



REPORT

**Melbourne, Australia
19-23 September 2016**

Expert Working Group Meeting on the International movement of grain September 2016



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

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 of FAO.

CONTENTS

1. Opening of the meeting	4
1.1 Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur	4
1.2 Adoption of the Agenda.....	4
2. Administrative Matters.....	4
3. Review of Specification	4
4. Development of the Draft ISPM	5
4.1 Discussion papers	5
4.2 Development of text for draft	7
5. Operational and Technical Implementation Issues (task 7 of Specification 60)	12
6. Next Steps	12
7. Other business	13
8. Close of the meeting.....	13

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Agenda	14
Appendix 2: Documents List	16
Appendix 3: Participants List.....	17

1. Opening of the meeting

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat (hereafter “Secretariat”) welcomed the experts to the meeting stressing the important work lying ahead, encompassing the challenging task of developing a draft International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM) on the *international movement of grain* (2008-007), which could be globally agreed to.
- [2] The host, Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL (Australia), Director of International Plant Health Policy Program, Biosecurity Plant Division in the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources, welcomed the experts to Australia wishing them a productive meeting and an enjoyable stay in Melbourne. He highlighted that this topic had been worked on for several years and that the experts had an important role in translating the tasks of the specification into requirements. He noted that the standard would be critical in ensuring that all countries can apply harmonized phytosanitary measures for the international movement of grain. He also underscored the standard’s importance in contributing to the mandate of the IPPC by protecting the world’s plant resources from the introduction and spread of pests while facilitating trade. He noted this standard would contribute to the IPPC Strategic Framework goal, to protect sustainable agriculture and enhance global food security through the prevention of pest spread, as well as the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation’s (FAO) strategic goal to reduce hunger and poverty.
- [3] The Secretariat presented an overview of the major steps in the IPPC Standard setting procedure, highlighting the next stages for the draft standard that would be developed by the expert working group. He recalled that, should the draft standard receive technical comments during consultation, the Steward of the standard may wish to consult the experts just as the Standards Committee may decide to return the draft to the EWG.
- [4] The Secretariat explained the roles of the experts, stressing that they were not representative of their region, country or industry and that they were to develop a global standard. He also encouraged active engagement of all the experts.
- [5] The Secretariat also gave a presentation on the IPPC Style Guide that contains guidance for good drafting practices, for instance on phytosanitary terminology, scientific nomenclature, how to address the task on biodiversity and the environment, or on how to appropriately express the level of obligation desired. The group played a terminology ice-breaker game to familiarize themselves with the phytosanitary terminology and each other.

1.1 Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur

- [6] The EWG selected Mr Bill MAGEE (Australia) as Chairperson for the first four days and Mr David Neil HEINRICH (Australia) for the last day. Ms Kanwal KOCHHAR (Canada) was selected as Rapporteur.

1.2 Adoption of the Agenda

- [7] The EWG reviewed and adopted the Agenda (Appendix 1).

2. Administrative Matters

- [8] The Secretariat introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and invited the experts to review their contact details in the Participants list (Appendix 3).

3. Review of Specification

- [9] The Steward introduced the Specification 60 (*International movement of grain*)¹ recalling that it was the result of intense and lengthy discussions. In this context, he stressed that the EWG should pay attention to the items that are outside the scope noting that the standard did not apply to seeds and did

¹ [Specification 60 \(International movement of grain\)](#)

not specifically address issues related to living modified organisms (LMOs), food safety, climate change, quality, deviation from intended use, traceability and food aid. He instructed the EWG to follow the decisions of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures, namely that an internationally harmonized standard containing requirements should be developed, whereas guidance material may be developed following adoption of the standard), and that it should not repeat the content of other standards. In addition, he reviewed the tasks contained in the Specification.

- [10] One expert queried the difference between a standard and guidance material, noting that it could be helpful to include industry practices in the standard to facilitate implementation. The Secretariat explained that a standard in the IPPC framework is adopted by the CPM, and that it must contain requirements, whereas guidance is not adopted by CPM and as such does not present requirements for IPPC contracting parties to follow when harmonizing their phytosanitary measures. He also clarified that guidance produced by NPPOs, RPPOs or industry may be submitted to the Capacity Development Committee for review and possible inclusion on the Phytosanitary resources page (www.Phytosanitary.info).

