



REPORT

Rome, Italy
16-20 May 2016

Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7) May, 2016



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way. All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	4
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat.....	4
1.2	Election of the Chairperson	4
1.3	Election of the Rapporteur.....	4
1.4	Adoption of the Agenda.....	4
2.	Administrative Matters.....	4
2.1	Documents list	4
2.3	Participants list.....	4
2.4	Local information	4
3.	Updates from the Standards Committee meeting.....	4
4.	Review of Draft ISPMs	4
4.1	<i>International movement of seeds</i> (2009-003), Priority 1	5
4.2	Draft revisions to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) – Annex 1 and 2 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B), Priority 2	7
4.3	<i>International movement of vehicles, machinery and equipment</i> (2006-004), Priority 3	9
4.4	Draft Appendix <i>Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country</i> to ISPM 20 (2005-003), Priority 3.....	12
5.	Other business	14
6.	Close of the meeting.....	14

APPENDICES

Appendix 01 - Agenda	15
Appendix 02 - Documents List	17
Appendix 03 - 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.

1.2 Election of the Chairperson

- [2] Mr Nico HORN (The Netherlands) was elected as Chairperson. Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) would act as Chairperson during the discussion on the draft standard on International movement of seeds (2009-003).

1.3 Election of the Rapporteur

- [3] Mr John HEDLEY (New Zealand) was elected as Rapporteur.

1.4 Adoption of the Agenda

- [4] The Standards Committee working group (SC-7) adopted the agenda as presented in Appendix 1.

2. Administrative Matters

2.1 Documents list

- [5] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter “Secretariat”) introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2).

2.3 Participants list

- [6] 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).

2.4 Local information

- [7] 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

- [8] The Chairperson gave a brief summary of the 2016 May meeting¹.

4. Review of Draft ISPMs

- [9] The SC-7 reviewed the draft ISPMs that had been submitted for consultation, July-September 2015, as well as the draft ISPM on the *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) and the draft ISPM on *International movement of vehicles, machinery and equipment* (2006-004), which had been submitted to consultation in 2014. The compiled consultation comments for all the draft ISPMs are available on the IPP².

¹ 2016 May SC meeting report : <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82530/>

² Compiled comments from first consultation (previously “member consultation” are available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/compiled-member-comments-draft-standards/>

4.1 *International movement of seeds (2009-003), Priority 1*

- [10] The Steward (Mr Nico HORN, The Netherlands) introduced the draft ISPM on the *International movement of seeds (2009-003)*³, the responses to consultation comments⁴, the TPG review⁵ and the Steward's notes⁶. He recalled that the draft had already been discussed by the SC-7 at the 2015 May meeting⁷, following the 2014 member consultation⁸. However, the SC-7 did not recommend it for the Substantial concerns commenting period then because the SC-7 could not complete the revision of the draft during the May 2015 meeting, due to time constraints and to the large number of concepts and comments to be addressed. The draft was therefore returned to the Steward and Assistant steward for further review of the comments and subsequently to the 2015 November SC for further discussion on specific conceptual issues.
- [11] The Steward guided the SC-7 in their discussion on the reviewed draft, noting that most comments were addressed and incorporated in the draft and that, in general, the text had been revised for a better flow and consistent terminology. The layout had been adjusted to allow for a more logical flow and to avoid duplication in the various sections of the draft. The text had been improved for consistency in the terms used and in some cases, some content had been deleted as the SC-7 (2015) felt the information was covered elsewhere, e.g. in other ISPMs.
- [12] The SC-7 discussed the following main points:
- [13] **Scope.** The SC-7 noted that a revised definition for “seeds (as a commodity class)” has been adopted by CPM-11 (2016) and the draft was adjusted accordingly.
- [14] The wording related to seeds for planting under restrictive conditions was removed as it was considered superfluous. One SC-7 member pointed out it was important to keep the wording indicating that grains were excluded from this standard for clarification and to avoid confusion. The SC-7 agreed to clarify and simplify the text, and added wording on what the standard does not apply to for improved comprehension by NPPOs.
- [15] **Outline of requirements.** The SC -7 revised the text to reflect changes made to the main text in response to consultation comments and the discussions during this meeting.
- [16] **Definitions.** The SC-7 had extensive discussion on the definitions for “seed-borne” and “seed-transmitted”. The SC-7 agreed that the important concept was that ‘seed-borne’ is a broader category (*may* or *may not* be seed-transmitted) and “seed-transmitted” is a narrower category (*will* be transmitted to resultant plants). The SC-7 felt the concept was clear but that the wording needed to be further improved. The SC-7 discussed the TPG proposals, agreed to them and revised the text accordingly. One member suggested adding a diagram, but the SC-7 was reminded that the draft had previously had a diagram but that the SC had decided not to keep it. The SC-7 felt that the definitions and the revised draft overall were clearer and that a diagram would not increase comprehension of the standard.
- [17] **Background.** The SC-7 streamlined and shortened the text to avoid redundancy and repetitions with other sections of the standard. The SC-7 discussed the need to keep the concepts on challenges that are

³ 2009-003

⁴ 05_SC7_2016_May

⁵ 10_SC7_2016_May

⁶ 04_SC7_2016_May

⁷ 2015-05 Report of the Standards Committee Working Group (SC-7):

<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81198/>

⁸ 2014 Compiled comments - Draft ISPM on *International movement of seeds (2009-003)*:

<https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/2656/>

not specifically related to seeds but could be applicable to any commodity. Consequently, the SC-7 modified this section so that it related principally to seed-specific elements.

