of the plants for freedom from pests</li> <li>• Pre-planting soil treatment or testing for freedom from pests such as fungi, nematodes, viruses transmissible by nematodes.</li> </ul>
8 Soil-borne pests in growing medium attached to plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing medium to be sterilized before use</li> <li>• Use of inert growing media</li> <li>• Use of soil-less growing media</li> <li>• Isolation from sources of infestation, maintenance of plants in such a way that contact with soil is prevented (e.g. on raised benches)</li> <li>• Pesticide treatment (e.g. drench or fumigation) prior to export</li> <li>• Roots washed free from growing medium (and repotted in sterile growing medium in a sterile container).</li> </ul>
9 Soil-borne pests in soil attached to plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Isolation from sources of infestation (e.g. buffer zone or geographical distance from other host plants, temporal isolation)</li> <li>• Pre-planting soil treatment or testing for freedom from pests (especially nematodes, fungi)</li> <li>• Pesticide treatment (fumigation) prior to export</li> <li>• Roots washed free from soil (and repotted in sterile growing medium).</li> </ul>

**Table 2.** Examples of measures to reduce the pest risk of plants for planting based on the type of plant material

<b>Type of plant broadly ranked according to pests risk</b>	<b>Examples of pest types</b>	<b>Available measures</b>
Meristem culture and <i>in vitro</i> culture	Viruses and virus-like diseases, bacteria, fungi, stem nematodes, mites and insects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Derivation from mother plants that have been tested and found free from the relevant pest</li> <li>• Cultivation in sterile medium under sealed aseptic conditions</li> <li>• Testing of samples of the plants for freedom from pests.</li> </ul>
Unrooted cuttings	Insects, viruses, bacteria, fungi and other pests	See groups 1 to 7 in Table 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hot water treatment.</li> </ul>
Budwood/graftwood	Bacteria and viruses, fungi, insects and other pests	See groups 1 to 7 in Table 1
Bulbs and tubers, root fragments, root cuttings, rootlets or rhizomes	Nematodes, viruses, bacteria, fungi, insects and other pests	See groups 1 to 7 Table 1 Hot water dipping to control nematodes.
Bare root plants	Nematodes and all other pests of the aerial plant part	See groups 1 to 7 in Table 1
Rooted cuttings	Nematodes, insects, viruses and bacteria and other pests	Measures depend <i>inter alia</i> on the pest risk of the growing medium used.  See groups 1 to 7 in Table 1
Plants in growing media excluding soil	Nematodes and all other pests of the aerial plant part	See groups 1 to 9 in Table 1
Plants in soil	Nematodes and all other pests of the aerial plant part	See groups 1 to 9 in Table 1

This appendix is for reference purposes only and is not a prescriptive part of this standard.

## **APPENDIX 2: Examples of non-conformity**

Examples of non-conformity may include the following:

- (1) detection of quarantine pests or regulated non-quarantine pests (above set tolerance levels) of concern to the importing country on plants in or from the place of production
- (2) failure to undertake required laboratory tests or analyses or correctly follow procedures to identify pests
- (3) failure to carry out control measures at the place of production for regulated pests
- (4) failure to notify the NPPO of the exporting country of the presence of regulated pests at the place of production
- (5) export of ineligible plant taxa, plants from non-authorized origins, or plants not meeting phytosanitary import requirements
- (6) failure to correctly list the botanical names of all the plants on documents accompanying consignments
- (7) failure to keep consistent pest management records as required in the place of production manual and pest management programme
- (8) failure to keep consistent records of country of origin of plant material
- (9) failure to undertake ordered corrective actions within the specified time period
- (10) failure to perform internal audits as required
- (11) operating without adequately trained personnel, designated responsible person or plant protection specialist
- (12) significant modification of the place of production manual or pest management practices without prior approval from the NPPO of the exporting country
- (13) failure to examine incoming or outgoing plant material
- (14) failure to keep plants for planting that have been examined for export separate from other plant material that has not been examined
- (15) failure to maintain an effective pest management programme
- (16) failure to maintain sanitation management practices at the place of production
- (17) failure to periodically provide personnel with relevant training
- (18) failure to maintain an up-to-date list and training records of all personnel involved in implementing the place of production manual
- (19) failure to consistently sign and date reports or records
- (20) failure to record relevant changes to the lists of plant taxa produced, their location in the place of production and the plant material to be exported
- (21) failure to detect and record low-level populations of pests
- (22) failure to inform the NPPO of the exporting country of any changes to management practices outlined in the place of production manual.

<sup>1</sup> Producer hereinafter refers to a producer of plants for planting at the place of production.

<sup>2</sup> A documented quality management system, where available, may also be presented to the NPPO for consideration.

## **APPENDIX 7: Draft ISPM for Systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae)**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **Scope**

This standard provides guidelines for the development, implementation and verification of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management of fruit flies (Tephritidae) of economic importance.

#### **References**

**IPPC.** *International Plant Protection Convention*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 2.** 2007. *Framework for pest risk analysis*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 5.** *Glossary of phytosanitary terms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 11.** 2004. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 13.** 2001. *Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 14.** 2002. *The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 24.** 2005. *Guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 26.** 2006. *Establishment of pest free areas for fruit flies (Tephritidae)*. Rome, IPPC, FAO.

#### **Definitions**

Definition of phytosanitary terms used in the present standard can be found in ISPM 5:2010 (*Glossary of phytosanitary terms*).

#### **Outline of requirements**

For the development of a systems approach for fruit flies (FF SA), the relationship between host, target fruit fly species and the area of production of the host fruits and vegetables<sup>1</sup> should be considered. The options for pest risk management measures should be determined by means of pest risk analysis (PRA).

An FF SA includes at least two independent measures, which may be applied throughout various stages of the process, specifically during the growing period and harvest; post-harvest and shipping; and entry and distribution within the importing country. An FF SA may establish an area of low pest prevalence or temporary or localized pest absence of the target fruit fly species in combination with other measures (such as host selection, crop management practices or post-harvest handling) to reduce pest risk to meet the phytosanitary requirements of the importing country.

For development, implementation and verification of an FF SA, operational procedures are necessary. Conformity with the import requirements should be ensured and verified by the national plant protection organization (NPPO) of the exporting country. Procedures should be monitored during the implementation and corrective actions should be taken in case of non-conformity.

The development, implementation and verification of an FF SA should be adequately documented and the documentation reviewed and updated when necessary.

## **BACKGROUND**

Many fruit flies of the family Tephritidae are pests of economic importance and their introduction may pose a pest risk. To identify and manage the target fruit fly species risk, a PRA should be conducted and phytosanitary measures may be applied (ISPM 2:2007, ISPM 11:2004).

Systems approaches have been developed as pest risk management measures in situations where a single measure is not available or practicable or in cases where a systems approach is more cost-effective than the single measure available. The decision to implement a specific FF SA depends on the particular relationship between the host fruit, the target fruit fly species and the specified fruit production area.

A systems approach requires a combination of at least two measures that are independent of each other, and may include any number of measures that are dependent on each other (ISPM 14:2002). Treatments used in an FF SA are those not considered sufficiently efficacious to be applied as a single measure. The measures may be applied in different places at different times and may therefore involve a number of organizations and individuals.

Often, countries have used phytosanitary measures such as treatments or pest free areas for fruit flies (FF-PFAs) (ISPM 26:2006) for import or movement of host fruit. In other cases, prohibition has been applied. An FF SA may be an alternative to facilitate the export and movement of fruit fly hosts into endangered areas. NPPOs may recognize FF SAs as being equivalent to single measures. In cases where an effective FF SA has been implemented, components of those systems may be used by other importing and exporting countries to facilitate the movement of fruit from areas with similar conditions.

An FF SA can be applied in an area of fruit production as small as a production site or as large as a country.

### **1. General Requirements**

#### **1.1 Decision to implement an FF SA**

It is the responsibility of the importing country to establish and communicate its technically justified phytosanitary import requirements. A combination of pest risk management measures integrated into an FF SA is one of the options that the importing country may select as a phytosanitary import requirement (ISPM 14:2002).

The development of an FF SA is the responsibility of the NPPO of the exporting country. An FF SA may be developed and implemented in cases where:

- a. The importing country, in its phytosanitary import requirements, specifies a systems approach to be used in the exporting country.
- b. The importing country does not explicitly require a systems approach, but the NPPO of the exporting country deems a systems approach to be a suitable and effective approach for

achieving the importing country's phytosanitary import requirements. The exporting country may need to negotiate formal approval of the equivalence of measures with the importing country (ISPM 24:2005).

An FF SA should have the appropriate number and combination of the measures and those should be scientifically sound and be selected to meet the phytosanitary import requirements, which in turn should take into account the principles of technical justification, minimal impact, transparency, non-discrimination, equivalence and operational feasibility. Aspects of operational feasibility include cost-effectiveness of the measures to be applied while seeking to impose the least restrictive measures necessary to manage target fruit fly species risks.

