



***REPORT***

**Rome, Italy  
15-19 May 2017**

**Standards Committee  
Working Group (SC-7)  
May, 2017**



**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](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request) or addressed to [copyright@fao.org](mailto:copyright@fao.org).

FAO information products are available on the FAO website ([www.fao.org/publications](http://www.fao.org/publications)) and can be purchased through [publications-sales@fao.org](mailto: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  |
| 3.  | Updates from the Standards Committee meeting.....  | 4  |
| 4.  | Review of Draft ISPMs .....  | 4  |
| 4.1 | Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001), Priority 1 .....   | 4  |
| 4.2 | Revision of ISPM 6: Surveillance (2009-004), Priority 1 .....  | 8  |
| 4.3 | Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005), Priority 1 .....   | 12 |
| 4.4 | 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 ..... | 17 |
| 5.  | Other business .....   | 18 |
| 6.  | Close of the meeting.....  | 18 |
|     | Appendix 01 - Agenda .....   | 19 |
|     | Appendix 02 - Documents List .....   | 21 |
|     | Appendix 03 - Participants List .....  | 23 |

## 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.

### 1.3 Election of the Rapporteur

- [3] Ms Thanh Huong HA (Vietnam) 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

### *Documents list*

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

### *Participants list*

- [6] The Secretariat introduced the Participants list (Appendix 3).

## 3. Updates from the Standards Committee meeting

- [7] The Chairperson gave a brief summary of the 2017 May meeting<sup>1</sup>.

## 4. Review of Draft ISPMs

- [8] The SC-7 reviewed the draft ISPMs that had been submitted for first consultation in July-September 2016 and in July – November 2015. The compiled consultation comments for all draft ISPMs are available on the IPP<sup>2</sup>.

### 4.1 Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001), Priority 1

- [9] The Steward for the IPPC Technical Panel for the Glossary (TPG) introduced the 2016 draft amendments to ISPM 5 (*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001)), the TPG responses to comments from the 2016 consultation, and the Steward’s additional notes<sup>3</sup>. The SC-7 thanked the TPG and the Steward for all their work on the terms.

- [10] The SC-7 discussed the following substantial issues.

#### [11] “exclusion (of a pest)” (2010-008)

- [12] One consultation comment had suggested deleting the qualifier “(of a pest)” from the term itself, because the definition of phytosanitary measures refers only to regulated pests. However, the TPG preferred to keep the qualifier so that the word “exclusion” could still be used in its common meaning in other contexts, as is currently the case in many ISPMs. The use of this qualifier is also consistent

---

<sup>1</sup> 2017 May SC meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/standards-committee/>

<sup>2</sup> Compiled comments from first consultation are available at: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispms/>

<sup>3</sup> 1994-001\_Rev1, 14\_SC7\_2017\_May, 12\_SC7\_2017\_May

with other Glossary terms, such as “control (of a pest)”, “entry (of a pest)” or “establishment (of a pest)”. The SC-7 agreed to keep the qualifier “(of a pest)” in the term.

[13] Taking into account some consultation comments, the TPG had proposed to replace in the definition “introduction” by “entry or establishment” to clarify that the applied phytosanitary measures can address either entry or establishment, or both. By using only the term “introduction” in the definition, the concept of exclusion could be misinterpreted as it would only apply to pests which can establish, and this would be in conflict with Article VII of the IPPC (Requirements in relation to imports) paragraph 3, which specifies that “A contracting party may apply measures specified in this Article to pests which may not be capable of establishment in its territories but, if they gained entry, cause economic damage”. Some SC-7 members highlighted that indeed some pests can enter but are not able to establish. The SC-7 agreed with the related comments from the first consultation and with the TPG proposal.

[14] The Steward noted that one sentence in the background information provided for the term in document 1994-001\_Rev1 had been accidentally modified and the SC-7 asked the Secretariat to revert to the version that was distributed for the first consultation. However, the Steward noted this did not change anything to the TPG review and recommendations on the term.

[15] The SC-7 agreed with the TPG proposal for the addition of the term “exclusion (of a pest)”.