4. Development of the Draft ISPM

4.1 Discussion papers

- [11] The Steward summarized the work carried out in relation to the topic “international movement of grain”² highlighting the process leading to the reduced scope.
- [12] The experts presented their papers.
- [13] Mr Liang WEI (China) presented a paper from AQSIQ (China) suggesting that a pre-export registration system be set up for international grain trade. He highlighted the need to ensure that foreign material would not be present in the grain³. He also felt that traceability was still important to consider in the standard in terms of being able to trace back to, for instance, a pest free areas. As to fumigation treatments, it should be noted that chemical residues in grain after treatment should not exceed a specific limit to lessen the risks for humans involved in the inspection. He pointed out that there is no information on the phytosanitary certificates that the grain was or would be fumigated which leads to potentially dangerous situations for the inspectors, as the fumigation is done during transit. For this reason, normally, China requests a specific declaration stating the details related to the fumigation treatment, which makes the export process longer and more complicated and costly.
- [14] In response to the paper, other experts pointed out that food safety and human safety were outside the scope of the standard, but that efficacy of fumigation treatments could be included. In addition, it was recalled that when fumigation is a phytosanitary import requirement, it can be listed on the phytosanitary certificate but that it would be challenging to include a similar commercial practice (i.e. when not a requirement) directly in the phytosanitary certificate. The EWG felt that, to tackle this concern, potentially a reference to the International Labor Organization (ILO) could be added to the standard, as this organization deals with human safety.
- [15] Mr David Neil HEINRICH (Australia) presented a paper describing in details the movement of grain to and from Australia as well as a flowchart of the grain pathway for the effective pest risk management⁴ highlighting the three tests that provide for the basis for Australia export of grain: 1) registered establishments, meaning that the grain must be prepared for export in a clean and hygienic place, known legally as a registered establishment; 2) export complaint grain, which foresees that the grain must meet phytosanitary requirements and be selected in accordance with the requirements of its intended destination; and 3) transport unit that determines that the transport unit in which the grain is exported (whether it be a package, shipping container or bulk vessel) must be clean and hygienic. He explained

² 05_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

³ 06_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

⁴ 08_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept; 17_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

that Australia has several of export terminals that are registered, and that the overall responsibility for registration lies with the Department of Agriculture and Water Resources.

- [16] Mr Bill MAGEE (Industry-Australia) spoke about the background and rationale for Australia's nil tolerance for live pests in export grain⁵ and the statistical implications of not finding a live grain pest(insect) in the sample. He also outlined the adverse statistical implications if the tolerance for live grain pests was changed to one, or two grain pests per sample inspected. He noted that the industry compliance with the nil tolerance policy goes back in the supply chain from the point where the farmer delivers grain to the country receiving point, then continues through to the final inspection by DAWR authorized officers at the export terminal. . He also explained the Australian sampling methods.
- [17] Mr Stephen BUTCHER (New Zealand) explained New Zealand's views and recommended specifications⁶ highlighting that he wished the standard would help countries tackle issues related to ensuring that exporting countries only export grain that does not present any pest risk, thereby alleviating the burden of risk management on importing countries upon arrival, where facilities to treat grain are often limited.
- [18] Mr George James GALASSO (USA) presented a paper developed by the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO)⁷ where an attempt to address the tasks of Specification 60 had been made. He particularly stressed that the phytosanitary import requirements should be technically justified and based on the probability of pest establishment, which does not always seem to be the case. The paper noted that grain (defined as "for processing"), generally, is a very low risk commodity and that NAPPO feared that it would be too challenging to find consensus on minimum prescriptive requirements, also taking into consideration experiences from other commodity class standards. Instead, focus should be on providing guidance on how NPPOs should develop the requirements. He also pointed out that deviation of intended use, while excluded from the scope, would still warrant a paragraph in the standard from the perspective that the importing country needs to put measures in place to help ensure the grain does not deviate from its intended use and pose a higher pest risk.
- [19] He also clarified that, in the USA, the actual inspection of grains would normally be carried out by the federal Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (GIPSA), acting on behalf of APHIS, before the issuance of the phytosanitary certificate.
- [20] Mr Marcel BRUINS (Industry-IGTC) presented the views of the International Grain Trade Coalition (IGTC)⁸. He clarified that IGTC consists of 25 grain importing or exporting associations and that all IGTC members had provided input to a survey on Specification 60, which resulted in the IGTC policy presented here. The key guiding principles were that the standard should facilitate trade and that industry practices could be consulted when setting the minimum requirements. He stressed that IGTC hoped that the standard would contain: harmonized guidance on sampling methods; a mechanism to resolve issues of rejected consignments, for instance allowing the parts of the consignment that would be cleared to be expedited; wording to clarify that pest risk assessments should be carried out, and the methodology and results communicated, hereby providing the commercial company the possibility of commenting on the pest risk assessment; auditing provisions; wording on the necessity for increased transparency, for instance, through improved implementation of the SPS-agreement; and lastly, text on the need for effective enforcement of the requirements.
- [21] The EWG acknowledged that harmonized methods for sampling would be important information to include in the standard, but also that none of the experts were statisticians and that it would therefore be difficult to draft text in this meeting.