The fruit production area proposed for implementing an FF SA should be defined and the participating producers should be approved by the NPPO of the exporting country.

It may be advisable that NPPOs involve other stakeholders in the development of an FF SA (ISPM 2:2007).

Basic information required for the development of an FF SA includes the following:

- The host should be identified to the species level. In cases, where risk varies with the variety (e.g. because of varying resistance to infestation), hosts should be identified to variety level.
- The stage of development of the fruit being examined is relevant (e.g. mature hard green bananas are recognized as not being suitable hosts for fruit flies).
- Data on the target fruit fly species associated with the host should be available (such as scientific name, pest incidence and its fluctuation, and host preference).
- The fruit production area defined for implementing an FF SA should be described and adequately documented with particular attention to host prevalence and distribution in commercial areas as well as non-commercial areas.

In practice, FF SAs may be applied to one or more hosts or target fruit fly species in the same fruit production area.

## **1.2 Documentation and record-keeping**

The development, implementation and verification of an FF SA should be documented and properly recorded by the NPPO of the exporting country. The roles and responsibilities of the NPPO of the exporting and importing countries should be specified and documented. The documentation and records should be reviewed and updated regularly, maintained for at least 24 months and made available to the NPPO of the importing country upon request.

Documentation may include:

- phytosanitary import requirements and, if available, a report of the pest risk analysis
- description of the requirements for an FF SA's operational procedures
- description of the area intended for an FF SA
- description of host fruit to be exported and target fruit fly species
- details of the organizations involved and their roles and responsibilities and any linkages, including for example:
  - . registration of organizations involved or stakeholders
  - . agreement to cooperate in surveillance and control procedures
  - . conformity with FF SA requirements (origin of fruit, movement from place of production, selection and packing of fruit, transportation and safeguarding of the fruit)

- . agreement to take appropriate corrective actions
- . keeping records and making them available
- pest surveillance and control programme
- survey results
- training programme for operators
- traceability procedures
- technical basis for specific procedures
- survey, detection and diagnostic methodology
- description of corrective actions and records of follow-up
- reviews of the implementation of an FF SA
- contingency plans.

### **1.3 Verification**

The measures in an FF SA should be implemented in accordance with the officially approved procedures and should be monitored by the NPPO of the exporting country to ensure the system achieves its objectives.

The NPPO of the exporting country has the responsibility to monitor the implementation and the effectiveness of all stages of an FF SA. In cases where the operational procedures of an FF SA were properly implemented, but one or more of the components did not provide sufficient pest management to give the required effectiveness of all stages, a revision of an FF SA should be conducted to ensure that phytosanitary import requirements are met. This revision may not necessarily involve the suspension of trade. Other components of an FF SA may not need to be verified again.

The NPPO of the importing country may audit an FF SA in agreement with the NPPO of the exporting country.

## **2. Specific Requirements**

### **2.1 Development of an FF SA**

Measures may be applied at various stages from production of fruit within the exporting country to distribution within the importing country. The NPPO of the importing country may also implement one or more measures on arrival of the consignment. Measures applied at the different stages to prevent fruit fly infestation may include:

#### Pre-planting

- selecting planting sites with low pest incidence of target fruit fly species (e.g. areas of low pest prevalence, areas unsuitable because of geographic location, altitude, climate)
- selection of resistant or less susceptible species or varieties
- sanitation
- managing hosts other than the crop
- intercropping with non-fruit fly host plants
- growing host fruit during specific periods when the pest incidence of target fruit fly species is low or temporally absent.

#### Growing period

- flowering control and timing fruit production

- chemical control such as insecticide bait treatments, bait stations, male annihilation technique and biological control such as natural enemies
- physical protection mechanisms (e.g. bagging fruit, fruit fly protected structures)
- sterile insect technique
- mass trapping
- management of non-commercial hosts within the production area (e.g. elimination or replacement of other host plants by non-host plants where appropriate)
- monitoring and survey of the target fruit fly species e.g. using traps or fruit sampling
- sanitation (i.e. collection, removal and appropriate disposal of fallen fruit from the orchard or removal of mature fruit from the tree after harvest season)
- fruit stripping.

#### Harvest

- harvest at a specific stage of fruit development or time of the year
- safeguarding activities to prevent infestation at harvest
- managing the target fruit fly species to low pest incidence
- surveillance including fruit cutting
- sanitation
- safe removal and disposal of fallen fruit.

#### Post-harvest and handling

- safeguarding activities to prevent infestation for example, processing in screen-protected packing rooms, warehouses and transit conveyances, using cold storage, wrapping of fruit
- monitoring for target fruit fly species absence by trapping in packing houses
- sanitation (e.g. in packing houses)
- removal of fruit with signs of infestation (culling) in packing house
- sampling, inspection (e.g. by fruit cutting) or testing
- treatments that are not considered sufficiently efficacious as a single measure
- packing requirements (e.g. using insect-proof packages)
- ensuring traceability of lots.

#### Transportation and distribution

- safeguarding activities to prevent target fruit fly species infestation
- treatments that are not considered sufficiently efficacious as a single measure (prior to, during or after transport)
- distribution limited geographically or seasonally to areas where target fruit fly species cannot establish.

#### Measures applied to several or all stages:

- community awareness programmes to generate support from the public
- movement control of host fruit into the area (e.g. requirements for production sites or islands).

## 2.2. Tolerance level

In many cases, the basis for developing an FF SA may be that the target fruit fly species incidence is kept at or below a tolerance level (in connection with fruit flies, the term “specified pest population level” has sometimes been used instead of “tolerance level”) specified by the NPPO of the importing country in the defined area, for example an area of low pest prevalence (ALPP). This may be as a

result of a naturally low target fruit fly species incidence or as a result of the implementation of control measures.

Evidence to support that the target fruit fly species incidence is kept at or below the specified tolerance level may be required and, if so, should be obtained as a result of trapping and fruit sampling.

Surveillance of target fruit fly species incidence may be conducted not only during the growing period of the host fruit but also during non-growing periods.

### **3. Non-conformity**

Non-conformity involves incorrect implementation of an FF SA. In such cases, the NPPO of the exporting country may suspend the trade from the non-conforming component of the FF SA until corrective actions have been taken to address the non-conformity. Non-conformity may occur in one or more stages of an FF SA. It is important to identify at which stage the non-conformity has occurred.

The NPPO of the importing country should be promptly notified of any non-conformity and corrective action being taken.

<sup>1</sup> Fruits and vegetables hereafter are referred to as fruits.

**APPENDIX 8: Draft amendments to ISPM 5 *Glossary of phytosanitary terms***

<b>Date of this document</b>	2011-11-17
<b>Document category</b>	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)
<b>Current document stage</b>	2011-11 SC reviewed and approved draft ISPM to go to CPM-7 (2012) 2011-11 TPG reviewed member comments 2011-05 SC approved draft for member consultation 2011
<b>Origin</b>	1994 CEPM added topic: 1994-001, Amendments to ISPM 5 <i>Glossary of phytosanitary terms</i>
<b>Major stages</b>	Specification TP5. Draft for member consultation, SC May 2011
<b>Notes</b>	12 February 2011: developed by the IPPC TPG at its October 2010 meeting. 27 February 2011: edited. Formatted for SC May 2011 on 1 March 2011. Copy edited after SC May 2011 on 6 May 2011. With TPG proposed changes. 2011-11 SC approved draft ISPM

Members are asked to consider the following proposals for additions, revisions and deletions in ISPM 5. Brief explanations are given for each proposal.

**1. ADDITIONS****1.1 Confinement**

**Background.** The term *confinement* was added to the work programme by the Standards Committee (SC) in April 2010 based on the proposal of the Technical Panel on the Glossary (TPG) to develop a definition for *confinement* in relation to ISPM 3:2005 (*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*) and ISPM 34:2010 (*Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*). A draft definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The following points may be considered:

- *Confinement* is now the term used in ISPM 34:2010. When the draft of that ISPM had been sent for member consultation, some member comments had suggested using *containment*. However, it was recommended that there was a need for the two terms as used in the IPPC context with their current meaning, i.e. *containment* in relation to areas and *confinement* in relation to regulated articles in a facility.
- *Confinement* of a regulated article is used to retain any pest in a quarantine facility, while *containment* aims at keeping a pest within an area.
- As in the definition of *containment*, it is the process of *confinement* that is described, not the result.

**Proposed addition**

<b>confinement</b> (of a <b>regulated article</b> )	Application of <b>phytosanitary</b> measures to a <b>regulated article</b> to prevent the escape of <b>pests</b>
---	--

**2. REVISIONS**

For revised terms and definitions, explanations of the changes made to the last approved definition are also given.