[18] **Pest risk analysis.** The SC-7 adjusted the text to include the concept that seeds may be potential pests, and to improve consistency with other standards.

[19] **Seeds as pathways.** The SC-7 had extensive discussion on the use of the word “pathway”, particularly whether it was used strictly in its ISPM 5 definition or also referred to establishment.

[20] To facilitate discussion, the Steward presented a text proposal intended to clarify the concepts of seed-transmission and establishment. The purpose was to clarify that in a PRA for seeds as a pathway, the aspect of transfer to a suitable host would need special attention.

The SC-7 discussed the proposal and in particular:

- The need to clarify the understanding of “seeds as pathways” and consider if it is the right term to use in the draft. In this context, the SC-7 agreed that the concept of “pest transfer to a suitable host” would help clarify “seeds as pathways”.
- That while ‘seed-borne pests’ are associated with a suitable host upon entry, some pests may infest the host when the seed is planted while others may not.
- That categorization of seed-borne pests would be helpful guidance to NPPOs when developing a PRA and determining whether a pest was seed-transmitted or seed-borne. The SC-7 agreed on categories reflecting the most common situations (seed-transmitted pests that are carried internally or externally by the seed, non-seed transmitted pests that are carried by the seed and are transferred to the environment and then infect a host, and those pests carried by the seed which do not transfer to a host). The SC-7 added guidance regarding the impact of these categories on a PRA and included pest-specific examples for each category.

[21] **Purpose of import.** The SC-7 adjusted the section to include the various possible purposes of seeds imports such as seeds for laboratory testing or destructive analysis, seeds for planting under quarantine conditions and seeds for planting under field conditions.

[22] **Seeds for laboratory testing or destructive analysis.** Several consultation comments had questioned the inclusion of seeds with no potential to germinate or generate plants as this was not consistent with the ISPM 5 definition for “seeds (as a commodity class)”. The text was simplified and information on “devalitized seeds” was removed as these seeds, and those with no potential to germinate, are not covered in the ISPM 5 definition. However, the SC-7 agreed that it was useful to have some guidance for seeds for laboratory testing or destructive analysis so the title of this section and the text was modified accordingly.

[23] **Seeds for planting under quarantine conditions.** The text was simplified and the wording was adjusted to improve consistency in the terms used.

[24] **Seeds for planting under field conditions.** The text was simplified, and the SC-7 agreed to use “regulated pests” instead of “regulated non-quarantine pests (RNQPs)” as this term covers both “quarantine pests” and “RNQPs”. The SC-7 also adjusted the text to highlight that the NPPO may require phytosanitary measures proportionate with the pest risk.

[25] **Mixing and blending of seeds.** The text, which was initially included under a different section of the draft, was clarified in particular in relation to seeds from various origins and different harvest years. The SC-7 also adjusted the wording relating to traceability of the mixture or blend because the SC-7 agreed that all mixtures and blends should be traceable.

[26] **Pest risk management in seed production.** The text, which was initially included in a different section of the draft, was modified to enhance clarity and reflect that common practices in the seed production may contribute to reduce the pest risk and should be considered when assessing pest risk management options. The decision to include this text earlier in the draft was made to improve the flow and organization of the draft.

- [27] **Resistant varieties.** The SC-7 agreed to reword the text to capture the concept that an importing country may consider resistance to pests as an option for pest risk management, either as a phytosanitary measure or in combination with other measures.
- [28] **Seed treatments.** The SC-7 agreed on including this section in the body of the draft to ensure a better flow, instead of keeping it as an annex as initially proposed.
- [29] **Pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence, pest free places of production and, pest free production sites and areas of low pest prevalence.** The SC-7 agreed to differentiate pest free areas, areas of low pest prevalence and pest free places of production from areas of low pest prevalence by adding a specific sentence indicating that areas of low pest prevalence may be used alone or in combination with other phytosanitary measures in a systems approach.
- [30] **Record keeping.** The SC-7 clarified the wording on what sort of information should be kept.
- [31] **Appendix 1.** The SC-7 agreed on renaming it *Guidance on the likelihood of pest groups being introduced with seeds*. The SC-7 re-organized the layout for enhanced clarity and better flow.
- [32] **Annex 2 on Forest tree seeds.** It was noted that this annex was currently under development by the TPFQ.⁹
- [33] The SC-7 thanked the Steward for all his work on the draft standard. The SC-7 also expressed thanks to the Assistant steward and to the former Steward.

