



REPORT

Rome, Italy
11-12 May 2015

**Standards
Committee
Working Group (SC-7)
May 2015**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	3
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	3
1.2 Election of the Chairperson	3
1.3 Election of the Rapporteur	3
1.4 Adoption of the Agenda.....	3
2. Administrative Matters.....	3
2.1 Documents List.....	3
2.2 Participants List	3
2.3 Local Information	3
3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting	3
4. Review of Draft ISPMs	4
4.1 International movement of seeds (2009-003)	4
4.2 Draft amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms</i> (1994-001)	12
5. Other business	14
6. Close of the meeting.....	14

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 - Agenda	16
APPENDIX 2 - Documents list.....	17
APPENDIX 3 – Participants list	18

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat

- [1] The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Standards Officer opened the meeting and welcomed the participants.
- [2] He noted that the stewards for the draft International Standard for Phytosanitary Measure (ISPM) *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) and the draft amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001) were unavailable to attend the meeting in person. However, Ms Julie ALIAGA (USA), who had been the steward for the draft ISPM *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) until the 2015 May Standards Committee (SC) meeting, was able to participate via conference call. He also noted that the assistant steward for this draft, Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina), had been invited to attend this meeting to present the draft. The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter “Secretariat”) lead for the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG, Ms Eva MOLLER) presented the amendments to the glossary (1994-001).
- [3] The IPPC Standards Officer acknowledged the absence of the Standards Committee working group (SC-7) member from Asia.
- [4] The SC-7 agreed to try to focus their work on only revising the draft based on IPPC member comments.

1.2 Election of the Chairperson

- [5] Ms Marie-Claude FOREST (Canada) was elected as Chairperson.

1.3 Election of the Rapporteur

- [6] Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK (Poland) was elected as Rapporteur.

1.4 Adoption of the Agenda

- [7] The agenda was adopted as presented in Appendix 1.

2. Administrative Matters

2.1 Documents List

- [8] The Secretariat introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2).

2.2 Participants List

- [9] The Secretariat introduced the Participants list (Appendix 3). The Participants were reminded to update any changes to their contact information on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP – www.ippc.int).

2.3 Local Information

- [10] The Secretariat provided a document on local information and invited participants to notify the Secretariat of any information that required updating.

3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting

- [11] The SC-7 Chair gave a brief summary of the 2015 May SC meeting¹.
- [12] The Secretariat noted that the stewards for both drafts had been changed during the 2015 May SC meeting, and both of the new stewards were not able to attend the SC-7 meeting. The steward for the

¹ 2015 May SC meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81111/>

draft ISPM *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) was now Mr Nico HORN (Netherlands) and the steward for the Technical Panel on the Glossary, who is also the steward for the draft amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001) was now Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (France)².

4. Review of Draft ISPMs

4.1 International movement of seeds (2009-003)

- [13] The former Steward (Ms Julie ALIAGA, USA), via conference call, outlined³ the main points raised during member consultation⁴. The connection for the teleconference was poor so the Assistant Steward provided detailed guidance and introduced the revised draft⁵ and gave a detailed overview of the issues for SC-7 consideration. The SC-7 reviewed the IPPC member comments, steward's responses to comments⁶, the Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) comments⁷ and the subsequently revised the draft ISPM. The major discussions by the SC-7 are provided below. The SC-7 acknowledged and thanked the former Steward and the Assistant Steward for all their work they had done in preparation for this meeting.
- [14] It should be noted that as the SC-7 was also tasked with reviewing and adjusting the IPPC standard setting procedure and only two meeting days were allocated to revise the draft ISPMs. Due to time constraints, and because there were a large number of concepts and a high volume of comments to be addressed, the SC-7 determined that it would not be possible to completely revise the draft at this meeting. The SC-7 requested the Assistant Steward to highlight the major issues with the draft, to which the SC-7 would provide guidance for the revision. It was also noted that the 2015 Working Group on the concept of a commodity standard may address some of the issues raised, so the SC-7 recommended the Steward and Assistant Steward to consider whether any outcomes from that meeting could be taken into account when further revising this draft.
- [15] The following major issues were discussed by the SC-7.
- [16] **General comments:** The experts and the steward made an effort to address all these concerns and have provided additional wording in the draft standard, as appropriate. Some of the issues raised in IPPC member comments included:
- Definition of "seeds" and their "intended use". It was explained that the draft has been modified to clarify the issue of the intended use.
 - Consideration in the draft ISPM of Specification 54's task requesting guidance to determine potential pests and the potential of seeds as pathways for their introduction and spread that may be used in pest risk analysis (PRA).
 - Inclusion of a new section on Pest Risk Management to clearly separate the three stages of pest risk analysis (PRA).
 - Section on "Phytosanitary certification" referred only to re-export of seeds and not to the entire export process.
 - One country recommended including case studies in the standard with different export and re-export scenarios and appropriate additional declarations options.

² IPPC List of topics for IPPC standards: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/>

³ 06_SC7_2015_May

⁴ The version of the draft ISPM submitted to 2014 member consultation is available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2531/> and compiled member comments are available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2656/>

⁵ 2009-003

⁶ 04_SC7_2015_May

⁷ 07_SC7_2015_May

- The use of “tolerance” and “resistant”. It was explained that experts were consulted on this issue and that in the revised draft the experts believe the use of the term “tolerance” in this ISPM would create a lot of misunderstanding amongst National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs).
- One country considered this draft to be a good subject introduction document and background training material rather than a standard and requested adding a list of seed-transmitted pests (by host) and agreed effective seed treatment methods.
- Some countries recommended the draft be sent back to the Expert Working Group (EWG), noting that they had many comments and felt the draft was not ready for member consultation, considering the number of issues they identified and the fact that an annex is still under development.