## 2.1 Absorbed dose

**Background.** The October 2010 TPG identified this revision when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. This change is not considered a consistency change as described in the report of CPM-4 (2009) so it is proposed as an amendment to the Glossary. The following points may be considered:

- *Absorbed dose* is a physical term with no specific IPPC meaning, which normally would not be part of ISPM 5. It is however recommended to retain it, as it is not easily understood and is of great importance in relation to ISPM 18:2003 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*) and to treatments in ISPM 28:2007 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*).
- The term Gray is not required in the definition.

### Original definition

<b>absorbed dose</b>	Quantity of radiating energy (in <b>gray</b> ) absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target [ISPM No. 18, 2003]
----------------------	--

### Proposed revision

<b>absorbed dose</b>	Quantity of radiating energy absorbed per unit of mass of a specified target
----------------------	--

## 2.2 Phytosanitary certificate

**Background.** The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on TPG proposal. A revised definition was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011. The following points may be considered:

- The current terms *certificate* and *phytosanitary certificate* are interrelated in the Glossary, *certificate* being used in the definition of *phytosanitary certificate*.
- *Phytosanitary certificate* is the term of specific IPPC relevance and its definition currently lacks its specific IPPC meaning (currently expressed in the definition for *certificate*), i.e. that it attests that a consignment meets phytosanitary import requirements. It was therefore proposed to merge the information from *certificate* into *phytosanitary certificate* and then delete *certificate* (as proposed under 3.1).
- The proposed revision covers phytosanitary certificates in paper form and in electronic form and uses wording from ISPM 12:2011 (*Phytosanitary certificates*). The original wording had to be adjusted as *document* (in the original definition of *certificate*) does not cover electronic phytosanitary certificates. The word *official* is used in both cases to indicate NPPO control.
- To solve the issue with “pattern” applying to paper and not the electronic version, the TPG proposes to use “consistent with” as in ISPM 12:2011 (section 1.4).
- Rewording of the last part reflects that the consignment is subject to phytosanitary import requirements and uses wording in line with ISPM 12:2011.

Original definition

<b>Phytosanitary Certificate</b>	<b>Certificate</b> patterned after the model <b>certificates</b> of the <b>IPPC</b> [FAO, 1990]
----------------------------------	---

Proposed revision

<b>phytosanitary certificate</b>	An <b>official</b> paper document or its <b>official</b> electronic equivalent, consistent with the model certificates of the <b>IPPC</b> , attesting that a <b>consignment</b> meets <b>phytosanitary import requirements</b>
----------------------------------	--

**3. DELETIONS****3.1 Certificate**

Background. The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

The current definition of *certificate* limits it to the IPPC context, but *certificate* and *certification* on their own have other meanings that need to be used in ISPMs (e.g. *CITES certificate* in ISPM 12:2011; *treatment documents/certificates*, *certificate of origin* in ISPM 23:2005; *certification of facilities* in ISPM 18:2003). Deletion of the term and definition is therefore proposed so as to not limit the use of the term. The proposed revision of the definition of *phytosanitary certificate* (see 2.3) ensures that the term of specific IPPC relevance is defined.

Proposed for deletion

<b>certificate</b>	An <b>official</b> document which attests to the phytosanitary status of any <b>consignment</b> affected by <b>phytosanitary regulations</b> [FAO, 1990]
--------------------	--

**3.2 Gray (Gy)**

Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

It also proposed that the term “gray (Gy)” be removed from the Glossary definition of absorbed dose (see 2.1). Gray as the unit of absorbed dose is defined in the International System of Units (i.e. an SI-unit) and therefore need not be defined in the Glossary.

It is noted that other ISPMs use such technical terms, which are not defined, as in the diagnostic protocols.

Proposed for deletion

<b>gray (Gy)</b>	Unit of <b>absorbed dose</b> where 1 Gy is equivalent to the absorption of 1 joule per kilogram (1 Gy = 1 J.kg <sup>-1</sup> ) [ISPM No. 18, 2003]
------------------	--

**3.3 Hitch-hiker pest**

Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

The current definition (“See contaminating pest”) simply states that hitch-hiker pest should be understood as identical to contaminating pest. The term hitch-hiker pest does not appear in the IPPC or ISPMs. The term is not easily understood by non-native English speakers and difficult to translate in a meaningful way. It need not be defined in the Glossary. However, based on member comments, it is

recommended that the definition of “contaminating pest” be reconsidered to more fully reflect the importance of this pathway.

Proposed for deletion

<b>hitch-hiker pest</b>	See <b>contaminating pest</b>
-------------------------	-------------------------------

### 3.4 Legislation

Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

The term *legislation* appears in the Convention Article II.1 in the definition of *phytosanitary measures*, in the definition of *phytosanitary legislation*, and in ISPMs 3:2005, 5, 12:2011, 18:2003, 19:2003, 20:2004 and 25:2006. Whereas the Glossary terms *phytosanitary legislation*, *phytosanitary measures* and *phytosanitary regulation* are defined with a particular meaning pertaining to the IPPC domain, the term *legislation* is a broadly used and understood term without any specific usage in the ISPMs. It need not be defined in the Glossary.

It is noted that the definitions of *phytosanitary legislation* and *phytosanitary regulation* appropriately cover the concepts previously covered in the definition of *legislation*.

Proposed for deletion:

<b>legislation</b>	Any act, law, regulation, guideline or other administrative order promulgated by a government [ISPM No. 3, 1996]
--------------------	--

### 3.5 Plant pest

Background: The term was added to the work programme by the SC in April 2010 based on a TPG proposal. Deletion was proposed by the TPG in October 2010 and reviewed by the SC in May 2011.

The current definition (“See pest”) states that plant pest should be understood as identical to the term pest, which is defined in the Convention itself. The term plant pest appears in the Convention Articles I.4, VII.5 and VIII.1(a). It also appears in ISPMs 2:2007, 3:2005, 5, 6:1997, 11:2004, 15:2009 and 17:2002. In all cases, the term is correctly used as synonymous to pest. Plant pest could be substituted by pest during revisions of ISPMs for consistency or revision. The use of two synonymous terms should be avoided, and only the term defined in the IPPC used.

However, because *plant pest* is the term used in the IPPC, the TPG suggest that the definition of pest be also modified in the consequential revision of the definition as indicated below.

Proposed for deletion

<b>plant pest</b>	See <b>pest</b>
-------------------	-----------------

#### Consequential revision of the definition of “pest”

Original definition

<b>pest</b>	Any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to <b>plants</b> or <b>plant products</b> .
-------------	---

Proposed revision

<b>pest</b>	Any species, strain or biotype of plant, animal or pathogenic agent injurious to <b>plants</b> or <b>plant products</b> . Note: In the IPPC, <b>plant pest</b> is sometimes used for the term <b>pest</b> .
-------------	---

#### Note on other deletions

Deletions proposed in 3.6 to 3.10 below were identified when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. These deletions are not considered consistency changes as described in the report of CPM-4 (2009) so they are proposed as amendments to the Glossary.

### 3.6 Antagonist

Background: The October 2010 TPG identified this deletion when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- This term and definition do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.

#### Proposed for deletion

<b>antagonist</b>	An <b>organism</b> (usually <b>pathogen</b> ) which does no significant damage to the host but its colonization of the host protects the host from significant subsequent damage by a <b>pest</b> [ISPM No. 3, 1996]
-------------------	--

### 3.7 Competitor

Background. The October 2010 TPG identified this deletion when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- This term and definition do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.

In addition the term is used in ISPM 3:2005 and ISPM 11:2004 with a different meaning.

#### Proposed for deletion

<b>competitor</b>	An organism which competes with pests for essential elements (e.g. food, shelter) in the environment [ISPM No. 3, 1996]
-------------------	---

### 3.8 Control point

Background. The October 2010 TPG identified this deletion when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- This term and definition do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.
- In addition control points are explained in ISPM 14:2002 (The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management).

#### Proposed for deletion:

<b>control point</b>	A step in a system where specific procedures can be applied to achieve a defined effect and can be measured, monitored, controlled and corrected [ISPM No. 14, 2002]
----------------------	--

### 3.9 Dosimeter and dosimetry

Background. The October 2010 TPG identified these deletions when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- These terms and definitions do not have a specific meaning in the IPPC context, and are not needed in the Glossary.
- The terms are well-known terms in the field of physics and not used in any particular or different way in ISPM 18:2003 and ISPM 28:2007.