The SC-7:

- (1) *approved* the draft ISPM *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) to be submitted to the second consultation period.
- (2) *invited* the SC consider recommending the draft ISPM *International movement of seeds* (2009-003) to the CPM for adoption.

4.2 Draft revisions to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) – Annex 1 and 2 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B), Priority 2

- [34] The Secretariat introduced the draft revision to Annex 1 to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*)¹⁰ in the absence of the former Steward (Mr Piotr WLODARCZYK, Poland). He also introduced the Steward's responses to comments from the 2015 consultation period highlighting that only 85 comments had been submitted¹¹, the TPG review¹² and the Steward's notes¹³. The draft comprised the change of some provisions relating to the dielectric heating (DH) treatment and the introduction of the fumigation of wood packaging material (WPM) with sulfuryl fluoride (SF) as an approved treatment. The SC-7 noted the comments submitted in relation to implementation of the sulfuryl fluoride treatment related to providing more consistency between the provisions for both fumigants (methyl bromide and SF).

⁹ The TPFQ since informed the Secretariat that the TPFQ proposed to incorporate text on forest tree seeds into the draft ISPM instead of proposing a separate annex.

¹⁰ 2006-010A and 2006-010B

¹¹ 14_SC7_2016_May; compiled comments: 2006-010A and B: Draft revisions to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade): <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/82624/>

¹² 13_SC7_2016_May

¹³ 12_SC7_2016_May

- [35] The current Steward (Marina ZLOTINA, United States) led the discussions on the draft standard.
- [36] The SC-7 discussed two issues, raised in the consultation comments that had been pointed out by the former Steward as requiring further discussion: The efficacy of the SF treatment at different temperatures and different concentrations, and the method to calculate the concentration-time (CT) values.
- [37] Regarding ISPM 15 treatments, the SC-7 noted that, the Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT) is mandated to analyze the data in accordance with ISPM 28 (*Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*) while the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine (TPFQ) was to provide advice on the feasibility and applicability of treatments proposed for inclusion in ISPM 15. The SC-7 noted that the TPPT advice might have been useful in addressing some member comments on efficacy of the treatments and the proposed schedules.
- [38] It was noted that two annexes to ISPM 28 on SF treatments had been submitted to the consultation period in 2015 (Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of insects in debarked wood (2007-101A) and Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of nematodes and insects in debarked wood (2007-101B)) and that the TPPT was currently reviewing member comments on these drafts. It was recalled that these draft annexes to ISPM 28 apply to wood while the draft under revision by the SC-7 applies only to WPM.
- [39] The SC-7 had a lengthy discussion on the technical nature of some comments, related to efficacy of the treatments and the proposed schedules. In particular in relation to the SF treatment and the discrepancy among the results of various studies. Some SC-7 members did not feel they had the necessary technical expertise to decide on these issues.
- [40] The SC-7 discussed the option to send the draft for consultation knowing that there still remained some unresolved issues and seek comments, or to seek further advice from the TPPT, which would delay the draft. The SC-7 agreed that the TPPT would have the technical expertise and knowledge required to consider the issues and requested the Secretariat to seek their advice on some comments.
- [41] The SC-7 discussed the overall issue of how it should proceed in the future when technical questions arise in preparation for the meeting and the Secretariat reminded the SC-7 members that they are encouraged to seek technical advice in advance of meetings.

The SC-7 discussed the following specific consultation comments and issues raised during this meeting:

- Calculation of CT for a particular treatment. The SC-7 pointed out that this comment was addressed in footnote 4 in the draft standard, which stipulates that “the CT utilized for methyl bromide and sulfuryl fluoride treatments in this standard is the sum of the products of the concentration (g/m³) and time (h) over the duration of the treatment.”
- **The minimum concentration of SF.** Some consultation comments queried the fact that the minimum concentration of SF after 0.5 hour was higher than the initial dosage, as stated in Table 4 of the draft standard, because this seemed unexpected. One member presented additional information received from an expert and clarified that the higher concentration of SF after 0.5 hour can be explained by the fact that the initial dosage of SF is calculated on the total volume contained in the closed chamber, which contains air and WPM. In contrast, the minimum concentration after 0.5 hour is measured on the volume of air in the chamber, which is the difference between the total volume of the chamber and the volume of WPM. The volume of air is therefore smaller than the total volume of the chamber and the relative concentration of SF is higher in the air. As expected, the minimum concentration of SF decreases with time, as the SF diffuses in the WPM.
- **Additional references to support Table 4 data.** Some consultation comments had requested additional references related to the data included in the table. While the SC-7 considered that adding references is not essential as the table only contained dosage examples, the SC-7 felt that might be helpful in this case to add more information on how these data were obtained. The SC-7 agreed to request the TPPT for their assistance in this regard.