[17] **Scope:** The major discussions regarding the scope include:

- **Guidance vs harmonization:** Although the Scope uses the term “guidance” and “harmonization”, there were some concerns whether the terminology should be changed. It was noted that there were no direct IPPC member comments on this issue, but many indirect comments, and that the draft was providing guidance on establishing requirements. It was suggested to clarify this by not using the wording “harmonization” but rather use “establishing requirements”. Some SC-7 members agreed that “guidance” was more appropriate. It was also noted that the intent of ISPMs is to harmonize countries phytosanitary measures. It was concluded that the standard was not harmonizing procedures, but providing guidance on which measures can be applied for seeds, and not harmonizing the requirements, but giving guidance on the procedures to establish the requirements. Therefore, the SC-7 agreed to remove all instances of “harmonized/harmonization/harmonizing of” from the scope.
- **Inclusion of export:** Some IPPC member comments noted that the standard is giving guidance on re-export, but not on export. The former Steward had responded to these comments by noting that the re-export is the main issue for seeds. However, the SC-7 agreed that more guidance on export should be included. The SC-7 asked the Steward and Assistant Steward to incorporate more guidance on export into the draft.
- **Seed (as a commodity class):** An IPPC member comment⁸ proposed to indicate “seeds (as a commodity class)” to clarify that this is a commodity class and to distinguish it from grain. To reduce redundancy, the SC-7 incorporated “seeds (as a commodity class) in the botanical sense” into the scope, and deleted the statement from later in the scope. “In the botanical sense” was included based on another IPPC member comment⁹, but the SC-7 considered whether it was necessary. They decided to keep the proposal to clarify that the standard does not address seed potatoes (also suggested by the TPG). The SC-7 noted that the glossary term for “seed (as a commodity class)” has not yet been adopted, but if the term is adopted before the standard is adopted, these editorial changes can be made later to the draft.
- **Intended use/purpose: Seeds for planting (e.g. in the field) vs not for planting (e.g. lab testing):** The ISPM 5 Glossary term indicates that seed is for planting. However, the scope indicates that the standard would cover seeds for planting, and, alternatively, not for planting, such as for testing and destructive analysis. The SC-7 agreed to modify the scope to clearly identify both situations. There was a suggestion to specify that seeds will be imported for “purposes other than planting”, but there was a concern that “other purposes” could be interpreted as grain for consumption, so the members did not retain the suggestion. The SC-7 tried to list what purposes (in addition to laboratory testing and destructive analysis) would not be for planting, such as cleaning, processing, and research. The SC-7 concluded that there were no comments on the two examples (laboratory testing and destructive analysis), so they did not add more examples.

⁸ IPPC member comment 31.

⁹ IPPC member comment 37.

- **Samples of seed:** The previous Steward had suggested adding a reference to “samples” of seeds moved internationally for laboratory testing or destructive analysis. The SC-7 considered that whether it was a large consignment or a small sample, the risk would be the same. It was noted that, in import requirements, the movement of seed is referred to as a consignment and not a sample; therefore, reference to “samples” of seed was not added.

[18] **The terminology of “intended use”:** Several countries expressed some confusion with the use of the terminology “intended use” in the draft standard, because it appeared to contradict the Glossary definition for seeds. Per the specification, the intended use of seeds in this standard is for planting. Nevertheless, there are several intermediate steps in the process of producing seeds, some of which may include the international movement of smaller amounts of seeds for analysis, testing, breeding purposes, etc. These seeds may not be released in the PRA area, or, if they are planted, they may be permitted under strict quarantine conditions. The EWG had wanted NPPOs to consider this fact when developing a PRA. As recommended by the TPG, the SC-7 agreed to, in some cases, change “intended use” to “purpose of import” where applicable throughout the draft standard.

[19] **Definition of seed:** The Secretariat noted that the definition of seed is being considered for revision by the TPG. A revised definition for “seeds (as a commodity)” is proposed in the Amendments to the Glossary (see section 4.2) and was provided only for information in the draft ISPM *International movement of seeds* (2009-003). Any Substantial Concern Commenting Period (SCCP) comments on the draft definition of “seeds (as a commodity)” should be made in relation to the draft Amendments, and not of the current draft ISPM.

[20] **Definitions of “seed-borne pest” and “seed-transmitted pest”:** The major discussions regarding the definitions include:

- **“can be” vs “is”:** The TPG preferred using “is” in the definitions, while the Assistant Steward suggested using “can be” because its transmission depends on many conditions, such as climate. It was noted that was a TPG comment, and not an IPPC member comment. One member noted that using “can be” instead of “is” implies that the seed will never be free from the pest. To avoid this issue, the SC-7 suggested rewording the definitions to remove any instance of “can be” or “is”.
- **“progeny” vs “resultant” vs. “adult” plants:** There were multiple IPPC member comments on the correct terminology of the plant grown from the imported seed. Three suggestions were provided: “progeny”, “resultant”, and “adult” plants. The TPG noted that “adult” plant is incorrect and proposed “resultant” plants, as in an IPPC member comment¹⁰ on “seed-borne pest”. The initial EWG definitions used “resulting” plant (seed-borne pest) and “progeny” plants (seed-transmitted pest). The SC-7 agreed that the use of these terms in the draft needs further consideration and clarification.
- **“causing” or “resulting in” infestation:** There were IPPC member comments on the issue of whether to include “causing infestation” or “resulting in infestation” in the definitions. It was noted that the TPG had supported “causing” instead of “resulting in”. It was noted that “may or may not cause/result in infestation” was used, leaving the definition more open to alternative options. To resolve the issue, the SC-7 suggested to remove “may or may not cause/result in infestation” in the definitions.
- **Original EWG definitions vs SC revisions vs member comments vs TPG comments:** It was noted that the TPG had provided comments on the version that had gone for member consultation (i.e. the version revised at the 2014 May SC meeting), and not on the original EWG version of the definitions. The SC-7 agreed to have the Steward and Assistant Steward review the original EWG definitions and the provisional SC-7 definitions, and determine whether elements of the two versions are still relevant to the current version of the draft standard (with the IPPC member comments incorporated), and then revise the definitions as necessary. In addition, the SC-7 agreed not to involve the TPG at this stage.