⁵ 07_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

⁶ 09_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

⁷ 10_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

⁸ 11_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept; 12_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

- [22] The Secretariat, presented Egypt's considerations, on behalf of Ms Shaza OMAR (Vice-chairperson of the Standards Committee)⁹ highlighting the correlation between import volume and phytosanitary measures.
- [23] Mr Diego QUIROGA (Argentina) suggested that the EWG focus on the task 2 of the Specification and the risks connected with the intended use, as well as on identification of the most relevant regulated pests in the international trade of grain¹⁰.
- [24] Mr Bill MAGEE (Industry-Australia) presented a paper on behalf of Esther KIMANI (Standards Committee member from the African region), on the movement of grain in Kenya¹¹ highlighting that the standard should address the whole grain export value chain. He also highlighted the economic losses from the introduction of pests into Kenya through trade in grain, including *Prostephanus truncatus* (the Larger grain borer) which arrived in the early 1990s through imported grain.
- [25] Ms La-Tanya RICHARDS (Jamaica) presented her paper¹² stressing that viable grain not destined for processing should have a higher risk than non-viable grain because there is often diversion from intended use in developing countries. She also stressed that not all countries have the necessary inspection system or treatment facilities to ensure that pest risks can be mitigated after spread.

4.2 Development of text for draft¹³

- [26] Based on the submitted papers, the EWG agreed that there should be a discussion whether the standard should include minimum requirements on prevention of adulteration of grain, on presence of live pests, and on thresholds foreign material.
- [27] EWG discussed the following overall concepts that the experts felt were essential for the international movement of grain and detailed issues they believe the draft should consider.
- [28] **Presence of live pests.** The EWG stressed that the presence of any live pests in samples drawn from grain exports, whether regulated pests or not, could be indication of the grain posing some pest risk. They also confirmed that most countries have a zero tolerance for live pests in grain. Text was added to convey this.
- [29] **Traceability.** The EWG discussed at length the need to set requirements around traceability, noting that this had been excluded from the scope of the standard. Some experts wished that the standard would include some requirements to be able to trace back grain exports to the individual farmers. However, the EWG finally agreed that, due to the nature of the international movement of grain, which foresees a very high level of aggregation and comingling of grains from hundreds of producers, trace back to the individual farmers would be too onerous. Should traceability to the producers be implemented, the EWG also noted that the grain price would increase significantly and thus not facilitate trade. Lastly, the EWG noted that ISPM 13 (*guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*) sets requirements around traceability. The EWG agreed that the country of import should be able to trace back the grain to the export facility.
- [30] **Equivalence.** While the EWG acknowledged that the principles of equivalence of measures are clearly laid out in ISPM 1 (*Principles of plant quarantine as related to international trade*) and ISPM 24 (*guidelines for the determination and recognition of equivalence of phytosanitary measures*), the EWG felt it was important to reiterate equivalence of measures in the draft standard specifically in relation to

⁹ 13_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

¹⁰ 14_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

¹¹ 15_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

¹² 16_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept

¹³ For reference: IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/development-standards/>

the section on export establishments, acknowledging that different countries have various approaches to managing pest risk (e.g. not all countries may find it necessary to register export establishments).

- [31] **Foreign material.** Some experts suggested that the standard should address what percentage of foreign material (i.e. anything -organic or non-organic- which does not form part of the grain in question such as shriveled kernels, weed seeds) would be acceptable in grain. Other experts highlighted that some components of foreign material might not pose a pest risk at all (e.g. small stones, metal) and that the interpretation of this pest risk varied greatly between countries. They stressed that the phytosanitary measures should only be applied for regulated pests and that the phytosanitary import requirements should be set in accordance with an assessed pest risk. The EWG recognized that there could be a correlation between the percentage of foreign material and possible pest risk. It was also noted that the percentage of foreign material was very closely related to quality.
- [32] The experts discussed whether to use “material” or “matter” and noted that both terms are used in various countries. The EWG agreed to use “material” consistently but agreed that both could be used.
- [33] As to the maximum level of foreign material in grain, however, it was acknowledged that many countries have set domestic or national levels for quality or grade purposes, but they vary between countries. In addition, some experts felt that there was no real science basis for setting a maximum level. . The EWG could not reach agreement on setting a maximum level for foreign material in grain. The EWG discussed whether specifically mention “soil” as potentially being part of the foreign material, as it was felt that it was a common understanding that soil is part of the foreign material.
- [34] Finally, the EWG agreed that the relative volume of foreign material in grain *might* pose a pest risk due to the overall grain trade volume (i.e. the higher the volume of grain, the higher relative volume of foreign material which, potentially, harbors pests), and agreed to mention that efforts to keep the level of foreign material in the commodity at a minimum should be made. The EWG also felt that it was useful to encourage the grain exporting industry to align their practices with national regulations, to reduce the amount of foreign material in grain, as for quality reasons grain must have reduced foreign material content. This practice should automatically help reduce the pest risk of the grain.
- [35] The EWG considered adding a definition on “foreign material” in the standard, but deemed it was better to describe the term in the text instead.
- [36] **Grain flow.** The EWG agreed to include a **flowchart** (as an appendix to the standard) to show the responsibilities of the exporting and importing countries along the grain pathway to help ensure that the pest risks would be managed properly at each critical point. The EWG felt this would facilitate understanding and implementation of the standard.
- [37] **Scope.** The EWG noted that animal feed was included in the scope as grain would be for any type of consumption. However, one experts noted that “grain” would not include “animal feed” in certain languages, and the EWG agreed that animal feed would be mentioned in the standard specifically when appropriate.
- [38] **Technically and scientifically justified measures.** The EWG felt that it was essential to reiterate that phytosanitary measures should be justified both technically and scientifically because this is, unfortunately, not always the case in the grain trade. The EWG also highlighted that the measures should target only regulated pests associated with grain because countries experience situations where measures are put in place for non-regulated pests or regulated pests that are not normally associated with grain. The EWG also stressed that the NPPO of the importing country should initiate a pest risk analysis (PRA) before setting their import requirements or set the requirements based on this standard. The EWG felt that adequate **surveillance** in the importing country should be a prerequisite for establishing phytosanitary measures to help ensure that phytosanitary import requirements are not set for pests that are already present in the importing country.
- [39] **Transparency.** In the context of setting technically and scientifically justified measures, the EWG concurred that the global grain industry faces important challenges in terms of understanding the