#### Proposed for deletion:

<b>dosimeter</b>	A device that, when irradiated, exhibits a quantifiable change in some property of the device which can be related to
------------------	---

	absorbed dose in a given material using appropriate analytical instrumentation and techniques [ISPM No. 18, 2003]
<b>dosimetry</b>	A system used for determining absorbed dose, consisting of dosimeters, measurement instruments and their associated reference standards, and procedures for the system [ISPM No. 18, 2003]

### 3.10 Ionizing radiation

Background. The October 2010 TPG identified this deletion when reviewing ISPM 5 for the consistency in the use of terms. The following may be considered:

- This is a definition from physics that has no specific meaning for the IPPC, and is not needed in the Glossary.

Proposed for deletion:

<b>ionizing radiation</b>	Charged particles and electromagnetic waves that as a result of physical interaction create ions by either primary or secondary processes [ISPM No. 18, 2003].
---------------------------	--



## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Scope**

This ~~guidelinesupplement refers only to~~ provides guidance on:

- the official control of regulated pests, and
- determination of when a pest is considered to be present but not widely distributed, for the decision on whether a pest qualifies as a quarantine pest.

~~For the purposes of this guideline, the relevant regulated pests are both quarantine pests that are present in an importing country but not widely distributed and regulated non-quarantine pests.~~

### **References**

**ISPM 1.** 2006. *Phytosanitary principles for the protection of plants and the application of phytosanitary measures in international trade.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 2.** 2007. *Framework for pest risk analysis.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 6.** 1997. *Guidelines for surveillance.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 8.** 1998. *Determination of pest status in an area.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

**ISPM 11.** 2004. *Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests including analysis of environmental risks and living modified organisms.* Rome, IPPC, FAO.

*Report of the ICPM open-ended working group on official control, 22-24 March 2000, Bordeaux, France, IPPC Secretariat, FAO, Rome.*

### **Definition**

Official control is defined as:

The active enforcement of mandatory phytosanitary regulations and the application of mandatory phytosanitary procedures with the objective of eradication or containment of quarantine pests or for the management of regulated non-quarantine pests.

## **Purpose-BACKGROUND**

The words “present but not widely distributed and being officially controlled” express an essential concept in the definition of ~~a~~ quarantine pest. According to that definition, a quarantine pest must always be of potential economic importance to an endangered area. In addition, it must either meet the criterion of not being present in that area or it must meet the combined criteria of being present but not widely distributed and subject to official control.

The *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* defines official as “established, authorized or performed by an NPPO” and control as “suppression, containment or eradication of a pest population”. However, for phytosanitary purposes, the concept of *official control* is not adequately expressed by the combination of these two definitions.

The purpose of this ~~supplementguideline~~ is to describe more precisely the interpretation of:

- the concept of official control and its application in practice **for quarantine pests that are present in an area as well as for regulated non-quarantine pests, and**
- the concept of “present but not widely distributed and under official control” for quarantine pests.

“Not widely distributed” is not a term included in the description of pest status listed in ISPM 8:1998.

## **REQUIREMENTS**

### **1. General Requirements**

Official control is subject to ISPM 1:2006, in particular the principles of non-discrimination, transparency, equivalence of phytosanitary measures and pest risk analysis.

#### **1.1 Official control**

Official control includes:

- eradication and/or containment in the infested area(s)
- surveillance in the endangered area(s)
- restrictions related to the movement into and within the protected area(s) including phytosanitary measures applied at import.

All official control programmes have elements that are mandatory. At minimum, programme evaluation and pest surveillance are required in official control programmes to determine the need for and effect of control to justify phytosanitary measures applied at import for the same purpose. Phytosanitary measures applied at import should be consistent with the principle of non-discrimination (see section 2.1 below).

For quarantine pests, eradication and containment may have an element of suppression. For regulated non-quarantine pests, suppression may be used to avoid unacceptable economic impact as it applies to the intended use of plants for planting.

#### **1.2 Not widely distributed**

“Not widely distributed” is a concept referring to a pest’s occurrence and distribution within an area. A pest may be categorized as present and widely distributed in an area or not widely distributed, or absent. In pest risk analysis (PRA), the determination of whether a pest is not widely distributed is carried out in the pest categorization step. Transience means that a pest is not expected to establish and therefore is not relevant to the concept of “not widely distributed”.

In the case of a quarantine pest that is present but not widely distributed, and where appropriate in the case of certain regulated non-quarantine pests, the importing country should define the infested area(s) and, endangered area(s) and protected area(s). When a quarantine pest is considered not widely distributed, this means that the pest is limited to parts of its potential distribution and there are areas free from the pest that are at risk of economic loss from introduction or spread. These endangered areas do not need to be contiguous but may consist of several distinct parts. In order to justify the statement of a pest being not widely distributed, a description and delimitation of the endangered areas should be made available if requested. There is a degree of uncertainty attached to any categorization of distribution. The categorization may also change over time.

The area in which the pest is not widely distributed should be the same as the area for which the economic impact applies (i.e. the endangered area) and where the pest is under or being considered for official control. The decision that a pest is a quarantine pest, including consideration of its distribution, and placing that pest under official control, is typically made with respect to an entire country. In some instances it may be more appropriate to regulate a pest as a quarantine pest in parts of a country rather than in the whole country. It is the potential economic importance of the pest for those parts that has to be considered in determining phytosanitary measures. Examples of when this may be appropriate are countries whose territories include one or more islands or other cases where there are natural or artificially created barriers to pest establishment and spread, such as large countries in which specified crops are restricted by climate to well-defined areas.

#### **1.3 Decision to apply official control**

A national plant protection organization (NPPO) may choose whether or not to officially control a pest of potential economic importance that is present but not widely distributed, taking into account

relevant factors from PRA, for example the costs and benefits of regulating the specific pest, and the technical and logistical ability to control the pest within the defined area. If the pest is not subjected to official control, it does not then qualify as a quarantine pest.

## 2. Specific Requirements

The specific requirements to be met relate to pest risk analysis, non-discrimination, transparency, technical justification, enforcement, mandatory nature of official control, area of application, and NPPO authority and involvement in official control.

### 2.1 Technical justification

Domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements should be technically justified and result in non-discriminatory phytosanitary measures.

Application of the definition of a quarantine pest requires knowledge of potential economic importance, potential distribution and official control programmes (ISPM 2:2007). The categorization of a pest as present and widely distributed or present but not widely distributed is determined in relation to its potential distribution. This potential distribution represents the areas where the pest could become established if given the opportunity, i.e. its hosts are present and environmental factors such as climate and soil are favourable. ISPM 11:2004 provides guidance on the factors to be considered in assessing the probability of establishment and spread. In the case of a pest that is present but not widely distributed, the assessment of potential economic importance should relate to the areas where the pest is not established.

Surveillance should be used to determine the distribution of a pest in an area as a basis for the further consideration of whether the pest is not widely distributed.

ISPM 6:1997 provides guidance on surveillance, and includes provisions on transparency. Biological factors such as pest life cycle, means of dispersal and rate of reproduction may influence the design of surveillance programmes, the interpretation of survey data and the level of confidence in the categorization of a pest as not widely distributed. The distribution of a pest in an area is not a static condition. Changing conditions or new information may necessitate reconsideration of whether a pest is not widely distributed.

### 2.2 Non-discrimination

The principle of non-discrimination between domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements is fundamental. In particular, requirements for imports should not be more stringent than the effect of official control in an importing country. There should therefore be consistency between domestic requirements and phytosanitary import requirements for a defined pest:

- Import requirements should not be more stringent than domestic requirements.
- Domestic and import requirements should be the same or have an equivalent effect.
- Mandatory elements of domestic and import requirements should be the same.
- The intensity of inspection of imported consignments should be the same as equivalent processes in domestic control programmes.
- In the case of non-compliance, the same or equivalent phytosanitary actions should be taken on imported consignments as are taken domestically.
- If a tolerance level is applied within a ~~national~~ domestic official control programme, the same tolerance level should be applied to equivalent imported material. In particular, if no action is taken in the ~~national~~ domestic official control programme because the pest incidence does not exceed the tolerance level concerned, then no action should be taken for an imported consignment if the pest incidence does not exceed that same tolerance level. Compliance with import tolerance levels is generally determined by inspection or testing at entry, whereas compliance with the tolerance level for domestic consignments should be determined at the last point where official control is applied.
- If downgrading or reclassifying is permitted within a domestic ~~national~~ official control programme, similar options should be available for imported consignments.

### **2.3 Transparency**

Domestic requirements for official control and the phytosanitary import requirements should be documented and made available, on request.

### **2.4 Enforcement**

The domestic enforcement of official control programmes should be equivalent to the enforcement of phytosanitary import requirements. Enforcement should include:

- a legal basis
- operational implementation
- evaluation and review
- phytosanitary action in the case of non-compliance.