The SC-7:

- (3) *requested* the Secretariat to present the draft ISPM on revisions to ISPM 15 (*Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade*) – Annex 1 and 2 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B), the compiled comments and the SC-7 document on Steward’s responses to the TPPT for further assessment of key issues raised during the consultation period. Once completed, the assessment of the TPPT along with their advice should be forwarded to the Steward with the intent of submitting it to the Secretariat in time for the May 2017 SC-7 meeting.

4.3 *International movement of vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004), Priority 3*

[42] The Steward (Mr Alvaro SEPULVEDA LUQUE, Chile) introduced the draft standard¹⁴ and provided background on the major development stages. He also introduced the Steward’s responses to comments from 2014 consultation period¹⁵, the TPG review¹⁶ and the Steward’s notes¹⁷. He outlined the key points raised during the consultation period and pointed out that the initial review of these documents had been done by the former Steward.

The SC-7 discussed the following general points:

- The Steward suggested using the abbreviation “VME” for “vehicles, machinery and equipment” based on some consultation comments to improve the flow of the text. The SC-7 agreed.
- Some consultation comments suggested expanding the scope of the standard to include new VME in addition to used VME. The SC-7 recognized that new VME also represent risks of carrying soil, pests, plant debris and seeds when they are moved internationally. The SC-7 agreed to include new VME to the draft standard. The scope, the background and the rest of the draft was revised accordingly. The SC-7 included information to reflect that the contamination of new VME is more prone to happen during the storage prior to the international movement and that these risks will be defined mostly by the storage conditions.
- Some consultation comments pointed out that it is acknowledged that there are some pest risks related to the movement of VME, that this pest risk is sufficient to justify the implementation of phytosanitary measures, and that it is not practical to undergo a PRA for this import pathway. Therefore, the draft standard should not refer to PRA and to the ISPMs related to PRA. The draft standard was revised to reflect this comment.
- The SC-7 discussed the appendix related to military VME in light of the consultation comments to the effect that the pest risk would be the same for military VME as for other VME. The SC-7 was reminded that the SC discussed this issue at the November 2015 meeting and that it was agreed that this appendix would contribute to facilitate communication with military authorities and help increase compliance with the standard. The SC-7 also discussed the nature of this part of the draft, i.e. if it should remain an appendix or become an annex. While making it an annex would raise its importance, it was pointed out that the information was meant as guidance for military authorities and not directed at NPPOs. The SC-7 agreed to keep it as an appendix.
- One SC-7 member commented that there is a lot of similarities between this draft standard and the draft standard on Sea containers, including the fact that it is a pathway and that compliance is industry-driven, and that the SC-7 should consider following the same structure. The SC-7 discussed this, recognizing that there are indeed similarities. The Chairperson proposed to keep this comment in mind as the SC-7 members proceeded with the revision of the draft.

¹⁴ 2006-004

¹⁵ 06_SC7_2016_May

¹⁶ 08_SC7_2016_May

¹⁷ 07_SC7_2016_May

- The order of the appendixes was revised to reflect the discussion of the SC-7.

[43] The Steward guided the SC-7 through the draft standard:

[44] **Scope.** One consultation comment suggested that the scope of the standard should not exclude VME moving under their own motive power as they also pose sufficient risk. One SC-7 member stressed that if these VME would be included, the standard would have a very broad scope and apply to any car or truck moved across border, and it would be difficult to implement. The SC-7 recognized that the concerns were related to those VME involved in agriculture and forestry activities, which was mentioned in the scope and that VME used for personal voyages (e.g. tourist bus) would therefore not be targeted. The SC-7 decided to keep the restriction excluding VME moving under their own motive power, noting that the draft standard would only cover those VME that are being moved. Additionally, the SC-7 recognized that VME moving under their own motive power, which would be involved in agriculture or forestry activities, would in general move over short distances and, if they were crossing the border, the pest risks would be similar close to the border.

[45] Some consultation comments suggested including VME utilized for industrial purposes to the draft standard and the SC-7 agreed on adding it, without further specifying which industrial purposes as the SC-7 felt it was clear.

[46] **Outline of requirements.** This section was revised to reflect the changes made to the main text as a result of the discussions and elements agreed to by the SC-7 during their revision of the draft. The flow of the text was also improved to facilitate reading.

[47] **Impact on biodiversity and the environment.** One SC-7 member raised concerns about specifying that “organisms other than quarantine pests” may be prevented from entry into new areas by decontaminating VME, as the IPPC would only regulate quarantine pests. His concern was mostly related to using “quarantine pests” as opposed to “pests”. The SC-7 discussed this, referring to consultation comments, and agreed that the intent of this section is broad and that it should be clear to NPPOs that the implementation of the standard may prevent the entry of organisms other than those of quarantine significance. Then, the wording was kept as proposed by the Steward.