phytosanitary import requirements set for the specific commodities. These are particular challenges due to the very high volume of grain trade, the need for rapid export and because of the importance of grain as a food staple. The EWG felt that these challenges could be mitigated by improving the communication between trading partners on significant changes in meeting some phytosanitary import requirements. Allowing commercial grain companies to have freer access to phytosanitary import requirements might help facilitate trade. The EWG agreed to add text to the standard to this effect, and also agreed that it would be helpful to set requirements around the notification period for any new significant changes in phytosanitary import requirements, allowing the import country time to comment and implement the measures. The EWG agreed that the terminology around this notification period should be aligned to World Trade Organization (WTO) terminology on this issue.

[40] In this section, the EWG considered adding guidance on pest risk mitigation measures taken by the exporting country, such as notification of newly detected quarantine pests, crop monitoring and pest surveillance (e.g. presence or absence) but the EWG felt that this sort of details were not necessary in the draft standard and did not add the text.

[41] **Pest free area.** The EWG discussed whether pest free area (PFA) should be included in the standard as more than an option for a phytosanitary measure. The experts agreed that while PFAs may be an appropriate and efficient measure applicable also to grain, in reality the application of PFA as a phytosanitary measure is limited by the high level of comingling of the commodity as it moves from production areas to export ports. The EWG also agreed that it was not a measure normally used for grain as it is one of the most restrictive phytosanitary measures and not justified considering the intended use of the commodity (i.e. PFA is often used for the production of seed which is a higher risk commodity).

[42] **Certification.** The EWG agreed to have a section that clarified the when phytosanitary certificates are issued for grain than any phytosanitary treatment that is applied as part of the import requirements may be included in the appropriate section of the phytosanitary certificate. The EWG considered including mention in the draft that the phytosanitary certificate may indicate treatments for the control of pests, i.e. not only regulated pests but also stored product pests. However, as the ISPMs relate to regulated pests only, the EWG agreed that this text was not relevant for the standard. One expert suggested adding mention of conditional certification (i.e. certification given on condition that fumigation be done during transit), but the EWG felt that although this might be an industry practice, it should not be included in the standard.

[43] **Audit of export pathway.** The EWG discussed whether adding requirements around auditing the pathway for grain by the importing country in the exporting country. Some experts felt that it would be necessary to set requirements because they found that the pest risk connected to movement of grain, due to its immense volume, was high and therefore warranted the possibility to conduct audit on the pathway. Others felt that the pest risk of grain was historically lower due to its end use and that auditing as suggested would only be possible in very particular cases and following justifications from the importing country. The EWG agreed that auditing in the exporting country by the importing country would depend on bilateral arrangements and that it would not be a common practice. The EWG did not add text on this to the draft but instead, they agreed to include mention that audit would normally be focused on the export facility (i.e. the last point of comingling such as an export facility for bulk shipments or point of loading for containers). The EWG felt that besides this point, reference to ISPM 20 would provide sufficient guidance on auditing.

[44] **Requirements for export facilities.** The experts had divided opinions whether registering establishments should be included in the standard as a requirement. Some felt that registration would facilitate transparent communication between countries, as a result could help prevent the spread of pests and thus could be considered a phytosanitary measure. Others felt that since a specific pest was not targeted or mitigated by the measure (i.e. registration) it could not be considered a phytosanitary measure, but rather a tool that might be agreed upon on a bilateral level. They felt that registration of establishments was a domestic issue because the detection of pests in such an establishment might not necessarily affect trade. They noted that certifying or attesting to the hygiene of establishments would

be outside of the authority of most NPPOs. It was also pointed out that many facilitates dealing with the grain trade would normally require some sort of registration but that this was not the essential point. The EWG agreed to include some general requirements for the grain export facilities but did not agree to include requirements around registration in the draft.