### **2.5 Mandatory nature of official control**

Official control is mandatory in the sense that all persons involved are legally bound to perform the actions required. The scope of official control programmes for quarantine pests is completely mandatory (e.g. procedures for eradication campaigns), whereas the scope for regulated non-quarantine pests is mandatory only in certain circumstances (e.g. official certification programmes).

### **2.6 Area of application**

An official control programme can be applied at national, subnational or local area level. The area of application of official control measures should be specified. Any phytosanitary import requirements should have the same effect as the domestic requirements for official control.

### **2.7 NPPO authority and involvement in official control**

Official control should:

- be established or recognized by the contracting party or the NPPO under appropriate legislative authority
- be performed, managed, supervised or, at minimum, audited/reviewed by the NPPO
- have enforcement assured by the contracting party or the NPPO
- be modified, terminated or lose official recognition by the contracting party or the NPPO.

Responsibility and accountability for official control programmes rests with the contracting party. Agencies other than the NPPO may be responsible for aspects of official control programmes, and certain aspects of official control programmes may be the responsibility of subnational authorities or the private sector. The NPPO should be fully aware of all aspects of official control programmes in its country.

## APPENDIX 10: List for topics for IPPC standards

### Table 1: List of topics for IPPC standards including Topics under TPF, TPFQ and TPG

This Table presents the topics sorted by Strategic Objectives, proposed priority ranging from 1 to 4 (with 1 being the highest priority - as agreed by the SC at their May 2011 meeting) and then by status. In addition, ten topics are proposed for deletion (listed below with reasons for deletion). Bracketed text indicates if the draft was developed by an expert working group (EWG), technical panel (TP) or consultant, and the number of meetings held. Rows marked by \* are those proposed for deletion.

#### Explanation for deletion of topics

**Row 3: Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade (2005-006)**

The SC recommended deletion and proposed this topic as a technical manual under IPPC Capacity Development or as an FAO guide (similar to the forestry guide).

**Row 16: International movement of forest tree seeds (2006-032)**

The SC proposed deletion and incorporated this topic into topic: **International movement of seed (2009-003) (Row 1)**.

**Row 17: Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (Appendix to ISPM 5) 2009-001**

The SC recommended deletion of this topic because it had been given a low priority in the *List of topics for IPPC standards* by the SC in May 2011 and there are few terms and explanations which have proved to be difficult to develop satisfactorily.

**Row 32: Appropriate level of protection (2005-007)**

The SC considered this topic impossible to agree to.

**Row 33: Biological control for forest pests (2009-008)**

The SC wasn't convinced that harmonized guidance was needed.

**Row 34: Forest pest surveys for determination of pest status (2006-030)**

The SC recommended deletion and proposes it be considered in the Revision of ISPM 6 (**Row 24**).

**Row 35: Guidelines for public officers issuing phytosanitary certificates (Appendix to ISPM 7:2011 *Phytosanitary certification system*(2010-038))**

The SC considered although the topics are relevant for the reliability of phytosanitary certification, they would be difficult to harmonize due to major divergence of views and approaches of NPPOs/contracting parties. The SC recommended deletion of this topic.

**Row 36: Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures (2005-005)**

The SC considered this topic related to national procedures and did not need to be harmonized in an ISPM Proposed for deletion and suggested to develop a technical manual under IPPC Capacity Development.

**Row 37: Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities (2008-003)**

The SC considered although the topics are relevant for the reliability of phytosanitary certification, they would be difficult to harmonize due to major divergence of views and approaches of NPPOs/contracting parties. The SC recommended deletion of this topic.

**Row 38: Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20:2004 Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system) (2008-006)**

The SC considered although the topics are relevant for the reliability of phytosanitary certification, they would be difficult to harmonize due to major divergence of views and approaches of NPPOs/contracting parties. The SC recommended deletion of this topic.

**Unlinking of a topic**

**Row 28: Efficacy of measures (2001-001)** is to be kept on the list of topics but SC decided to delete the linkage with **Appropriate Level of Protection (2005-007)** because this is an important conceptual topic.

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
<b>Strategic Objective A: Food Security</b>													
1.	T	2009-003	International movement of seed	Regular	2016	High	1	A	EWG	SC Nov 2009; CPM -6 (2010)	08. Specification approved by SC	Porritt, David (Australia, SC April 2010); (Backup Bakak, Marcel (Cameroon, SC May 2011)	54
2.	T	2008-007	International movement of grain	Regular	Pending	Normal	1	A	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	00. Pending: Steward assigned, pending results of open-ended workshop on the international movement of grain	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.		
3.	T	2005-006	Minimizing the risk of quarantine pests associated with stored products in international trade	Regular	Pending Deletion	Normal	Delete	A	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	00. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Vacant (link with "International movement of grain") No Action	Draft	*
Strategic Objective B: Environmental Protection														
4.	T	2005-002	Integrated measures approach for plants for planting in international trade (3 EWGs)	Regular	2012	High	1	B	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Opatowski, David (Israel, SC Apr 2005)	34	
5.	T	2006-011	Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): - Guidelines for heat treatment (2 TPFQ) - Correction of two titles on MeBr between text and ISPM 15:2009, Annex 1 TPFQ) - Addition of sulfuryl fluoride and microwave irradiation treatments	Regular	2013	High	1	B	TPFQ	CPM-1 (2006)	18. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed by Steward	Schroder, Thomas (Germany, SC Apr 2010)	31	
6.	T	2006-029	Management of phytosanitary risks in the international movement of wood (2+1 TPFQ)	Regular	2014	High	1	B	TPFQ	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Forest, Marie Claude (Canada, SC via mail 2008), Wolff, Greg (Canada, SC May 2006)	46	
7.	T	2005-004	Movement of growing media in association with plants for planting in international trade (1 EWG)	Regular	2014	Normal	1	B	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Forest, Marie-Claude (Canada, SC Nov 2008)	43 Rev1	
8.	T	2008-001	Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade	Regular	2015	High	1	B	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	10. Experts selected	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC Nov 2010); (Backup: Ashby, Steve (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010))	51	

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
9.	T	2008-002	Minimizing pest movement by air containers and aircrafts	Regular	Unknown	High	1	B	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	08. Specification approved by SC	Unger, Jens (Germany, SC Nov 2008)	52
10.	T	2006-010	Revision of ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) specifically: - Criteria for treatments for wood packaging material in international trade (3 TPFQ)	Regular	2014	High	2	B	TPFQ	CPM-1 (2006)	19. Draft ISPM with steward's comments to SC-7	Wolff, Greg (Canada, SC May 2006); (Backup Wang, Fuixiang (China, SC May 2011))	31
11.	T	2005-001	Pest risk analysis for plants as quarantine pests (1 EWG)	Regular	2013	High	2	B	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	18. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed by Steward	Nordbo, Ebbe (Denmark, SC Nov 2008)	44 Rev1
12.	T	2006-004	Guidelines for the movement of used machinery and equipment	Regular	Unknown	Normal	3	B	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	10. Experts selected	Rossi, Guillermo (Argentina, SC May 2009)	48
13.	T	2008-004	Safe handling and disposal of waste with potential pest risk generated during international voyages.	Regular	Unknown	Normal	3	B	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	05. Specification with stewards comments to SC	Rossel, Bart (Australia, SC May 2011)	Draft
14.	T	2004-001	Import of germplasm (1 EWG)	Regular	2014	Normal	4	B	EWG	ICPM-6 (2004)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Holtzhausen, Mike (South Africa, SC Nov 2007)	45 Rev1
15.	T	2008-008	Wood products and handicrafts made from raw wood	Regular	Unknown	Normal	4	B	TPFQ	CPM-3 (2008)	02. Steward assigned	Musa, Khidir Gibril (Sudan, SC April 2010)	-
16.	T	2006-032	International movement of forest tree seeds (4 TPFQ)	Regular	Proposed for Deletion	High	Delete	B	TPFQ	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	00. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Wang, Fuixiang (China, SC Nov 2008)	47 Rev1

\*

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.		
17.	T	2009-001	Terminology of the Montreal Protocol in relation to the Glossary of phytosanitary terms (appendix to ISPM 5) (2 TPG)	Regular	Proposed for Deletion	Normal	Delete	B	TPG	CPM-4 (2009)	00. Pending: SC November 2011 proposed for deletion	Hedley, John (New Zealand, TPG will consider)	-	*
Strategic Objective C: Trade Facilitation														
18.	T	2004-022	Systems approaches for pest risk management of fruit flies (1 consultant, 2 TPF)	Regular	2012	Normal	1	C	TPFF	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Gonzalez, Magda (Costa Rica, SC Nov 2008); (Backup: Holtzhausen, Mike (South Africa, SC Nov 2008))	29	
19.	T	2006-031	Protocol to determine host status of fruits and vegetables to fruit fly infestations (Tephritidae) (3 TPF)	Regular	2014	High	1	C	TPFF	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Cardoso, Rui Pereira (IAEA, SC Apr 2010)	50	
20.	T	2006-003	Electronic certification, information on standard XML schemes and exchange mechanisms (Appendix to ISPM 12: Phytosanitary certificates)	Regular	Unknown	High	1	C	EWG	CPM-1 (2006)	11. Draft ISPM drafted	Sakamura, Motoi (Japan, SC Nov 2006)	38	
21.	T	2005-008	Not widely distributed (supplement to ISPM 5: Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1 EWG, 3 TPG)	Regular	2012	High	2	C	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Aliaga, Julie (USA, SC Nov 2007)	33	
22.	T	2005-010	Phytosanitary procedures for fruit fly (Tephritidae) management (1 TPF)	Regular	2014	High	2	C	TPFF	SC Nov 2005; CPM-1 (2006)	15. Draft ISPM to SC for MC	Opatowski, David (Israel, SC Nov 2008); (Backup: Musa, Khidir (Sudan, SC Nov 2008))	39	