[48] **Pest risks.** The SC-7 agreed on adding wording related to new VME and their potential contamination during storage. One SC-7 member also suggested to replace “plants for planting” by “plant parts capable of propagation”, referring to some consultation comments and highlighting that the intended use of the plants in this case is not for planting, but that the risk is related to the capacity of these plant parts to propagate. The SC-7 agreed to revise the wording.

[49] **Element of pest risk categorization.** The SC-7 removed the references to the ISPMs on PRA because the risks related to VME are generally recognized and this is sufficient to justify the application of phytosanitary measures. Therefore, guidance on PRA was not felt useful and practical in this draft standard.

[50] **Phytosanitary measures and phytosanitary procedures.** The SC-7 revised this section to reflect some consultation comments and the TPG recommendation, clarifying that this section refers to both phytosanitary measures and phytosanitary procedures. The whole section was re-organized to provide a better flow and to better distinguish between the four main groups of procedures and measures, which were described in detail in another section of the standard. Consistency was also improved throughout the section to reflect some consultation comments (e.g. using “cleaning and treatments” as opposed to “decontamination and disinfection”). Besides, a sentence was added to cover the issue of new VME and to indicate that, based on evidence of interceptions of pests in new VME, the NPPO of the importing country may require measures related to the prevention of contamination in the exporting country.

[51] For improved consistency with other ISPMs, the SC-7 agreed to use of “importing country” instead of “country of destination” throughout the document.

- [52] **Verification procedures.** The SC-7 revised the wording related to NPPOs of exporting countries that may authorize entities for the cleaning and treatment of VME, agreeing that the new wording covered NPPO oversight activities.
- [53] **Non-compliance and phytosanitary actions.** The SC-7 discussed the use of the term “emergency actions” and agreed to replace it by “phytosanitary actions” pointing out that the draft standard does not intend to address “emergency actions” and that “phytosanitary actions” was therefore the correct term to use.
- [54] **Appendix on “Examples of pests that may contaminate VME”.** One consultation comment had suggested deleting this appendix pointing out it was neither exhaustive nor very indicative, and therefore not useful for NPPOs. The SC-7 discussed this, recognizing that it may be difficult to write an exhaustive list of pests, but also finding that it would be useful information for NPPOs in showing the range of pests that could contaminate VME. The SC-7 agreed to keep the appendix, keeping in mind that the intent was not to be exhaustive but rather to provide some guidance.
- [55] The SC-7 discussed the various examples provided in the appendix and made changes to provide better guidance. The SC-7 noted that there is some information available on the movement of the beet necrotic yellow vein virus on machinery in Europe. The SC-7 discussed the example of *Fusarium oxysporum* and agreed to keep it to the species level as going further could give misleading information that only a particular race could be moved by VME. The SC-7 agreed on the addition of a termite species for which there is proof that it has been introduced via machinery. The SC-7 also discussed the consultation comments questioning some of the examples included in the appendix. The SC-7 agreed that these examples were carefully selected by the experts who developed the standard, and had been taken from a study on the pest risks associated with used equipment, which was conducted by New Zealand. The SC-7 agreed to keep the list as provided by the experts, unless proof was provided against the inclusion of some organisms.
- [56] **Appendix on “Examples of VME, ranked in order of decreasing pest risk together with examples of possible phytosanitary measures and verification procedures”.** In line with the inclusion of new VME in the draft, the SC-7 discussed how this could be reflected in the table of the appendix. One member pointed out that most examples provided in the table were related to used VME. It was proposed that a new row for “New VME” be added to the table, indicating that the “pest risk is variable, but generally low, depending on storage conditions”.
- [57] The table was revised for consistency with the rest of the draft and some elements were clarified for a better understanding (e.g. rimless tires was changed to un-mounted tires). The SC-7 discussed the quantification of the level of risk with respect to comments submitted by some member countries. The SC-7 felt that by removing the level of risk, NPPOs would lose useful information. The SC-7 was reminded of the lengthy discussion among the EWG when they developed the draft and decided to include information about the risk ranking. The SC-7 agreed on the usefulness of this information and concluded that the title of this appendix should include the concept of risk ranking.
- [58] **Appendix on “Guidance for the international movement of military VME”.** The SC-7 discussed the inclusion of new VME in the appendix, and agreed to include it for consistency with the rest of the standard.
- [59] Some consultation comments had proposed the addition of a new section describing the roles of NPPOs in the exporting and importing countries, pointing out that in some cases, the NPPO of the exporting country is not involved in the process and that several provisions included in the standards do not require the NPPO to be involved. The SC-7 noted this proposal and agreed that such information is not necessary as this section is an appendix and therefore not a prescriptive part of the standard.
- [60] Some consultation comments queried the relevance of including detailed examples of military movements and transport in the appendix, as it would seem unnecessary to specify in an ISPM all types

of movements the military may be undertaking. The SC-7 agreed on this comment. They clarified the objective of the appendix, which is that military VME are free from soil, pests, plant debris and seeds before they are moved internationally, and added only broad examples of movements (e.g. training, missions and deployment) to the text.