¹⁰ IPPC member comment 63.

- [21] **Equivalence of phytosanitary measures:** The SC-7 noted that the equivalence of phytosanitary measures would be more relevant to the seed re-export situations because seed production and export in the first country of import is a much clearer situation and in less need of equivalence. It was also noted that the equivalence may be as relevant for the export situations (from the country of origin) since at the time of export the direct fulfilment of some phytosanitary import requirements may not be feasible, e.g. when the export takes place a number of years after the harvest of the seed or when the requirements were not known during the growing of the seed. The SC-7 agreed that the equivalence of phytosanitary measures is important and that the draft should make a reference to them.
- [22] **Regulated non quarantine pests (RNQPs):** The Assistant Steward noted that RNQPs are mentioned in the draft, but no guidance is given. The SC-7 agreed that the draft should note that seeds are plants for planting, referring to ISPM 16 (*Regulated non-quarantine pests: Concept and application*) and ISPM 21 (*Pest risk analysis for regulated non-quarantine pests*) and that some guidance should be provided.
- [23] **Ranking of seeds in relation to the risk:** The SC-7 suggested the Steward and Assistant Steward to review the ranking of seeds in relation to the risk and consider the following ranking suggested by the SC-7:
- Seeds for purposes other than for planting
 - Seeds for planting under restricted conditions
 - Seeds for planting under field conditions
- [24] The Steward and Assistant Steward should also note that the SC-7 tentatively agreed to avoid the use of “quarantine conditions” and to keep the ranking and examples (not the phytosanitary measures). In addition, the Steward and Assistant Steward should keep in mind that subsequent changes may need to be made in paragraphs in which members did not comment.
- [25] **Mixing and blending of seeds:** An IPPC member comment had suggested moving the entire section of “Mixing and Blending of seeds” under the “Pest Risk Analysis” section, and this proposal had been considered by the previous Steward. The SC-7 requested the Steward and Assistant Steward to review this section and consider whether detailed elements for assessing the risk of these seeds are needed. The Steward and Assistant Steward should also consider the definitions of “seed-borne” and “seed-transmitted” in the cases where trace-back is needed and to check the impact of these definitions in the standard (taking also the consideration for the “next generation of seeds”). The SC-7 also suggested the Steward and Assistant Steward consider asking the EWG for technical advice on this issue.
- [26] **Systems approach:** Following a proposal made in IPPC member comments, some paragraphs state that phytosanitary measures “should be applied singly or in combination in a systems approach according to ISPM 14 (*The use of integrated measures in a systems approach for pest risk management*)”. The Assistant Steward recalled that a systems approach is an option for pest risk management and suggested the wording be aligned with this. The SC-7 agreed to have the Steward and Assistant Steward review this because systems approaches could be considered phytosanitary measures.
- [27] **Resistant vs tolerance varieties:** Several IPPC member comments had proposed a global change for the use of “tolerance” instead of “resistance” in the draft. The previous Steward had consulted the EWG experts on the issue. The experts had noted that tolerant varieties are susceptible to the pest, but the symptoms are not expressed. Resistant varieties are less likely to be infected by the pest and this may be of varying degrees, up to full resistance. Because the concept of resistance is tied to the absence of the pest in varying degrees, resistance is a more useful term for developing PRAs and phytosanitary measures. The experts had believed the use of the term “tolerance” in this ISPM would create misunderstanding among NPPOs. The previous Steward had noted that “tolerance is used for the level of pest that is acceptable”, that “resistance” could be considered when evaluating factors during the pest risk management and that care should be taken not to mix up both concepts. The previous Steward had retained the term “resistance” in the standard to avoid confusion. The SC-7

suggested that the Steward and Assistant Steward provide more information in the draft and what would be the target (i.e. possibly RNQPs). The SC-7 also suggested adjusting the concepts so they would be better understood from the NPPO perspective.