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
23.	T	2009-002	Revision of ISPM 4 Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas	Regular	Unknown	High	2	C	EWG	SC Nov 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	04. Draft Specification to SC for MC	Awosusi, Olufunke Olusola (Nigeria, SC Nov 2009)	Draft
24.	T	2009-004	Revision of ISPM 6 Guidelines for surveillance	Regular	Unknown	Normal	2	C	EWG	SC Nov 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	04. Draft Specification to SC for MC	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC Nov2009)	Draft
25.	T	2009-007	Establishment and maintenance of fruit fly regulated areas in the event of outbreak detection in pest free areas for fruit flies (for inclusion as Annex 1 of ISPM 26) (1 TPF)	Regular	2014	Normal	3	C	TPFF	SC Nov 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	EWG Steward Gonzalez, Jaime (IAEA, SC Nov 2009); SC Steward: Rossel, Bart (Australia, SC May 2011)	53
26.	T	2005-003	Phytosanitary pre-import clearance (1 EWG)	Regular	2014	Normal	3	C	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	13. Draft ISPM being reviewed by steward	Vacant (Backup, Holtzhausen, Mike)	42
27.	T	2009-005	Revision of ISPM 8 Determination of pest status in an area	Regular	Unknown	Normal	3	C	EWG	SC Nov 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	04. Draft Specification to SC for MC	Melcho, Beatriz (Uruguay, SC Nov2009)	Draft
28.	T	2001-001	Efficacy of measures (2 EWGs)	Regular	Unknown	High	4	C	EWG	ICPM-3 (2001)	11. Draft ISPM drafted	Vacant	8 Rev1
29.	T	2008-005	International movement of cut flowers and foliage	Regular	Unknown	Normal	4	C	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	04. Draft Specification to SC for MC	Gonzalez, Magda (Costa Rica, SC Nov 2008)	Draft
30.	T	2002-001	Surveillance for citrus canker ( <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> ) (1 EWG)	Regular	Pending	High	4	C	EWG	ICPM-4 (2002)	00. Pending: Draft ISPM drafted, pending outcome of the standard on systems approach for citrus canker	Vacant	23

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
31.	T	2003-001	Systems approach for management of citrus canker ( <i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>citri</i> ) (2 EWGs)	Regular	Pending	Normal	4	C	EWG	ICPM-5 (2003)	00. Pending: Draft ISPM drafted, pending consensus on a technical issue.	Vacant	15 Rev1
32.	T	2005-007	Appropriate level of protection (1 EWG)	Regular	Pending Deletion	High	Delete	C	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	00. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	-No Action	36 *
33.	T	2009-008	Biological control for forest pests	Regular	Pending Deletion	Normal	Delete	C	TPFQ	SC Nov 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	00. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	TPFQ member (SC Nov2009)	- *
34.	T	2006-030	Forest pest surveys for determination of pest status	Regular	Pending Deletion	Normal	Delete	C	TPFQ	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	00. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Aliaga, Julie (United States, SC Nov 2008)	49 *
<b>Strategic Objective D: Capacity Development</b>													
35.	T	2010-038	Guidelines for public officers issuing phytosanitary certificates (Appendix to ISPM 7: Phytosanitary certification system)	Regular	Pending Deletion	High	Delete	D	EWG	SC Nov 2010	00. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Sakamura, Motoi (Japan, SC Nov 2006)	38 *
36.	T	2005-005	Framework for national phytosanitary inspection procedures	Regular	Pending Deletion	High	Delete	D	EWG	ICPM-7 (2005)	00. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Aliaga, Julie (United States, SC Nov 2007)	Draft *
37.	T	2008-003	Systems for authorizing phytosanitary activities	Regular	Pending Deletion	Normal	Delete	D	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	00. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Forest, Marie-Claude (Canada, SC Nov 2008)	Draft *
38.	T	2008-006	Use of permits as import authorization (Annex to ISPM 20: Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system)	Regular	Pending Deletion	Normal	Delete	D	EWG	CPM-3 (2008)	00. Pending: SC May 2011 proposed for deletion	Vacant – No Action	Draft *

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
<b>Strategic Objective : Unknown</b>													
39.	T	2006-012	Review of the following ISPMs: 5 (Sup 2), 9, 16, 17, 20, 23, 25 (and minor modifications to ISPMs resulting from the review) (1 consultant, 2 TPG)	Regular	Unknown	High	-	-	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	12. Draft ISPM being reviewed by drafting group	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	32

**Table 2: Technical Panels and topics for Glossary Terms, Diagnostic Protocols and Phytosanitary Treatments**

This Table presents the technical areas (Technical Panels) sorted alphabetically with their respective topics.

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
40.	TA	2004-002	TPDP (Technical panel to develop diagnostic protocols for specific pests)	-	Technical panel	High			TPDP	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	TP1 Rev3
41.	T	2006-005	Bacteria	Special	Topic	Normal	-	-	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-
42.	T	2006-006	Fungi and fungus-like organisms	Special	Topic	Normal	-	-	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
43.	T	2006-007	Insects and mites	Special	Topic	Normal	-	-	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
44.	T	2006-008	Nematodes	Special	Topic	Normal	-	-	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-
45.	T	2007-001	Plants	Special	Topic	Normal	-	-	TPDP	CPM-2 (2007)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
46.	T	2006-009	Viruses and phytoplasmas	Special	Topic	Normal	-	-	TPDP	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
47.	TA	2004-003	TPFF (Technical panel on pest free areas and systems approaches for fruit flies)	-	Technical panel	High			TPFF	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Aliaga, Julie (USA, SC, Nov 2009)	TP2 Rev2
48.	TA	2004-004	TPFQ (Technical panel on forest quarantine)	-	Technical panel	High			TPFQ	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Wang, Fuxiang (China, SC Nov 2008)	TP4 Rev2
49.	TA	2006-013	TPG (Technical panel on the Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	-	Technical panel	High	-	-	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	-	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC Nov 2005)	TP5

	Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
50.	T	1991-001	Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms)	Regular	Topic / Annual	High	-	-	TPG	CEPM (1994)	Work ongoing	Hedley, John (New Zealand, SC November 2009)	1
51.	TA	2004-005	TPPT (Technical panel on phytosanitary treatments)	-	Technical panel	High	-	-	TPPT	ICPM-6 (2004)	-	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	TP3 Rev1
52.	T	2006-024	Fruit fly treatments	Special	Topic	High	-	-	TPPT	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	Work ongoing	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
53.	T	2006-014	Irradiation treatments	Special	Topic	High	-	-	TPPT	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
54.	T	2009-006	Soil and growing media in association with plants: treatments	Special	Topic	Normal	-	-	TPPT	SC Nov 2009; CPM-5 (2010)	-	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
55.	T	2006-015	Wood packaging material treatments	Special	Topic	High	-	-	TPPT (TPFQ)	CPM-1 (2006)	Work ongoing	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-

### Table 3: Diagnostic Protocols

This Table presents the diagnostic protocols sorted alphabetically by topic and status.

The SC May 2011 considered the diagnostic protocols presented in the discussion paper<sup>22</sup> regarding reprioritization. After discussion, the SC concluded that it would not make recommendations regarding priorities for diagnostic protocols.

The SC (May 2011) decided that

Regarding diagnostic protocols, the Secretariat will use the priorities presented to the SC as working priorities (see Appendix 5 to SC May 2011 report).

Before the SC November 2011 meeting, a group composed of Mr Nordbo (Denmark), the Steward of the TPDP and the Secretariat were requested to review the criteria and the priority listing. The results of this discussion are presented under agenda item 3.1 (2011\_SC\_Nov\_08).