- [45] **Sampling.** The EWG felt that ISPM 31 gave good guidance on sampling, but that consistency and transparency in sampling methodologies within the international grain trade should be emphasized in the draft, because the lack of this may be considered a trade barrier. Therefore, the EWG agreed to set requirements for the exporting countries to help ensure that inspection procedures were publicly available (e.g. on the NPPO's website or the International Phytosanitary Portal – IPP).
- [46] The EWG discussed whether it would be possible to include an internationally harmonized baseline for sampling intensity. Some experts were concerned about such an inclusion, considering all countries have different methods and experiences. They also felt that there should be recognition of the fact that transparency should go both ways; export countries sample in one way, and importing countries in another but both sides should be communicating their methods to their trading partners. Some exporting countries feel that they provide complete transparency but that there is a lack of equal transparency in the sampling methods and intensity applied in the importing country, especially in the case of non-compliance. They also stressed that there is not an international level of confidence for sampling and that it would perhaps be more important to set requirements around this. The EWG felt that it would be important to set minimum levels of confidence and provide some guidance on sampling methods, because there are many countries that do not have the capacity to do sampling and they would find such guidance useful. However, the EWG recognized that some additional statistical expertise should be sought to do this.
- [47] Based on the discussions, the EWG decided that it was useful to clearly indicate when sampling was carried out in the exporting country or in the importing country and to present this in a manner that matched the flow of grain being traded (i.e. first sampling in the exporting country, then in the importing country). The EWG agreed to add some principles around grain sampling that could provide guidance and agreed to add an appendix with the sampling principles and methods. The EWG agreed to work on this appendix via an e-forum to be opened in November.
- [48] The EWG considered whether to use “lot”, “commodity” or consignment” in this section. With reference to ISPM 31, the EWG agreed to use “lot” (i.e. a number of units of a single commodity) because, as an example, a consignment made up of different grain commodities would need to have each lot sampled (i.e. type of commodity).
- [49] The EWG agreed that it was useful to clarify that the consignment from which a sample has been drawn should be kept in a manner so that it would not be infested by pests after the sample was taken; i.e. that it would maintain its phytosanitary security. Regarding the retention of samples, the EWG felt that it was essential to clarify that samples taken from different lots are normally combined and divided down to an appropriate composite samples (so that countries would not have to retain samples from each lot). The EWG discussed how much time before the issuance of the phytosanitary certificate sampling should be carried out, and agreed that this should normally not exceed 30 days. Some experts were concerned about specific situations that may require more time, and the EWG agreed to add text to take this into consideration. The EWG agreed that the recommended retention time would be 30 days for consignments moving by truck or rail, and 90 days for consignments moving by ocean vessel. The experts noted that the timeframes were based simply on the fact that the shipment method influences the time it takes for the consignment to arrive at the import country.
- [50] **Inspection.** The EWG agreed that reference to ISPM 23 should be included but also that text should be added to clarify that internationally recognized or validated science-based inspection procedures should be used for the inspection of grain in the exporting country. Several experts suggested clarifying that inspection should to comply with the phytosanitary import requirements (i.e. the “published phytosanitary import requirements”), because there may be cases where new requirements are only set upon arrival of the consignment in the importing country, which impedes trade. However, the EWG did

not add text to this effect as this type of practice would not be in line with the IPPC nor the WTO-SPS agreement.