- [28] **Resistant varieties:** The SC-7 agreed to remove reference to conducting a PRA on specific resistant varieties because it was not necessary.
- [29] **Phytosanitary certification:** The draft ISPM referred only to re-export of seeds and not to the entire export process. The previous Steward considered not repeating guidance provided already in ISPM 12, but instead focused on seed re-export. Thus, the section “Phytosanitary certification” was re-titled “Re-export of Seeds” and the wording revised. The SC-7 agreed to have the Steward and Assistant Steward include more detailed information on export and re-export.
- [30] **Examples of pests of seed:** The Assistant Steward noted that the SC-7 had agreed not to add examples of pests of seed (see Requirements section below), and therefore wanted guidance on whether to add similar examples throughout the draft (examples of biological treatments used for some specific pests of seed). The SC-7 agreed to keep the other examples for now, requesting the Steward and Assistant Steward to reconsider this after the draft is revised.
- [31] **Pest risk management seed production:** The Assistant Steward noted that “pest risk management and quality protocols” is mentioned in this section, which also stated that NPPOs of the “exporting country should monitor the correct use and implementation of such” protocols. The SC-7 agreed to remove “risk” because it refers to the Glossary definition, and noted it referred more to integrated pest management and quality control (industry practices).
- [32] **Re-export of seeds:** The Assistant Steward noted that there were some comments with text proposals which appeared to be contradictory, especially with ISPM 12. The SC-7 agreed not to add these paragraphs on re-export and additional declarations because it is in contradiction with ISPM 12, and because the meanings in the terms are not clear (e.g. “minor variations”). The SC-7 also suggested that the Steward and Assistant Steward consider including a general statement that, for the purpose of seeds, ISPM 12 still applies.
- [33] **Forest tree seeds:** It was explained that the scope in Specification 54 included forest tree seeds and that the SC¹¹ had already asked the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) to review and redraft the draft annex on Forest tree seed. The TPFQ had not finalized yet this task.
- [34] **Annex/Appendix 1:** The major discussions regarding the requirements include:
- **Annex vs. Appendix:** The SC-7 agreed with the IPPC member comments to change the proposed Annex 1 to an Appendix.
 - **Title of Annex/Appendix 1:** There were several comments to change the title of the Annex/Appendix 1 (previously “Guidance on the likelihood for pest groups to be present in the seed pathway and their potential to establish and spread”). The SC-7 suggested “Guidance on the likelihood for pest groups to be present in the seed and their potential to establish and spread”, incorporating several IPPC member comments. The SC-7 also noted that the Steward and Assistant Steward should review the draft to ensure that the title of the Annex/Appendix is consistently referenced as well as which is the better wording between “in the seed” or “in the seed pathway”. Other major discussions regarding the title of this Annex/Appendix include:
 - **“consignments”:** Some IPPC member comments had suggested the use of “consignments of seeds” in the title of Annex/Appendix 1. The SC-7 noted that the Annex/Appendix contains guidance about “seeds as pests”, and the SC-7 agreed that “consignments” can be used when referring to PRA in the PRA section of the draft standard. The SC-7 agreed not to use “consignments of seeds” in the Annex/Appendix title.

¹¹ [IPP link to 2013 November SC report](#), Appendix 6, 2013_eSC_Nov_11

- **“seed pathway”**: One member preferred the phrase “in the seed” instead of “seed pathway”. The SC-7 agreed to this change.
 - **“fungal-like organisms”**: The SC-7 agreed that a reference to “fungal-like organisms” will be added in the sub-section on “Fungi” in the Annex/Appendix, but the header would reference only “fungi” to retain consistency throughout the text.
- [35] **Treatments**: The SC-7 asked the Steward and Assistant Steward to clarify the sections related to treatments used as industry practices, and to treatments used as phytosanitary measures. Regarding the suggestion from a comment to add a paragraph on treatments related to import requirements (referring to the required type or effect of a treatment to be specified in the import requirements and the issue of products and active ingredients in the import requirements), the SC-7 suggested not to add this because the information was not relevant and outside the scope.
- [36] **Post entry quarantine (PEQ)**: The SC-7 asked the Steward and Assistant Steward to consider whether to incorporate the concept of PEQ into the draft or to refer instead to ISPM 34 (*Design and operation of post-entry quarantine stations for plants*).
- [37] **Regulated pests as contaminants**: The SC-7 suggested that the Steward and Assistant Steward replace this term with the Glossary term “contaminating pest”.
- [38] **Repeating information**: The Assistant Steward noted that there was repeating information from adopted ISPMs throughout the text. The SC-7 advised not to repeat information already included in other ISPMs, but to instead refer to the concepts in other ISPMs.
- [39] **Sample size**: The Assistant Steward noted that the text on sample size (added based on an IPPC member comment) was confusing. The SC-7 suggested that the Steward and Assistant Steward clarify the text.
- [40] **Validated protocols**: The Assistant Steward was concerned about the inclusion of “validated protocols” and whether that was the appropriate terminology for this draft. The SC-7 suggested that the Steward and Assistant Steward consider whether this is specific for seeds, because testing for seeds would apply for any commodity and should not differ. The SC-7 also suggested the Steward and Assistant Steward review the entire section to make sure it is consistent with ISPM 27 (*Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests*) and consider whether to revise it.
- [41] **The use of “Recommend” and “are encouraged”**: The Assistant Steward questioned whether this terminology is appropriate for an ISPM. The SC-7 noted that this terminology is used in several ISPMs, so they recommended that the Steward and Assistant Steward consider whether the terminology is used appropriately in this standard and adjust as needed.
- [42] **References**: It was noted that there was a reference that was included in Appendix 2 (Bibliography), but not yet officially published. The SC-7 agreed that the reference should be retained because it will contain valuable information for NPPOs. However, it was noted that the reference should be verified when the adoption is presented for adoption, and removed from the list if not finalized at that time.
- [43] The SC-7 began reviewing the draft standard paragraph by paragraph but did not complete the entire review:
- [44] **Background**: The major discussions regarding the background include:
- **“treated” seeds**: There were some IPPC member comments¹² proposing adding the concept of “treated” seeds to the draft. The SC-7 was confused whether this indicated a process or a phytosanitary measure (e.g. phytosanitary treatment), per the Glossary. It was noted that the section of the draft standard on seed treatments covers all processes and measures. The SC-7 agreed to not include “treated” seeds because it was too confusing and noted the issue is detailed already in the draft standard under the seed treatment section.

¹² IPPC member comments 112 and 117.