[61] Some consultation comments had proposed to remove the reference to ISPM 15 because they felt it was out of scope of this draft ISPM. However, the SC-7 agreed to retain the reference as they considered it was specifically relevant for military authorities.

[62] The overall appendix was revised for consistency with the rest of the draft standard. For instance, additional examples of cleaning methods were added to reflect the content of the body of the text. The structure of the appendix was also revised to improve the flow and keep what was felt as essential, considering this intends to provide guidance to military authorities.

[63] The SC-7:

(4) *approved* the draft to be submitted to the second consultation period.

(5) *invited* the SC to consider recommending the draft ISPM *International movement of vehicles, machinery and equipment* (2006-004) to the CPM for adoption.

4.4 Draft Appendix Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country to ISPM 20 (2005-003), Priority 3

[64] The Steward (Mr Ezequiel FERRO, Argentina) introduced the Steward's responses to comments from 2015 consultation period¹⁸, the TPG review¹⁹ and the Steward's notes²⁰. He outlined the main points and comments received on the draft standard, as per the document prepared by the former Steward. A total of 394 comments had been submitted and most of them had been incorporated in the draft presented to the SC-7. Some of the main issues raised through consultation were related to the layout, the nature (appendix, annex or supplement), and the scope of the document.

[65] The SC-7 discussed the following general points:

[66] **Nature of the document.** The SC-7 discussed whether the draft should become a prescriptive part of ISPM 20, either an annex (adding technical information) or as a supplement (adding conceptual information), or if it should remain as an appendix. The Steward reminded the SC-7 that the SC in its May 2015 meeting had decided that "due to the voluntary nature of the arrangements, the draft should be considered an appendix to ISPM 20". Some SC-7 members felt that this guidance was already broadly used by countries and this guidance would be used on a voluntary basis. However, if used, the countries agree on using arrangements as described. For these reasons, they were in favor of an annex.. They felt that changing the document to an annex would provide more prescriptive guidance. The SC-7 agreed that the draft should be an annex although it was pointed out that the draft does not harmonize phytosanitary measures but focuses on trade logistics, which means it provides additional practical guidance and therefore could be an appendix.

Scope of document and layout. The SC-7 agreed with the remarks of former Steward, in particular:

- **Layout:** The text was revised to provide a clear and logical flow, improving the overall quality of the document. For instance, the information related to the initiation of arrangements and the criteria to establish them were included earlier in the draft, greatly improving the flow and facilitating the understanding of the text.
- **Scope:** Some consultation comments stressed that the draft was related to arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country

¹⁸ 09_SC7_2016_May

¹⁹ 11_SC7_2016_May

²⁰ 15_SC7_2016_May

and not to audits of procedures in the exporting country. The SC-7 agreed and revised the draft to reflect this.

- [67] The Steward guided the SC-7 throughout the draft and the SC-7 discussed the following elements:
- [68] **Adding the term “clearance” in the title.** The SC-7 considered the consultation comment suggesting to add “clearance” in the title but pointed out that clearance is a process happening in the importing country and not in the exporting country. Therefore, the SC-7 agreed to keep the title as was, not including the term “clearance”.
- [69] **Adding wording related to the prevention of the introduction of regulated pests as a purpose of establishing arrangements between importing and exporting countries.** This was proposed by a consultation comment as an addition to the purpose of facilitating trade logistics. Some SC-7 members argued the primary reason for this kind of arrangements was to facilitate trade, while others argued that as the IPPC aims at preventing pest spread, the proposed wording should be included. It was noted that this issue had been discussed in depth in previous occasions with the conclusion that the focus of this draft should be on facilitation of trade logistics and not on phytosanitary measures. The SC-7 agreed that verification performed in the exporting country is done to facilitate trade. Therefore, the SC-7 agreed not to include the proposed additional wording. In line with this discussion, the SC-7 agreed to add wording to clarify that the arrangements described in the draft should not be established as part of pest risk management.
- [70] **Proposed deletion of wording on release of a consignment at destination.** One SC-7 member disagreed on the consultation comment proposal to delete this wording, feeling that it was one of the rationales for this draft. Another SC-7 member pointed out that in ISPM 20 “preclearance” is listed as a phytosanitary measure, but commented that this draft intended to stay away from using the term “preclearance”. It was pointed out that release of a consignment at destination is part of the continuum of trade logistics. The SC-7 revised the wording by adding that the expedited release of a shipment is an example of a situation that can be addressed by establishing an arrangement.
- [71] **Terms for particular articles.** The SC-7 discussed some consultation comments proposing to delete some text related to the terms of the arrangement for particular articles, which should be developed once the PRA is completed. The SC-7 considered that the concepts included in this section were important and should be kept. The SC-7 also agreed that the key idea was not that the arrangement should be based on a PRA, but that the phytosanitary measures should be, and revised the text to capture this.
- [72] **General requirements for an arrangement.** The SC-7 revised the text to reflect consultation comments and to include examples of reasons where the importing country’s NPPO may undertake additional checks on a consignment. The SC-7 agreed to focus on examples that relate to verifications for phytosanitary purposes, but added a statement on verifications and checks for purposes outside of the phytosanitary context, such as food safety.
- [73] **Proposal.** The text was streamlined to reflect that a request for an arrangement may be initiated by the NPPO of the exporting or importing country and that it should identify the scope and reasons for the arrangement, which should be agreed by both NPPOs. This section was also revised to include other factors that may be considered in the proposal.
- [74] **Evaluation.** The text was adjusted to improve consistency with the rest of the draft. The SC-7 discussed including the concept that the evaluation should encompass pest risk concerns (with respect to the previous discussion related to the fact that pest risks are not the focus of these arrangements). The SC-7 considered that while the focus is on facilitation of trade logistics, the effect of arrangements on pest risk concerns should still be considered; some wording was added to reflect this.
- [75] **Elements of an arrangement.** The SC-7 discussed the wording related to approval procedures for growers and exporters participating in the arrangement. The SC-7 concluded that the intent was to have access to the approval procedures rather than a list of approved growers and exporters. Keeping in mind