- [51] The EWG agreed adding requirements on the necessity for the exporting countries to communicate the results of their inspection to the importing countries immediately. Some experts suggested adding a maximum timeframe, but the EWG did not agree to this, because it would be clear that certain tests may take several days to complete so the communication of the results should still be immediate after they have become available.
- [52] Following discussions, the EWG strongly encouraged the development of internationally recognized guidance on science-based inspection procedures.
- [53] **Testing.** The EWG recognized that testing for pests was not routinely carried out for grain and several experts felt that this should be emphasized and the NPPOs should take this into consideration when setting phytosanitary import requirements. NPPOs should carefully consider if testing for pests is necessary or if the pest risk could be mitigated by the level of processing of the commodity (which would be indicated by its intended use). However, if testing for pests is required, the EWG agreed that it should be based on internationally recognized or validated science-based diagnostic protocols to avoid false positives or false negatives.
- [54] **Export conveyances.** The EWG agreed that requirements for vessels and containers for bulk trade could help mitigate pest risks. The EWG agreed that export conveyances should be free from debris, odor and be dry, and added this text to the draft.
- [55] **Phytosanitary treatments.** The EWG discussed whether it was possible to include specific phytosanitary treatments in the draft. The experts agreed that there was general global acceptance that Methyl bromide and Phosphine treatments provide an acceptable level of protection, and agreed to add information on this, but could not agree on specific efficacy schedules so just advised that label instructions should be followed. The EWG discussed whether adding some guidance on the application of the treatments, but noted that the Technical Panel for Phytosanitary Treatments would be developing a standard on the *Requirements for the use of fumigation as a phytosanitary treatment* (2014-004) where this type of information would surely be included.
- [56] In this context, the Secretariat noted that a call for treatments was foreseen for 2017. The EWG felt that this would be an opportunity to provide transparency for the grain trade, and strongly urged contracting parties or RPPOs to submit approved phytosanitary treatments for gain, accompanied by supporting data in response to the call for treatments.
- [57] **Pest risk mitigation.** The EWG agreed that the designation of a specific port of arrival in importing country may be used as a measure to reduce pest risks (e.g. because pest mitigation options may only be available at the specific ports), and felt it important to include this in the draft.
- [58] **Secure transport.** The EWG felt it was important to include a section on the importance of preventing spillage and scattering from the port of arrival to the processing facility, which should help address issues related to diversion from intended use, and therefore added some requirements around the transportation from entry to the point of processing.
- [59] **Transport unit construction (to prevent spillage).** The EWG agreed that it was important that construction of transport units was done properly to ensure secure transport, and added guidance on this.
- [60] **Processing.** The EWG agreed that processing of grain may reduce or eliminate pest risks and felt that this should be included in the draft as it was quite particular for grain, and important both in the pest risk assessment phase and as a mitigation measure. The EWG also felt it was essential to capture that the intended use and the associated pest mitigation measures would eliminate or reduce the pest risk to acceptable levels to help ensure that quarantine pests are not introduced or spread in the importing country. The experts stressed the importance of recognizing this as the detection of a quarantine pest in

a shipment should not necessarily mean the rejection of the consignment as the intended use and the level of processing will affect the potential for that pest to establish, which is the main consideration.

- [61] The EWG discussed if processing should be carried out in an approved established but did not agree to add this as a requirement considering some countries could potentially use non-approved establishments.
- [62] The EWG agreed to add a list of processing methods (similar to the analogue list in ISPM 32) that would mitigate the pest risk in an appendix. The EWG decided to agree on the contents of the appendix and potentially adjust the section on processing following the meeting via e-forum discussions.
- [63] **Waste management after processing.** The EWG acknowledged that there were several publications available for data on grain waste management methods, but that these data demonstrated a high level of variability. For this reason, the EWG did not feel it was possible to add specific guidance on waste management, but only wished to mention the various waste management options available.
- [64] **Non-compliance Reporting.** The EWG felt that the standard should set requirements around reporting of non-compliance between industry and the NPPO, and between exporting and importing NPPOs. One of the challenges in this area pertains to understanding whether the non-compliance relate to quality or to phytosanitary issues. Therefore, the EWG agreed to add examples of what should constitute non-compliance. The EWG also agreed to include mention of actions to be taken to deal with the non-compliance, again highlighting that the actions should consider the intended use and level of processing of the commodity.
- [65] The EWG also felt that it would be useful for the grain trade to explicitly note that ISPM 13 should be followed and that the NPPO of the exporting country should respond to a notification of non-compliance and provide feedback to the importing country NPPO.
- [66] The EWG also agreed to include mention that intentional adulteration, i.e, deliberate admixture of other grains etc., would be considered non-compliance and this might help tackle the issues raised in relation to foreign material .
- [67] The EWG discussed if the standard should consider management of bulk ships where non-compliance was detected (“distressed vessels”). The EWG considered that the main issue underlying challenges in this area concerned the fact that pest identification may be faulty. As most grain trade is done via bulk shipments, physically carried out by third party shippers, such situations may possibly result in disputes with high associated costs. The EWG agreed to add a paragraph under “Testing” to emphasize this point, which was felt to be particular to grain, and to stress the need for using internationally agreed diagnostic protocols for identification of pests.
- [68] **Arrangements between NPPO and Industry.** Some experts suggested to include guidance on formalized procedures for non-compliance to be undertaken by the importing country. These could include, for instance, transport of the commodity to inland processing facilities (following specific safeguards). In this context, one expert noted that the regulation of weed seeds (plant pests) was a relative recent phenomenon and that it would be impossible for the exporting country alone to ensure that no weed seeds would be present in grain. Avoiding the spread of weed seeds would necessarily be a joint responsibility between the exporting and importing country. The EWG considered that an example could be included in the draft.

5. Operational and Technical Implementation Issues (task 7 of Specification 60)

- [69] The EWG agreed to consider the implementation issues in an e-forum discussion, following the meeting and would request the Steward to present this to the SC.

6. Next Steps

- [70] The EWG agreed on the following tasks to be handled virtually after the meeting.