- **“serious” vs “high” pest risk:** Some IPPC member comments had proposed to indicate in the background that seeds may present a “serious pest risk”. The SC-7 noted that it would be difficult to quantify a “serious” pest risk. Other proposals such as “may present a pest risk or higher pest risk” or “increased pest risk”, would also require qualifying/comparative statements. For simplicity, the SC-7 agreed to change it to “may present a pest risk”.
- **“breeding and multiplication programmes”:** The SC-7 considered whether this should be included, and whether it is really background information¹³. The EWG had included this in the draft standard because it was a serious and real issue in international trade, so it was kept.
- **“time lag”:** There was a IPPC member comment¹⁴ proposing including the terminology of “time lag”. There was an issue of whether this would be easily understood in all FAO languages. The SC-7 agreed it was appropriate terminology.
- **“contradictory measures”:** Several IPPC member comments suggested removing the concept of “contradictory” measures because it was not considered properly used in this standard. The SC-7 agreed.
- **“technically justified”:** An IPPC member comment¹⁵ proposed introducing the term “technically justified”. The SC-7 determined the inclusion of this statement was redundant because all phytosanitary measures are technically justified, so that comment was not incorporated.

[45] **Requirements:** The major discussions regarding the requirements include:

- **“intended use and purpose”:** See above, under scope.
- **Rearrangement of subsections:** It was noted that the requirements section was rearranged to follow the process of a PRA, as indicated in ISPM 11 (*Pest risk analysis for quarantine pests*).
- **Referencing ISPM 11 Annex 4:** An IPPC member proposed in a comment¹⁶ adding a reference to Annex 4 of ISPM 11. Some SC-7 members felt the guidance is better provided in the main text of ISPM 11, and not Annex 4. However, it was agreed that Annex 4 be referred because it contained the appropriate guidance relevant to this draft standard.
- **“quarantine” vs “regulated” pests:** The version that went for member consultation included “quarantine” pests and there were IPPC member comments to change it to “regulated”. The SC-7 agreed that the most appropriate terminology was “regulated” because it includes quarantine pests and regulated non-quarantine pests.
- **Conducting a PRA:** Several IPPC member comments suggested simplifying the text on conducting a PRA on seeds. The SC-7 took into account these suggestions while incorporating the comments, to prevent redundancy and improve clarity.
- **Examples of pests for which seeds are a pathway:** In some IPPC member comments, it was proposed to change annex 1 (Guidance on the likelihood for pest groups to be present in the seed pathway and their potential to establish and spread) to an appendix, and the previous Steward had provided a list of examples in section 1.2 “Seeds as pathways” to ensure that there was a prescriptive list included in the standard. It was noted that the appendix contains examples which are not the same, but could be viewed as redundant. It was also noted that it may be useful to indicate whether the examples are seed-borne, seed-transmitted, etc., which may help clarify their purpose in the standard and not in the Annex/Appendix. As the examples did not directly originate from member comments, the SC-7 agreed to remove them.
- **“likelihood of establishment of quarantine pests”:** Several IPPC member comments were made to clarify the concept of the “likelihood of establishment of quarantine pests” by modifying the text to “the purpose for which seeds are moved internationally (e.g. breeding,

¹³ IPPC member comments 123, 124, 125 and 126.

¹⁴ IPPC member comment 130.

¹⁵ IPPC member comment 153.

¹⁶ IPPC member comment 179.

- multiplication, testing, and field planting) may impact the likelihood of establishment of quarantine pests.” The SC-7 agreed to its inclusion and made modifications to the proposal and reworded the paragraph to incorporate this concept.
- **“pest risk levels”:** There were several IPPC member comments on including the terminology “pest risk levels”. The SC-7 did not incorporate “levels” of pest risk because it was not appropriate wording.
 - **“ranking” vs “classified” vs “categorized”:** There were several IPPC member comments on the terminology of “ranking/classifying/categorizing” pest risk. It was noted that ISPM 32 (*Categorization of commodities according to their pest risk*) refers to categorizing pest risk. The SC-7 determined that “ranking” pest risk is the most appropriate because the risks are being ranked from highest to lowest pest risk. There was a proposal to begin each purpose of import by including “pest risk of ...” to clarify that it is not the seeds that are being ranked, but the risk, but the SC-7 decided not to include it.
 - **“quarantine” vs “restricted” conditions:** There were IPPC member comments concerning whether laboratories for seed devitalization were under quarantine or restricted conditions. It was noted that “quarantine” was probably used because it is a glossary term, but “restricted” is a more appropriate term. However, if minimal or no phytosanitary measures are in the description, then adding restricting conditions was contradictory. The SC-7 agreed to add to the description paragraph “may not require phytosanitary measures if the pest risk is considered negligible” and then retained the proposal to include “under restrictive conditions”.
 - **“minimal or no phytosanitary measures”:** There was an IPPC member comment that proposed to eliminate either “minimal” or “no” . The SC-7 removed both and proposed instead “NPPOs may not require phytosanitary measures” to clarify this.
 - **“seeds with no potential to germinate or generate plants”:** Some IPPC member comments had suggested to name one of the original purposes of import headings “seeds with no potential to germinate or generate plants”. Based on IPPC member comments, the previous Steward had proposed the revision “seeds not for planting”. The SC-7 proposed to replace “not for planting” with “for laboratory testing and destructive analysis” but this would not address all seeds not for planting. However, it was noted that “seeds not for planting” includes more than just seeds for testing; it would also cover devitalized seeds. There was a proposal to change it to “seeds imported for purposes other than planting”, but this did not fit the TPG proposal for the term “seeds (as a commodity)”. The SC-7 agreed the most appropriate wording was “seeds for purposes other than planting”.
 - **“seeds not for planting but retaining viability”:** Based on an IPPC member comment, the previous Steward had proposed deletion of this header (to be covered under the previous header). However, there was a concern whether the description under this deleted header was reflected under the header of the previous section. The SC-7 agreed that it was relevant to the previous section “seeds for purposes other than planting”, so the description was retained (with modifications based on member comments).
 - **“ultimate destruction”:** There was one IPPC member comment¹⁷ that introduced the terminology “ultimate destruction” to the draft. However, the SC-7 felt it was not appropriate and removed “ultimate” for clarity.
 - **“seeds for planting under restricted conditions and not for general release”:** The SC-7 modified the heading of this section to reflect member comments. There was a proposal to rework this section because there are some duplications. The text was modified and consolidated.