that this section includes elements which may be included in an arrangement, the SC-7 agreed on key elements, while recognizing that other elements may be included depending on the specific arrangement.

- [76] **Implementation of an arrangement.** The SC-7 agreed on adding a note to clarify that the activities should be limited to those agreed under the arrangement.
- [77] **Review of an arrangement.** The SC-7 agreed on clarifying that a revision could be proposed by either of the NPPOs and would require the agreement of both NPPOs before any changes were to be implemented.
- [78] **Termination of an arrangement.** The SC-7 adjusted the text to clarify that once an arrangement has terminated, verification procedures would be conducted in the importing country.

The SC-7:

- (6) *recommended* the draft to be submitted to the second consultation period.
- (7) *Invited* the SC to consider recommending the draft *Annex Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country* to ISPM 20 (2005-003) to the CPM for adoption.

5. Other business

- [79] There was no other business.

6. Close of the meeting

- [80] The IPPC Standards Officer thanked the participants for their work. The SC-7 members were reminded on the importance of arriving fully prepared with suggestions of wording and recommendations to improve the drafts so as not to delay drafts more than necessary. He also thanked the Chairperson as well as Mr Ezequiel FERRO (Argentina) for acting as Chairperson during the discussion on the draft on *International movement of seeds*. Lastly, he thanked the Rapporteur for his work, as well as the report writer, acknowledging Canada's in-kind contribution.
- [81] The Chairperson thanked the participants for the fruitful discussion and closed the meeting.

Appendix 01 - Agenda

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_2016_May	MOREIRA
2. Administrative Matters		
2.1 Documents List	02_SC7_2016_May	MOREIRA
2.2 Participants List	03_SC7_2016_May	MOREIRA
2.3 Local Information (refer to the 2016 May SC Local Information document)	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: Nico HORN	2009-003	HORN
- Assistant Steward: Ezequiel FERRO		
• Steward's Responses to Comments from 2014 Member Consultation and to TPG review	05_SC7_2016_May	
• Steward's additional notes	04_SC7_2016_May	
• TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency	10_SC7_2016_May	
4.2 Draft revisions to ISPM 15 (Regulation of wood packaging material in international trade) - Annex 1 and 2 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B), Priority 2		
- Steward: Marina ZLOTINA Assistant Stewards: Ezequiel FERRO	2006-010A and 2006-010B	LARSON
• Steward's Responses to Comments from 2015 Member Consultation and to TPG review	14_SC7_2016_May	
• Steward's additional notes	12_SC7_2016_May	
• TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency	13_SC7_2016_May	
4.3 International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004), Priority 3		
- Steward: Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE	2006-004	LUQUE
- Assistant Steward: Pere KOKOA		
• Steward's Responses to Comments from 2014 Member Consultation and to TPG review	06_SC7_2016_May	
• Steward's additional notes	07_SC7_2016_May	

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency 	08_SC7_2016_May	
<p>4.4 Appendix 1 to ISPM 20: Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003), Priority 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steward: Ezequiel FERRO Assistant Stewards: Stephen BUTCHER and Ana Lilia MONTEALEGRE Steward's Responses to Comments from 2015 Member Consultation and to TPG review Steward's additional notes TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency 	<p>2005-003</p> <p>09_SC7_2016_May</p> <p>15_SC7_2016_May</p> <p>11_SC7_2016_May</p>	FERRO
5. Other business		CHAIRPERSON
6. Close of the meeting		CHAIRPERSON