[16] **“contaminating pest”, “contamination” (2012-001)**

[17] Following consultation comments on the term “contaminating pest”, the SC-7 agreed to the TPG proposal to retain “carried by” (which was previously proposed to be changed to “present in”) in relation to the regulated articles that move, because “present in” may be understood as “infestation” and cause confusion. This way it would be clear that a “contaminating pest” does not cause “infestation”. “Present in” would only be used in relation to storage places, because storage places do not move and thus cannot “carry” contaminating pests.

[18] A consultation comment had proposed to add “or other means” to the definitions of “contamination pest” and “contamination”, considering that the list of means was not complete. However, the TPG did not recommend this change because they considered it was unclear what would be understood by “other means”. While noting that definitions should not necessarily contain lengthy lists of examples, the TPG had proposed to add “packaging” to the definitions, as suggested in a consultation comment, because “packaging” was an important article that may carry contaminating pests or be contaminated.

[19] The SC-7 discussed whether to add “packing place” to the definitions of “contamination pest” and “contamination”: the packing place may also be contaminated, so it could be added for parallelism to the mention of “storage place” in the proposed definition. The Steward noted that what would be most important to know is whether the packaging is contaminated, but not whether the packing place was. The mention of “storage place” in the definitions was considered very relevant especially in the case of grain where pests such as *Trogoderma granarium* could contaminate storage places and because the likelihood of exposure to contaminating pests will increase with the length of time for which the commodity is stored. Besides, the Steward noted that this issue is closely linked to the definition of “regulated articles”, which includes “storage place”, “packaging” and refer to “international transportation”, but does not mention “packing place”. Therefore, the SC-7 did not agree to add “packing place” to the definitions.

[20] The SC-7 agreed to the revisions of “contamination pest” and “contamination” as proposed by the TPG, and agreed to a few minor modifications to the background information which were suggested by the Steward for clarity reasons.

[21] **“endangered area” (2014-009)**

[22] The SC-7 agreed with the TPG proposal to withdraw this term from the draft 2016 Amendments because “endangered area” is defined in Article II of IPPC and the original definition is not incorrect. The

misunderstandings that the revision could address are not sufficiently important to merit an “agreed interpretation” of the term. Instead, the Explanatory document on ISPM 5 (the “Annotated Glossary”), note 1, will be adjusted to clarify that the term “endangered area” should not be misinterpreted to mean an environmentally protected area in the ecological conservation sense.

**[23] “quarantine” (2015-002)**

**[24]** Following consultation comments, the TPG had proposed to reinstate the purposes “observation and research” for quarantine of regulated articles as for instance some prohibited plants could be kept in quarantine stations for varietal selection or breeding. Besides, the TPG had proposed not to distinguish anymore between the purposes for quarantine of regulated articles and the purposes for quarantine of pests or beneficial organisms in order to keep the definition simple and not overly restrictive, as suggested by some consultations comments.

**[25]** One SC-7 member proposed adding to the definition the example of prohibited plants that are used for varietal selection or breeding in a quarantine station (e.g. for detection of “latent infection”) in order to illustrate what could be kept in quarantine for observation or research. The Steward noted that ISPM 5 definitions do not usually include examples, but that such examples could be added to the Annotated Glossary; the SC-7 agreed to this approach and did not add the example to the definition.

**[26]** The SC-7 agreed with the revision of “quarantine”, as proposed by the TPG.

**[27] “test” (2015-003), “visual examination” (2013-010)**

**[28] Regarding the term “test”,** the SC-7 agreed to include “determine compliance with phytosanitary regulations” as an objective of test, as proposed by the TPG following a consultation comment. This addition allows the definition of “test” to cover the common use of testing to check for compliance (e.g. whether a required treatment has been carried out), beyond only determining if pests are present or identifying pests, and aligns the definition of “test” to that of “inspection”.

**[29]** A consultation comment had suggested to delete “plants and plant products” from the definition of “test” as these are included in the definition of “regulated articles”. The TPG had acknowledged that this was correct, but agreed that the focus of the definition should be on plants and plant products, therefore it was useful to retain such a mention. The SC-7 agreed to retain “plants and plant products” in the definition of “test”.

**[30]** One SC-7 member felt that “test” could be included in “inspection”. However, the Steward noted that “test” and “inspection” are two different methods on the same hierarchical level, and therefore have separate definitions. Visual examination may not be sufficient to detect some pests, and in these cases tests need to be performed. Besides, the Steward informed the SC-7 that, in their May 2017 meeting, the SC had just added the term “inspection” to the *List of topics for IPPC standards*, as the TPG felt it might be outdated and might need to be revised to reflect current practices, such as the mention of olfactory and acoustic examinations.