- [71] **Development of an appendix containing a list of processing methods** (Ms Kochhar KANWAL (Lead), Ms LaTanya RICHARDS and Mr Liang WEI) for submission to the Secretariat by 15 October 2016. The IPPC Secretariat would then organize a forum on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP – www.ippc.int) for the EWG to agree on it. The forum would provide two weeks for the experts to submit their comments and would close on 31 October 2016.
- [72] **Development of an appendix on sampling** (Mr George GALASSO (lead) and Ms Kochhar KANWAL) for submission to the IPPC Secretariat by 15 November. The Secretariat would then organize a forum on the IPP for the EWG to agree on it. The forum would provide two weeks for the experts to submit their comments and would close on 30 November 2016.
- [73] **Biodiversity and implementation tasks.** The Steward was tasked with proposing draft text on the biodiversity and implementation tasks for presentation to the SC. The Steward was also requested to inform the SC of the need for the development of internationally recognized guidance on science-based inspection procedures. In addition, the Steward was tasked to reorganize the draft in accordance with the grain flow, and submit the revised draft standard to the Secretariat by 10 December 2016.
- [74] The draft ISPM would tentatively be submitted to the IPPC Standards Committee in May 2017 for their consideration and possible approval for consultation in July 2017.

7. Other business

- [75] There was no other business.

8. Close of the meeting

- [76] The Chairperson expressed his gratitude for the work carried out and noted that he was positively surprised at how far the EWG had come with the draft considering the many diverging opinions on the topic.
- [77] The Secretariat thanked the experts for their contributions and good spirits of compromise. He informed the EWG of the next steps and answered any queries in this respect. He expressed deep appreciation to the host for the generous funding of the meeting and related costs, as well as for the excellent arrangements. He thanked the Australia grain industry for the cocktail, dinner and interesting field trip.
- [78] Wishing all safe travels, he closed the meeting.

Appendix 1: Agenda

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat Welcome by the meeting host Welcome by the meeting organizer 	--	LARSON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introductions 	--	LARSON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation on the standard setting process Roles of the Participants 	--	LARSON
1.1 Selection of the Chairperson and Rapporteur	--	LARSON
1.2 Adoption of the Agenda	01_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	CHAIRPERSON
2. Administrative Matters		CHAIRPERSON
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documents List Participants List Local Information 	02_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept 03_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept 04Rev1_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	LARSON
3. Review of Specification	Specification 60 (International movement of grain)	BUTCHER
4. Development of draft ISPM		
4.1 Discussion papers		
History of the topic and draft specification	05_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	BUTCHER
Discussion paper from AQSIQ	06_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	WEI
Movement of grain from Australia	08_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	HEINRICH
The background and rationale for Australia's nil tolerance for live pests in export grain	07_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	MAGEE
New Zealand's views and recommended specifications	09_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	BUTCHER
NAPPO discussion paper: The vision of an ISPM on the International movement of grain	10_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	GALASSO
IGTC policy: IPPC and Phytosanitary Measures for Grain	11_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept 12_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	BRUINS
Movement of grain from Egypt	13_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	LARSON
The tasks of Specification 60	14_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	QUIROGA
Movement of grain – the case of Kenya	15_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	MAGEE
Grain in Jamaica	16_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	RICHARDS
4.2 Development of text for draft¹⁴	--	CHAIRPERSON

¹⁴ For reference: IPPC Style Guide and annotated templates: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/development-standards/>

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
5. Identity Operational and Technical Implementation Issues (see task 7 of Specification 60)	--	CHAIRPERSON
6. Next Steps		CHAIRPERSON
7. Other business		CHAIRPERSON
8. Close of the meeting		IPPC SECRETARIAT / CHAIRPERSON

Appendix 2: Documents List

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
01_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	1.2	Agenda	2016-09-14
02_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	02	Documents list	2016-09-14
03_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	02	Participants list	2016-06-15
04Rev2_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	02	Local information	2016-07-25
05_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	History of the topic and draft specification	2016-07-13
06_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	Discussion paper from AQSIQ	2016-08-25
07_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	The background and rationale for Australia's nil tolerance for live pests in export grain	2016-08-25
08_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	Movement of grain from Australia	2016-08-25
09_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	New Zealand's views and recommendations on the International movement of Grain	2016-08-25
10_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	The vision of an ISPM on the international movement of grain	2016-08-25
11_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	IPPC and Phytosanitary Measures for Grain	2016-08-25
12_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	IGTC Flyer	2016-08-25
13_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	Movement of grain from Egypt	2016-08-30
14_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	The tasks of Specification 60	2016-08-30
15_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	Movement of grain – the case of Kenya	2016-09-02
16_EWG_Grains_2016_Sept	4.1	Grain in Jamaica	2016-09-14