Appendix 02 - Documents List

DOCUMENT NUMBER	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	DATE POSTED
01_SC7_2016_May	1.4	Agenda	2016-03-23
02_SC7_2016_May	2.1	Documents List	2016-03-23
03_SC7_2016_May	2.2	Participants List	2016-05-05
2009-003	4.1	International movement of seeds (2009-003)	2016-02-26
10_SC7_2016_May	4.1	TPG recommendations on member comments on terms and consistency (2009-003)	2016-02-26
04_SC7_2016_May	4.1	Stewards Additional Notes: International movement of seeds (2009-003)	2016-02-26
05_SC7_2016_May	4.1	Compiled comments with steward's responses: International movement of seeds (2009-003)	2016-02-26
2006-010A&B	4.2	Annex 1 and 2 for inclusion of the phytosanitary treatment Sulphuryl fluoride fumigation of wood packaging material (2006-010A) and the revision of the dielectric heating section in Annex 1 of ISPM 15 (2006-010B)	2016-02-29
12_SC7_2015_May	4.2	Steward's additional notes to 2006-010A&B	2016-02-29
13_SC7_2015_May	4.2	TPG review of member comments on terms and consistency for 2006-010A&B	2016-02-29
14_SC7_2015_May	4.2	Steward's Responses to Comments from 2015 Member Consultation and to TPG review on 2006-010A&B	2016-02-29
2006-004	4.3	International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment	2016-02-26
07_SC7_2016_May	4.3	Stewards notes: Draft ISPM on International movement of used vehicles, machinery and equipment (2006-004)	2016-02-26
06_SC7_2016_May	4.3	Compiled comments with steward's responses: International movement of used vehicles ,machinery and equipment (2006-004)	2016-02-26
08_SC7_2016_May	4.3	TPG recommendations on compiled comments on terms and consistency for: International movement of used vehicles ,machinery and equipment (2006-004)	2016-02-26
2005-003	4.4	Draft Appendix to ISPM 20 – Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003)	2016-02-26
09_SC7_2016_May	4.4	Compiled comments with steward's responses : Draft Appendix to ISPM 20 – Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003)	2016-02-26
11_SC7_2016_May	4.4	TPG recommendations on compiled comments on terms and consistency for Draft Appendix to ISPM 20 – Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003)	2016-02-26
15_SC7_2016_May	4.4	Draft Annex to ISPM 20 – Arrangements for verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country (2005-003) – Steward's summary of comments	2016-03-23

Appendix 03 - Participants List

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ²¹	Term expires
Africa Member SC 7	Ms Esther KIMANI General Manager, Phytosanitary Services Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service- KEPHIS P.O. BOX 49592-00100, Nairobi KENYA Tel: (+254) 3597201/2/3, Mobile: (+254) 0722 226 239	ekimani@kephis.org ; ekimaniw@gmail.com	CPM-9 (2014) 1st term / 3 years (2)	2017
Asia Member SC-7	Ms Thanh Huong HA Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine Division, Plant Protection Department 149 Ho Dac Di Street Dong Da district Hanoi City VIET NAM Tel: (+844) 35331033 Fax: (+844) 35330043	ppdhuong@yahoo.com ; ppdhuong@gmail.com ;	CPM-10 (2015) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2018
Europe Member SC-7	Mr Nicolaas Maria HORN Senior Officer Plant Health, Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA) Division Plant and Nature National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) P.O. Box 9102 6700 HC Wageningen THE NETHERLANDS Phone: (+31) 651998151	n.m.horn@minlnv.nl	CPM-9 (2014) 1st term/3 years (0)	2017
Latin America and Caribbean Member SC-7	Mr Ezequiel FERRO Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal - SENASA Av, Paeso Colón 315 C.A. de Buenos Aires ARGENTINA Tel/Fax : (+5411) 4121-5350	eferro@senasa.gov.ar	CPM-8 (2013) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2016

²¹ The numbers in parenthesis refers to FAO travel funding assistance. (0) No funding; (1) Airfare funding; (2) Airfare and DSA funding.

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed ²¹	Term expires
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 Marina ZLOTINA Risk Analyst/Entomologist USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) 1730 Varsity Drive, Suite 300, Raleigh, NC 27606, USA Fax: 1 (919) 855-7599 Phone: 1 (919) 855-7530	Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov	CPM-10 (2015) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2018
Pacific Member SC-7	Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Organizations Policy Branch Ministry for Primary Industries P.O. Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742	john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz	CPM-11 (2016) 4th term / 3 years (0)	2019

Others

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Latin America and Caribbean Member / Steward	Mr. Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, Santiago, CHILE Tel + 56-2 2345 1454	alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl	CPM-10 (2015) 1st term / 3 years (0)	2018

Region / Role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Membership Confirmed	Term expires
Pacific Member / SC Chair	Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL Director International Plant Health Program Office of the Australian Chief Plant Protection Officer Australian Government Department of Agriculture 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 (0)	2017
IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON Senior Standards Officer	Brent.Larson@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standards Officer	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Celine GERMAIN Support	Celine.Germain@fao.org	N/A	N/A
IPPC Secretariat	Ms Marie-Pierre MIGNAULT Support	MariePierre.Mignault@fao.org	N/A	N/A