**[31]** One SC-7 member wondered why the definition for “test” specified the purpose whereas the definition for “visual examination” did not. The Steward noted that “visual examination” only describes the process, not the purpose, which is specified in the definition of “inspection” (the definition of “inspection” refers to “official visual examination”).

**[32]** The SC-7 agreed with the revision of “test”, as proposed by the TPG.

**[33] Regarding the term “visual examination”,** the SC-7 agreed to remove “physical” from the definition, as suggested by consultation comments and the TPG, because this word was unnecessary and confusing. The SC-7 also agreed to the TPG suggestion to delete “plants, plant products, or other regulated articles” in the definition to make it less restrictive and allow for the term to be used for “visual examination” of objects that are not regulated articles.

- [34] Some consultation comments had pointed out that a “microscope” is a tool that can be used for visual examination or for testing, depending on the situation. Thus they considered it was better not to mention this tool, in order to leave the definition of “visual examination” open as regards the use of a microscope. The TPG had suggested instead to use the term “light microscope” because the simple use of that tool can be considered part of the inspection process, although it was recognized that it may also be used with tests. The Steward noted the tools mentioned in the definition were the most common tools used for visual examination, but this was not an exhaustive list. The SC-7 felt that the use of “light microscope” could cause confusion, as “light” could refer to a light source, a simple or basic microscope, its weight, an optical microscope, etc. The SC-7 agreed to change “light” to “optical” to reduce ambiguity. Besides, “other” was added before “optical microscope” as a stereoscope is a type of optical microscope, but since stereoscopes are used extensively by inspectors the SC-7 considered it was important to keep the mention of “stereoscopes” in the definition.
- [35] The SC-7 suggested that when the TPG reviews the term “inspection”, it also considers the above discussion and the terms “test” and “visual examination”.
- [36] The SC-7 adjusted the proposal for revision of “visual examination”, as explained above.
- [37] **“kiln-drying” (2013-006)**
- [38] The Steward noted that this term proposed for deletion did not receive any comment during the 2016 first consultation. Therefore, the term would not be open for comments during the second consultation.
- [39] The SC-7 agreed with the proposal for deletion and agreed that the term would be closed for comments during second consultation.
- [40] **“pre-clearance” (2013-016)**
- [41] The Steward noted that, during the 2016 consultation, countries from various regions had proposed this term not be deleted. However, after reviewing the consultation comments, the TPG still recommended the term be deleted from ISPM 5 because the concept covered by the term remains unclear and “pre-clearance” is currently used in many different countries with very different meaning. Even if the term is not defined in the Glossary, countries can continue to use it if they deem it useful. The SC-7 agreed to the TPG approach and agreed with the proposal for deletion of “pre-clearance”. One SC-7 member noted though it would be confusing in her National Plant Protection Organization (NPPO) to use the term when it is not defined in ISPM 5, nor in the newly adopted, by CPM 12 (2017), Annex 1 to ISPM 20: *Arrangements for the verification of compliance of consignments by the importing country in the exporting country*.
- [42] The SC-7:
- (1) *approved* the draft 2015-2016 *Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms* (1994-001) as modified in this meeting for submission to the second consultation.
  - (2) *invited* the TPG to consider adding to the Annotated Glossary, for the term “quarantine” the example of prohibited plants that are used for varietal selection or breeding in a quarantine station in order to illustrate what could be kept in quarantine for observation or research (e.g. for detection of “latent infection”).
  - (3) *invited* the TPG to consider the above discussion and the terms “test” and “visual examination” when the revision of the term “inspection” takes place.