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
<b>Bacteria (2006-005)</b>													
56.	S	2004-009	<i>Erwinia amylovora</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
57.	S	2004-010	<i>Liberibacter</i> spp. / <i>Liberobacter</i> spp.	Special	Unknown	Normal	3	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
58.	S	2004-011	<i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. citri	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-
59.	S	2004-012	<i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	4	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-

<sup>22</sup> 2011\_SC\_May\_54

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
60.	S	2004-024	<i>Xylella fastidiosa</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	2	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
Fungi and fungus-like organisms (2006-006)													
61.	S	2004-023	<i>Guignardia citricarpa</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006);	08. Draft ISPM approved for MC	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-
62.	S	2004-013	<i>Phytophthora ramorum</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	3	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
63.	S	2004-014	<i>Tilletia indica</i> / <i>T. controversa</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	A,B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	08. Draft ISPM approved for MC	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
64.	S	2004-008	<i>Gymnosporangium</i> spp.	Special	Unknown	Normal	4	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-
65.	S	2006-021	<i>Fusarium moniliformis</i> / <i>moniforme</i> syn. <i>F. circinatum</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	2	B,C	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
66.	S	2006-018	<i>Puccinia psidi</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	2	B,C	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-

Insects and mites (2006-007)													
67.	S	2004-006	<i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	Special	2013	Normal	1	A,B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	10. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
68.	S	2004-015	<i>Anastrepha</i> spp.	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
69.	S	2006-028	Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	06. Draft being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
70.	S	2004-020	<i>Anoplophora</i> spp.	Special	Unknown	Normal	3	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-
71.	S	2006-026	<i>Bactrocera dorsalis</i> complex	Special	Unknown	Normal	2	B,C	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
72.	S	2006-017	<i>Liriomyza</i> spp.	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	A,B,C	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
73.	S	2006-019	<i>Dendroctonus ponderosae</i> syn. <i>Scolytus scolytus</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	3	B,C	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
74.	S	2006-020	<i>Ips</i> spp.	Special	Unknown	Normal	4	B,C	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-

Plants (2007-001)													
75.	S	2006-027	<i>Sorghum halepense</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	A,B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
76.	S	2008-009	<i>Striga</i> spp.	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	A,B,C	TPDP	CPM-3 (2008)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
Nematodes (2006-008)													
77.	S	2004-016	<i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	2	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
78.	S	2004-017	<i>Ditylenchus destructor</i> / <i>D. dipsaci</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	A,B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
79.	S	2004-025	<i>Xiphinema americanum</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	4	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
80.	S	2006-025	<i>Aphelenchoides besseyi</i> , <i>A. ritzemabosi</i> and <i>A. fragariae</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	A,B,C	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	03. Authors selected	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
Viruses and phytoplasmas (2006-009)													
81.	S	2004-007	Plum pox virus	Special	2012	Normal	1	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov2004; CPM-1 (2006)	12. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-
82.	S	2004-019	Tospoviruses (TSWV, INSV, WSMV)	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	06. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPDP	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-

83.	S	2004-021	Citrus tristeza virus	Special	Unknown	Normal	3	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-
84.	S	2006-022	Potato spindle tuber viroid	Special	Unknown	Normal	1	A,B,C	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
85.	S	2004-018	Phytoplasmas (general)	Special	Unknown	Normal	4	B,C	TPDP	SC Nov 2004; CPM-1 (2006)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov2010)	-
86.	S	2006-023	viruses transmitted by <i>Bemisia tabaci</i>	Special	Unknown	Normal	2	B,C	TPDP	SC May 2006; CPM-2 (2007)	05. Draft ISPM under development	Chard, Jane (United Kingdom, SC Nov 2010)	-

**Table 4: Phytosanitary Treatments**

This Table presents the phytosanitary treatments sorted alphabetically by topic and status.

The SC (May 2011) accepted the priorities of subjects for the Phytosanitary Treatments as presented in Appendix 5 to SC May 2011 report which are presented below.

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
Fruit fly treatments(2006-024)													
87.	S	2007-206E	Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i>	Special	2012	High	1	A,C	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	10. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Baxter, Alice (South Africa, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
88.	S	2007-206F	Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>C. reticulata</i> x <i>C. sinensis</i>	Special	2012	High	1	A,C	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	10. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
89.	S	2007-210	Cold treatment at .2° C for 19 days and at 3° C for 23 days for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus paradisi</i>	Special	2013	High	1	A,C	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	10. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
90.	S	2007-212	Cold treatment at 2°C for 23 days for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> cultivars and hybrids	Special	2012	High	1	A,C	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	10. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
91.	S	2007-206A	Cold treatment at 2°C for 18 days, 3°C for 20 days and 2°C for 21 days for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i>	Special	2012	High	1	A,C	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	08. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed TPPT	Baxter, Alice (South Africa, TPPT Dec 2007)	-
92.	S	2007-206B	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>C. reticulata</i> x <i>C. sinensis</i>	Special	2012	High	1	A,C	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	08. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed TPPT	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
93.	S	2007-206G	Cold treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Citrus limon</i>	Special	2012	High	1	A,C	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	08. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed TPPT	Wang, Yuejin (China, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
94.	S	2007-206C	Cold treatment for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus limon</i>	Special	2012	High	1	A,C	TPPT	CPM-3 (2008); SC Nov 2008	08. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed TPPT	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
95.	S	2006-110	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera cucurbitae</i> on <i>Cucumis melo</i> var. <i>reticulatus</i>	Special	2012	High	1	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	08. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed TPPT	Wang, Yuejin (China, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
96.	S	2010-101	Cold treatment at .05° C for 12 days for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus paradise</i>	Special	2014	High	2	A,C	TPPT	SC May 2011	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Baxter, Alice (TPPT 2010)	-
97.	S	2010-102	Cold treatment at 2°C for 16 days for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus reticulata</i> and their hybrids	Special	2014	High	2	A,C	TPPT	SC May 2011	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
98.	S	2010-103	Cold treatment at 2°C for 16 days for <i>Ceratitidis capitata</i> on <i>Citrus sinensis</i>	Special	2014	High	1	A,C-	TPPT	SC May 2011	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
99.	S	2009-101	Heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera cucumis</i> on <i>Cucurbita pepo</i>	Special	2014	High	2	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Wood, Scott (USA, TPPT 2009)	-
100.	S	2009-105	High temperature forced air treatment for selected fruit fly species (Diptera: Tephritidae) on fruit.	Special	2014	High	2	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Jessup, Andrew (TPPT 2009)	-
101.	S	2009-104	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i>	Special	2014	High	2	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Park, Min-Goo (TPPT 2009)	-

Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
102.	S	2010-107	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Bactrocera tryoni</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i>	Special	2014	High	2	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Park, Min-Goo (Korea, TPPT July 2010)	-
103.	S	2010-106	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Ceratitis capitata</i> on <i>Mangifera indica</i>	Special	2014	High	2	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Wood, Scott (USA, TPPT July 2010)	-
104.	S	2009-109	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Carica papaya</i> var. Solo	Special	2014	High	2	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Baxter, Alice (South Africa, TPPT 2009)	-
105.	S	2006-132	Vapour heat treatment for fruit flies on <i>Mangifera indica</i>	Special	2013	High	3	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Cannon, Ray (UK, TPPT July 2010)	-
106.	S	2009-108	Vapour heat treatment for <i>Mangifera indica</i> var. Manila Super	Special	2014	High	2	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Dikin, Antarjo (Indonesia, SC Nov 2010)	-
Irradiation treatments(2006-014)													
107.	S	2007-105	Generic irradiation treatment for all insects (Arthropoda: Insecta) except lepidopteran pupae and adults (Insecta: Lepidoptera) in any host commodity.	Special	2013	High	3	A,C	TPPT	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Cannon, Ray (UK, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
Soil and growing media in association with plants: treatments(2009-006) – Currently no treatments under review													
Wood packaging material treatments(2006-015)													
108.	S	2007-114	Heat treatment of wood packaging material using dielectric heat	Special	2013	High	1	B,C	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	08. Draft ISPM Member comments being reviewed TPPT	Ormsby, Mike (New Zealand, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
109.	S	2007-101	Sulfuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material	Special	2013	High	1	B,C	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	04. Draft ISPM being reviewed by TPPT	Ormsby, Mike (New Zealand, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
110.	S	2007-103	HCN treatment of wood packaging material	Special	2013	High	4	B,C	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Jessup, Andrew (Australia/IAEA, TPPT Jan 2009)	-

	Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
111.	S	2007-116	Methyl iodide fumigation for <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> and Coleoptera: Cerambycidae of wood packaging material	Special	2014	High	3	B,C	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Ormsby, Michael (New Zealand, TPPT Dec 2006)	-
112.	S	2007-102	Methyl isothiocyanate and sulfuryl fluoride (Ecotwin mixture) fumigation for <i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i> , Coleoptera: Cerambycidae, and Coleoptera: Scolytinae of wood packaging material	Special	2013	High	3	B,C	TPPT (TPFQ)	SC Nov 2010	02. Additional data requested from submitter	Wood, Scott (USA, TPPT Dec 2006)	-

**Table 5: Glossary Terms**

This Table presents the glossary terms sorted alphabetically.