[46] Recommendations:

[47] The SC-7:

¹⁷ IPPC member comment 290.

- (1) *requested* the Steward and Assistant Steward revise the draft for review at the next SC-7 meeting, taking into account the comments and suggestions provided by the SC-7.
- (2) *recommended* that the SC, in consultation with the Secretariat and the Bureau, consider whether an additional SC-7 meeting would be required in 2015, based on the amount of work anticipated for the 2016 SC-7 meeting.

4.2 Draft amendments to ISPM 5: *Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)*

[48] The IPPC Secretariat Lead for the TPG introduced the draft 2014 Amendments to ISPM 5¹⁸ and the TPG responses to IPPC member comments¹⁹. She noted that all terms submitted for member consultation had received comments²⁰.

[49] “bark (as a commodity)” (2013-005)

[50] The Secretariat noted that “bark” is currently defined in the Glossary in its biological sense, specifying how the term should be understood in the IPPC context. In February 2014, the TPG had determined that the existing Glossary term for “bark” did not need to be revised, but determined it would be useful to define bark as a commodity.

[51] When reviewing the IPPC member comments on the term “bark (as a commodity)”, the TPG considered member comments proposing that only one definition be maintained. The TPG maintained that a definition of “bark (as a commodity)” would be useful because this term refers to bark as something which is traded versus bark in its biological sense (in an IPPC context), which according to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) is something which needs to be removed.

[52] The SC-7 reviewed the IPPC member comments and agreed with the comments suggesting that only one definition for bark be included in the Glossary. The SC-7 did not agree with the prospect of defining Glossary terms both in their biological sense and as a commodity. They feared that this could lead to the creation of two Glossaries: one with definitions in the botanical sense and one in the commodity/trade sense.

[53] The SC-7 agreed there were no strong arguments to define bark as a commodity, withdrew the term from the draft 2014 Amendments to the Glossary and recommended to the SC that the term be removed from the *List of topics for IPPC standards (LOT)*²¹.

[54] “additional declaration” (2010-006)

[55] The term “additional declaration” was added to the LOT by the SC in November 2010 to align the definition in ISPM 5 with the use in ISPM 12 (*Phytosanitary certificates*), i.e. to cover soil. The TPG proposed to use “regulated articles” to cover soil and other items that may be subject to additional declaration such as growing media or packaging. While the TPG recognized that phytosanitary certificates apply only to “regulated pests and regulated articles” and the text may therefore seem redundant, the TPG felt it useful to maintain this wording because this was the part of the definition for which a revision was originally requested.

[56] The SC-7 agreed and noted that deleting “in relation to regulated pests or regulated articles” would leave the term too open for interpretation and create doubt regarding what was covered by “additional declaration”.

¹⁸ 1994-001

¹⁹ 05_SC7_2015_May

²⁰ The version of the draft ISPM submitted to 2014 member consultation is available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2525/> and compiled member comments are available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2651/>

²¹ IPPC List of topics for IPPC standards: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/list-topics-ippc-standards/>

- [57] Some SC-7 members suggested changing “specific additional information” to “specific additional phytosanitary information”. However, the SC-7 agreed that the definition did not leave doubt as to the fact that only phytosanitary information should be included.
- [58] The SC-7 agreed with the TPG proposal confirming that it aligns the definition with the term’s use in ISPM 12 and because it provides flexibility to contracting parties regarding regulated articles (such as soil).
- [59] **“grain” (2013-018), “seeds”**
- [60] The SC added the term “grain” to the LOT in November 2013 when reviewing the draft specification on the *International movement of grain* (2008-007). When reviewing the revised definition of “grain” in May 2014, the SC proposed a consequential revision to the definition of “seeds”. Based on one IPPC member comment, “processing or consumption” was deleted in the definition of seeds because it was recognized that “processing” may be misunderstood.
- [61] It was recalled that bolded terms in a definition means there is a cross-reference to another Glossary term. Several IPPC member comments considered it was unnecessary to have “(in the botanical sense)” in the definition, but the TPG reaffirmed that this was necessary to convey the intended meaning.
- [62] The SC-7 agreed with the TPG proposal.
- [63] **“mark” (2013-007)**
- [64] The SC added the term “mark” to the LOT in May 2013, based on a TPG proposal. The Secretariat noted that according to ISPM 15, marking is a phytosanitary procedure. It was also noted that a stamp or brand indicate the process by which the mark has been applied (one by ink, the other by burning). Some IPPC member comments proposed alternative wordings, such as “symbol”. However, because “symbol” is used in describing a part of the mark (see ISPM 15, Annex 2) it is suggested that this term not be used in this definition.
- [65] The proposed revision to the definition was necessary because it used “phytosanitary status”, which the SC had previously agreed to avoid as it is not clear what is meant. The TPG proposed “phytosanitary procedures” instead because this is the wording used in ISPM 15.
- [66] The SC-7 agreed with the TPG proposal.
- [67] **“visual examination” (2013-010)**
- [68] The SC added the term “visual examination” to the LOT in May 2013, based on a TPG proposal. The Secretariat noted that, based on an IPPC member comment, “without testing” was deleted because it does not add clarification, and the definition should focus on what visual examination is. Another IPPC member comment suggested that “microscope” be deleted. However, the TPG found that the use of a microscope is part of a visual examination.
- [69] It was noted that an IPPC member comment suggested that definitions of “visual examination”, “testing”, and “inspection” should be considered by the TPG at the same time to ensure they are consistent and useful. The Secretariat noted that “testing” is already on the LOT to be reviewed, but that “inspection” was not added to the LOT because the TPG did not find there was any immediate confusion between the terms; “visual examination” describes a process while “inspection” describes the purpose of that process. One SC-7 member pointed out that the definition of “testing” could refer to a visual examination. Therefore, when the TPG considers the definition of “testing”, it could have consequences for the definitions “visual examination” and “inspection”.
- [70] There was another concern about whether sending a sample to an expert for identification is considered “testing” or “visual examination”. One SC-7 member queried whether visual examination in a laboratory (e.g. in the case where the identification of a pest at the point of entry is difficult)