IPP LINKS:	Agenda item
Specification 60 (International movement of grain)	3
IRSS study on Diversion from intended use	-
Report from the International movement of grain workshop (2011-12-06)	-

Appendix 3: Participants List

	Participant role (Country / Organization)	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Steward (New Zealand)	Mr Stephen BUTCHER Manager, Imports and Exports Group (Plants) Plant, Food and Environment Regulation and Assurance Branch Ministry for Primary Industries - Manatū Ahu Matua Pastoral House 25 The Terrace, PO Box 2526 Wellington NEW ZEALAND Tel: (+64) 4 894 0478 Fax: (+ 64) 4 894 0662 Mob: (+ 64) 29 894 0478	stephen.butcher@mpi.govt.nz ;
✓	EWG member (Australia)	Mr David Neil HEINRICH Acting Assistant Secretary, Plant Biosecurity Branch Australia/ Department of Agriculture GPO Box 858 Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Phone: +61 2 62723220	David.heinrich@agriculture.gov.au ;
✓	EWG member (Canada)	Ms Kanwal KOCHHAR National Manager, Grains and Oilseeds Canada / Canadian Food Inspection Agency 59 Camelot Drive, Ottawa, ON, K1A 0Y9 CANADA Phone: 001 613 773 7118	kanwal.kochhar@inspection.gc.ca ;
✓	EWG member (China)	Mr Wu XINHUA Division Direction Jiangsu Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau of P.R.C. No. 99, Zhonghua Road, Nanjing, Jiangsu, CHINA Phone: 025-52345052	wuxh@jsciq.gov.cn ;
✓	EWG member (China)	Mr Liang WEI (Fletcher) Section Chief P.R.China/ General Administration of Quality Supervision, Inspection and Quarantine of the People's Republic of China RM 2005, ZhongShan Road No2 , Shinan Distr., Qingdao, CHINA, 266000 Phone: 0086 532 80886109	Liangweiqd@qq.com ;

	Participant role (Country / Organization)	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	EWG member (Jamaica)	Ms La-Tanya RICHARDS Entomologist/Identifier Jamaica/ Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries - Plant Quarantine/ Produce Inspection Unit c/o Agricultural Export Complex, Sangsters International Airport, Montego Bay, JAMAICA Phone: (876) 940-4146	latanya_richards@yahoo.com ;
✓	EWG member (USA)	Mr George James GALASSO National Trade Director for Grains Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture 4700 River Road, Riverdale, MD 20737, USA Phone: +1 301 851-2050	George.Galasso@aphis.usda.gov ;
✓	Invited Expert (Industry, Australia)	Mr Bill MAGEE Independent Biosecurity Consultant Project Leader (Part time) Plant Biosecurity Cooperative Research Centre + 61 2 6201 2882 0407935236	bill.magee04@gmail.com ;
✓	Invited Expert (Industry, Canada)	Mr Gord KURBIS Director, Market Access and Trade Policy Pulse Canada 1212-220 Portage Ave Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3C 0A5, CANADA Phone: +001 204 925 4454	gkurbis@pulsecanada.com ;
✓	Invited Expert (International Grain Trade Coalition, Switzerland)	Mr Marcel BRUINS Head of Secretariat International Grain Trade Coalition (IGTC) Route des Esserts 8, 1279 Bogis-Bossey, SWITZERLAND Phone: +41 79 192 4126	mbruins1964@gmail.com ;
✓	Invited Expert (Argentina)	Mr Diego QUIROGA National Director of Plant Protection Argentina - SENASA (Argentine NPPO) 2898 Condarco Street. 1st Floor Apt. 3 Buenos Aires ARGENTINA Phone:+5411-4503-3642	dquiroga@senasa.gob.ar ;

	Participant role (Country / Organization)	Name, mailing address, telephone	Email address
✓	Host representative (Australia)	Mr Jan Bart ROSSEL Director International Plant Health Policy Program Plant Health Policy Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture and Water Resources GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 2 6272 5056 / 0408625413 Fax: (+61) 2 6272 5835	Bart.Rossel@agriculture.gov.au
✓	Organizer representative (Australia)	Mr Bruce HANCOCKS Assistant Director International Plant Health Policy Program Plant Health Policy Biosecurity Plant Division Department of Agriculture and Water Resources GPO Box 858, Canberra ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA Tel: (+61) 02 6272 3826 Fax: (+61) 02 6272 5835	bruce.hancocks@agriculture.gov.a u :
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 1 00153 - Rome ITALY Phone: +(39) 06-5705-4915	Brent.Larson@fao.org :
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Ms Eva MOLLER FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 1 00153 - Rome ITALY Phone: +(39) 06-5705-2855	Eva.Moller@fao.org :
Not Attending			
	Member (Uruguay)	Ms Maria Inés ARES ALFONZO MILLAN 4703, MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY Phone: 598 23098410 INT. 263	mares@mgap.gub.uy