The SC (May 2011) decided that glossary terms would not be prioritized at this time.

Hier arch y	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/ Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/ TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.	
<b>Amendments to ISPM 5 (Glossary of phytosanitary terms) (1991-001)</b>													
113.	S	2010-031	Absorbed dose	Regular	2012	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
114.	S	2010-032	Antagonist	Regular	2012	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
115.	S	2010-015	Certificate	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
116.	S	2010-033	Competitor	Regular	2012	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
117.	S	2010-012	Confinement	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
118.	S	2010-034	Control point	Regular	2012	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
119.	S	2010-035	Dosimeter	Regular	2012	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
120.	S	2010-036	Dosimetry	Regular	2012	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
121.	S	2010-018	Gray	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
122.	S	2010-017	Hitch hiker	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-

	Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
123.	S	2010-075	Ionizing radiation	Regular	2012	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
124.	S	2010-019	Legislation	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
125.	S	2010-016	Phytosanitary certificate	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
126.	S	2010-020	Plant pest	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	21. Draft ISPM recommended by SC to CPM	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
127.	S	2010-006	Additional declaration	Regular	Pending	-	-	-	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
128.	S	2011-004	Containment	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
129.	S	2011-005	Control	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
130.	S	2006-016	Country of origin	Regular	Unknown	High	-	-	TPG	CPM-1 (2006)	00. Pending. SC April 2010 agreed to add this subject to the list of topics and priorities as pending	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	37
131.	S	2011-003	Eradication	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
132.	S	2010-008	Exclusion	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	12. Draft ISPM being reviewed by drafting group	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
133.	S	2011-001	Identity	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-

	Hierarchy	No.	Current title	Process (Regular/Special)	Projected adoption	Priority	Proposed priority	Strategic objectives	Drafting body	Added to list of topics and priorities	Status	Current Steward/TP Lead (country, date assigned)	Spec No.
134.	S	2010-023	Naturally occurring	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
135.	S	2010-026	Occurrence	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
136.	S	2010-021	Organism	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
137.	S	2010-022	Pest	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
138.	S	2010-003	Pest freedom	Regular	Pending	-	-	-	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
139.	S	2010-004	Phytosanitary status	Regular	Pending	-	-	-	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
140.	S	2010-025	Presence	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
141.	S	2010-013	Quarantine station	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	12. Draft ISPM being reviewed by drafting group	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
142.	S	2010-024	Re-export (of a consignment)	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	12. Draft ISPM being reviewed by drafting group	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
143.	S	2010-027	Restriction	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
144.	S	2010-030	Review of the use of and/or in adopted ISPMs	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC April 2010	12. Draft ISPM being reviewed by drafting group	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
145.	S	2010-005	Revision of point of entry	Regular	Pending	-	-	-	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
146.	S	2010-002	Revision of systems approach	Regular	Pending	-	-	-	TPG	SC Nov 2010	01. Added to list of topics	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-
147.	S	2011-002	Suppression	Regular	Unknown	-	-	-	TPG	SC May 2011	01. Added to list of topics and priorities	Hedley, John (New Zealand)	-

## **APPENDIX 11: Standards Committee request for CPM decisions**

### **Background**

At CPM-6 (2010), the Chair of the Standards Committee (SC) in her report to the Commission stated that the SC would be considering developing a method that would allow the SC to make direct requests to the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) for decisions. The SC in May 2011 discussed this issue and put forward a request to the CPM Bureau for consideration. The Bureau decided that where possible these decisions could be incorporated into existing CPM documents and for those issues not covered by an existing paper, a decision paper should be produced separately from the SC chair's report and would be subject to review by the Bureau before it is presented to the CPM.

The SC discussed several issues at their meetings that they felt should be forwarded to the CPM and agreed on the following issues.

### **1. Developments with Technical Panels**

The SC thought it was important that the CPM notes the developments with technical panels. The SC has taken an active supervisory role and has recently included structured sessions on the Technical Panel (TP) work programmes at the May SC meetings. In addition, the SC has decided that two TPs should work virtually and this demonstrates that the SC has taken into account the reduced funding available for standard setting and also CPM priorities for topics. None the less, the SC also recognises the importance for experts to meet face to face and appreciates that resources have been made available for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG), Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) and Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) to meet in 2012.

The five technical panels have been extremely successful and they have provided significant support to the SC, both by drafting standards and by providing scientific rigour when evaluating data. The SC has recently conducted an in depth review of TP membership and have tried to balance keeping on existing members for continuity with bringing in new members. The SC feels that TPs play a valuable role and recommends that the CPM acknowledge the efforts of the TP experts.

It is inevitable that with new groups there has had to be a period of adjustment to new ways of working and confidence building. The number of comments on draft technical standards indicates that the SC, TPs and the CPM still have work to do to develop our understanding of the type of information contracting parties need before they can support some of these standards.

### **2. Revision of ISPM 15. 2009 *Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade and related phytosanitary treatments***

The draft Annex 1 to ISPM 15:2009 (2006-011) and the draft annex to ISPM 28. 2007 *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests* on dielectric heating as a phytosanitary treatment for wood packaging material (2007-114) were submitted for member consultation 20 June 2011.

The steward for the Annex 1 to ISPM 15:2009 has reviewed the member comments and many member comments requested that more operational guidance on the use of ISPM 15 approved treatments. The TPPT reviewed the member comments on the phytosanitary treatment and again many member comments stressed the need for operational guidance for the proposed dielectric heat treatment. In addition, the International Forestry Quarantine Research Group (IFQRG) also reviewed some of the scientific issues supporting this phytosanitary treatment and as stated in their report, find the proposed treatment schedule for dielectric heating of wood packaging material is supported by sufficient scientific research.

The SC in responding to the repeated requests by the CPM for the urgent development of alternatives to methyl bromide and the CPM-6 (2011) request to try to expedite this, discussed how to progress with this new treatment with a view to present it for adoption at CPM-7. The SC realized that there was a particular difficulty with obtaining operational guidance because the treatment has not been

adopted and cannot presently be used for wood packaging material to meet the requirements of ISPM 15:2009. The SC could not resolve this in order to recommend the draft phytosanitary treatment to CPM-7 (2012). The SC seeks guidance from the CPM in order to progress this phytosanitary treatment.

The SC would like to continue with the development of this treatment in the knowledge that detailed operational guidance will only be able to be developed after the treatment is adopted. If the CPM agrees to continue as proposed, the CPM could consider requesting contracting parties to monitor and report to the Secretariat on the use of the treatment after adoption. The CPM may also wish to review the treatment, within a specified time period, based on these monitoring reports.

### **3. Implementation of standards**

In May 2011, the SC discussed how to identify potential implementation issues during the development of a standard. It was recognized that the main objective of developing a standard was to have it implemented. It was felt that the experts developing the standard may be able to help identify these issues early in the process so that some action could be taken to possibly address the issues identified and help ensure that a globally acceptable draft standard would be developed.

The SC decided that some additional tasks should be added to the specifications requesting the experts developing the draft standard to consider potential implementation issues and to identify what might be involved in the implementation of the standards and what might be difficult areas when implementing the standard. The results from this task will be reviewed by the SC and try to identify the need for supporting material. These issues would be highlighted at member consultation.

### **4. Developments with technical panels**

The CPM is requested to:

- (1) *note* that two technical panels will continue to support the Standards Committee by working virtually to provide expertise relevant to their subject areas
- (2) *note* the continued importance of holding face-to-face meetings for the Technical Panels.
- (3) *note* the terms of the majority of TP experts will expire in 2013 and the arrangements the SC has put in place to ensure continuity and some new blood
- (4) *agree* that technical panels play a valuable role in standard setting
- (5) *thank* technical panel members for their efforts in regards to developing technical standards

### **5. Revision of ISPM 15 (2009):**

The CPM is requested to:

- (1) *note* ongoing efforts to identify alternative treatments to methyl bromide for inclusion in ISPM 15
- (2) *note* that dielectric heating schedule is supported by sufficient scientific research
- (3) *note* that there is limited experience with using dielectric heating treatment on wood on a commercial level and it is difficult to gain such experience until the treatment is adopted in ISPM 15
- (4) *agree* to continue with the development of this treatment in the knowledge that detailed operational guidance will only be able to be developed after the treatment is adopted.

### **6. Implementation of standards:**

The CPM is requested to:

- (1) *note* that the SC will be adding a new task to each specification relating to the implementation of the standard

- (2) *note* that the SC will review any implementation issues and the need for supporting material and highlight such issues at member consultation.