would be testing; a sample is then sent to a laboratory for “testing”. However, according to the Glossary, visual examination is not a “test” (even if performed in a laboratory), but possibly an “inspection”.

[71] The SC-7 recommended the SC add the term “inspection” to the LOT for the TPG to consider “visual examination”, “test” and “inspection” together. The SC-7 also suggested that the TPG consider what could be the consequential changes to ISPMs following their review.

[72] **“wood” (2013-011)**

[73] The SC added the term “wood” to the LOT in May 2013, based on a TPG proposal.

[74] The Secretariat noted that the inclusion of the term “wood waste” had originally been proposed and understood to cover residues from the processing of wood (such as wood shavings and sawdust). Based on an IPPC member comment, it was changed to “wood residue”, which is more straightforward and used in the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood* (2006-029). “Wood chips”, which was in the original definition, is a widely used term for a traded commodity. It is listed separately from “wood residue” because it may be produced for itself (and is not necessarily a by-product of wood processing). Other commodities that would fall under this commodity class according to this definition would be, for example, furniture made of non-processed wood.

[75] It was noted that definitions do not normally mention what they exclude. However, because the proposed definition only gives examples, it is clearer to indicate which commodities are excluded (because they otherwise may be thought to be covered by the definition). As a result of member consultation, “bamboo products” was added as an exclusion (because bamboo is also excluded from the scope of the draft ISPM on *International movement of wood* (2006-029)).

[76] The SC-7 agreed with the proposal to include “wood residue” and agreed with keeping the exceptions noting that the definition is for a commodity class.

[77] One SC-7 member noted that the definition for “wood packaging material” includes wood, and that the revised definition for “wood (as a commodity)” excludes wood packaging material, hence there seemed to be a contradiction. It was clarified that “wood packaging material” would not be considered a wood commodity and that “wood packaging material” will continue to refer to wood in its botanical sense (the word “wood” will not be bolded). It was further confirmed that the TPG will review ISPM 5 for cross-references to “wood” and determine whether the “term” should be unbolded.

[78] The SC-7 agreed with the TPG proposal.

[79] The SC-7 invited the SC to:

- (3) *consider* recommending the draft 2014 Amendments to ISPM 5 *Glossary of phytosanitary terms* (1994-001) to the CPM for adoption.

5. Other business

[80] There was no other business.

6. Close of the meeting

[81] The SC-7 also thanked the stewards and Secretariat for providing useful explanations during the discussions. The SC-7 members also noted that, with the high number of comments received during member consultation, the steward’s support at the SC-7 meeting is imperative and helps SC-7 members gain a better understanding of the nature of the comments and the main issues.

[82] The Chairperson thanked the Rapporteur for his work, and the Secretariat for their support during the meeting. Sincere thanks were expressed to Mr Alexandre PALMA (Brazil) and Mr Bart ROSSEL

(Australia), who will be completing their terms as SC-7 members, for their excellent work over the years.

- [83] The SC-7 regretted that it did not have sufficient time to fully review the draft ISPM on the *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) as some time from the SC-7 weeklong meeting had been allocated to the review of the proposed adjustments to the IPPC standard setting procedure. The SC-7 recommends that the SC not assign these types of tasks to the weeklong meeting of the SC-7 but if it was considered that the SC-7 was the best group to do certain tasks, that additional days be allocated or a different meeting time be set aside.
- [84] The Chairperson thanked the participants for a productive meeting and closed the meeting.

APPENDIX 1 - Agenda*11-12 May 2015**Canada Room A356/7, FAO Headquarters, Rome, Italy**11 May start time: 10:00 hrs**Daily Schedule: 09:00-12:00 and 13:30-17:00*

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	-	LARSON
1.2 Election of the Chairperson	-	LARSON
1.3 Election of the Rapporteur	-	CHAIRPERSON
1.4 Adoption of the Agenda	01_SC7_2015_May	MOREIRA
2. Administrative Matters		
2.1 Documents List	02_SC7_2015_May	MOREIRA
2.2 Participants List	03_SC7_2015_May	MOREIRA
2.3 Local Information (refer to the 2015 May SC Local Information document)	IPP link to local information	MOREIRA
3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting	-	CHAIRPERSON
4. Review of Draft ISPMs		
4.1 International movement of seeds (2009-003), Priority 1		
- Steward: Julie ALIAGA	2009-003	ALIAGA / FERRO (GERMAIN)
- Assistant Steward: Ezequiel FERRO		
• Steward's Responses to Comments from 2014 Member Consultation and to TPG review	04_SC7_2015_May	ALIAGA / FERRO (GERMAIN)
• Steward's additional notes	06_SC7_2015_May	ALIAGA / FERRO (GERMAIN)
• TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency	07_SC7_2015_May	ALIAGA / FERRO (GERMAIN)
4.2 Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)		
- Steward: John HEDLEY	1994-001	MOLLER
- Assistant Steward: Ebbe NORDBO		
• TPG Response to Comments from 2014 Member Consultation	05_SC7_2015_May	MOLLER
5. Other business		CHAIRPERSON
6. Close of the meeting		CHAIRPERSON

APPENDIX 2 - Documents list

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED
01_SC7_2015_May	1.4	Agenda	2015-03-25
02_SC7_2015_May	2.1	Documents List	2015-04-08
03_SC7_2015_May	2.2	Participants List	2015-04-08
2009-003	4.1	International movement of seeds (2009-003)	2015-02-25
04_SC7_2015_May	4.1	2009-003: Steward's Response to Comments from 2014 Member Consultation	2015-02-25
06_SC7_2015_May	4.1	2009-003: Steward's additional notes	2015-02-25
07_SC7_2015_May	4.1	2009-003: TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency with steward's responses	2015-02-25
1994-001	4.2	Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)	2015-02-25
05_SC7_2015_May	4.2	1994-001: TPG Response to Comments from 2013 Member Consultation	2015-02-25

APPENDIX 3 – Participants list

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ²²	Term expires
✓	Africa Member SC-7	Ms Ruth WOODE Deputy Director of Agriculture Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate Ministry of Food and Agriculture P.O.Box M37 Accra GHANA Tel: (+233) 244507687	wooderuth@yahoo.com	CPM-8 (2013) 1 st term / 3 years (2)	2016
	Asia Member SC-7	Mr D.D.K. SHARMA Additional, Plant Protection Advisor (Plant Quarantine) Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarantine & Storage - Department of Agriculture & Cooperation Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, N. H. – IV, Faridabad (Haryana), 121001 INDIA Tel: + 91 129 2418506 (Office) Mobile: + 91 8901326967 Fax: + 91 129 2412125	ddk.sharma@nic.in	CPM-8 (2013) 1st term/3 years (1)	2016
✓	Europe Member SC-7	Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK Wojewodzki Inspektorat Ochrony Roslin I Nasiennictwa w Lublinie ul. Diamentowa 6 20-447 Lublin POLAND Tel: (+48) 81 7440326 Fax: (+48) 81 7447363	p.wlodarczyk@piorin.gov.pl	CPM-7(2012) 1st term/3 years (0)	2015

²² Bracketed number indicates the Criteria used for prioritizing participants to receive travel assistance to attend meetings organized by the IPPC Secretariat when Statement of Commitment was signed (0) no funding, (1) airfare only, (2) full funding (<https://www.ippc.int/publications/criteria-used-prioritizing-participants-receive-travel-assistance-attend-meetings>)

✓	Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ²²	Term expires
✓	Latin America & Caribbean Member SC-7	Mr Alexandre MOREIRA PALMA Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Supply Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco D Anexo B, Sala 326 Brasilia DF 70043900 BRAZIL Tel: (+55) 61 3218 2850	alexandre.palma@agricultura.gov.br ;	CPM-7(2012) 1st term / 3 years	2015
	Near East Member SC-7	Mr Gamil Anwar Mohammed RAMADHAN Head of Plant Quarantine Department (Director) General Department of Plant Protection Department Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation Sana'a REPUBLIC OF YEMEN Tel: 0096701563328 (Office) 00967733802618 (Mobile) 00967770712209 (Mobile)	dr.gamel_ramadan@yahoo.com ; Anvar.gamel@mail.ru ;	CPM-8(2013) 1st term/3 years (2)	2016
✓	North America Member SC-7	Ms Marie-Claude FOREST National Manager and International Standards Advisor Plant Biosecurity and Forestry Division Import, Export and Technical Standards Section Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0Y9 CANADA Tel: (+1) 613-773-7235 Fax: (+1) 613-773-7204	marie-claude.forest@inspection.gc.ca ;	CPM-3 (2008) CPM-6 (2011) 2 nd term / 3 years (0)	2014
✓	Pacific Member SC-7	Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL Director International Plant Health Program Office of the Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5056 / 0408625413 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 5835	Bart.Rossel@agriculture.gov.au	CPM-6 (2011) CPM-9 (2014) 2nd term / 3 years	2017

Others

	Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Steward	Ms Julie ALIAGA ²³ Program Director, International Standards Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, Unit 140 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Tel: (+1) 301 851 2032 Fax: (+1) 301 734 7639	julie.e.aliaga@aphis.usda.gov
✓	Assistant Steward (Latin America and Caribbean SC member)	Mr Ezequiel FERRO Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av. Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires ARGENTINA Tel/Fax : (+5411) 4121-5091	eferro@senasa.gov.ar ;
✓	Near East Member (SC member and SC-7 representative for this meeting)	Mr Kamaleldin Abdelmahmoud Amein BAKR Quarantine Director Plant Quarantine Department Direction Khartoum North, Industrial Area P.O.BOX 14 SUDAN Phone: +249 913207800 Fax: +249 185 337462	kamalbakr91@yahoo.com ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON Standard Setting Officer International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome ITALY Tel: + 39 06 570 55809	Brent.Larson@fao.org
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standard Setting Programme Specialist International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome ITALY Tel: + 39 06 570 55 809	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org

²³ Via conference call

✓	IPPC Secretariat	<p>Ms Stephanie DUBON Standard Setting IPS Deputy Technical Director Plant Protection and Quarantine Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road Riverdal, MD 20737 UNITED STATES</p>	<p>Stephanie.Dubon@fao.org ; stephanie.m.dubon@aphis.usda.gov</p>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<p>Ms Eva MOLLER Standard Setting International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome ITALY Tel: + 39 06 570 52855</p>	<p>Eva.Moller@fao.org</p>
✓	IPPC Secretariat	<p>Ms Céline GERMAIN Standard Setting International Plant Protection Convention Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome ITALY Tel: + 39 06 570 54468</p>	<p>Celine.Germain@fao.org</p>