## 4.2 Revision of ISPM 6: Surveillance (2009-004), Priority 1

- [43] The Steward introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documents<sup>4</sup>. The Steward noted that some issues that had arisen from the 2016 first consultation had already been presented to and decided by the 2016 November SC. The Steward had already incorporated these into the draft presented to the SC-7 at this meeting.
- [44] The SC-7 discussed the following substantial issues.
- [45] **Title.** The SC-7 discussed the proposed change to the title from “Surveillance” to “Surveillance systems”. It was noted that “system” is not in the definition of “surveillance”. It was mentioned that by adding “systems” to the title, this would not accurately reflect what is in the scope of the draft ISPM, and that the scope would be broader than the title. It was suggested that the title be as short as possible and should be easily referenced. The SC-7 agreed to keep the title as “Surveillance” because the SC agreed at its 2016 November meeting, also noting the scope is not necessarily reflected in the title but in the scope section.
- [46] **Outline of requirements.** Based on comments in previous SC meetings, the SC-7 revised the Outline of requirements section to ensure that included requirements, and made other editorial changes (e.g. removing the word “should”). The SC-7 did not make substantive changes because there were no substantial consultation comments in this section.
- [47] **Background.** The SC-7 noted that the concept of “Surveillance as an essential ‘instrument’” was confusing, and agreed to remove “instrument”. The Steward pointed out that there was a contracting party comment to add a new bullet “prediction of pest spread” under the activities which surveillance underpins. The Steward asked the SC-7 to consider this comment because prediction is related to modelling and does not necessarily underpin surveillance. The SC-7 acknowledged that the surveillance data can be used for prediction; one SC-7 member suggested adding this as an example. The SC-7 agreed that the list of activities which surveillance underpins is a non-exhaustive list and text was adjusted to clarify this. Thus, the comment was not incorporated as proposed:
- [48] **Impacts on biodiversity and the environment.** The Steward noted there was a consultation comment suggesting the SC to review the inclusion of human and animal health in all standards. It was also noted that there were several comments stating that this section in this draft ISPM should be relevant only to plant health. The SC-7 agreed that human and animal health are outside the mandate of the IPPC, and agreed to modify the last sentence of this section to reflect this discussion by removing reference to human and animal health, but retaining invasive alien species.
- [49] **Reorganization of the draft and figure.** The Steward noted there was consultation comment to reorganize the draft ISPM on “National surveillance systems comprising surveillance programmes (general and specific) and supporting infrastructure” according to the outline in Figure 1. He also noted that there were a substantive comment to reorganize the draft based on supporting infrastructure first, then secondly the surveillance programmes (in summary, to follow the organization of Figure 1). One SC-7 member suggested modifying Figure 1 to include three general sections: 1. Surveillance programs, 2. Supporting infrastructure, and 3. Information management systems. The Steward stressed that Figure 1 was not meant to be an index or summary of the draft, but the components of a national surveillance system and to help the reader visualize this. The SC-7 had lengthy discussion about the reorganization of the figure and the draft ISPM and agreed with the comment to reorganize the draft instead of the figure. It was explained that the supporting infrastructure is for both surveillance programmes, i.e. general and specific surveillance. Consequently, the SC-7 reorganized the draft ISPM including a new section header “Supporting infrastructure” to better differentiate from other activities and did not change the layout or the content in Figure 1.
- [50] **Designing of a surveillance program.** The SC-7 discussed the editorial issue to clarify “faced with” new or emerging pests. It was agreed this was not clear, so was changed to remove “face” entirely for

---

<sup>4</sup> 2009-004, 04\_SC7\_2017\_May\_Rev1, 11\_SC7\_2017\_May, 06\_SC7\_2017\_May



simplification. It was also noted that NPPOs “develop and adopt” new methods, so this change was incorporated. The SC-7 discussed the title of this section, and whether it should be “Surveillance design” or “Surveillance programme”. It was noted that the title “Surveillance design” is broader than “Surveillance programme” and that the wording of the body text relates more to surveillance programmes. It was also noted that “Surveillance design” is relevant to multiple parts of Figure 1, and currently does not have a separate box in Figure 1. The Steward also noted that the Expert Working Group (EWG) felt it was important to include surveillance design in the standard. As a compromise, the SC-7 agreed to change the heading of this section to “Designing of a surveillance program” and removed any reference to “design” from the “Components of a national surveillance system” section.

- [51] **Approaches to general surveillance.** The SC-7 discussed the use of passive and active data acceptance and whether this would be helpful guidance. The SC-7 agreed to remove reference to “passive” and “active” throughout this section to reduce confusion as these terms refer to reports received by the NPPO, and made consequential changes to the text. The SC-7 also questioned for an added list item based on consultation comments, what is the meaning of “targeted cooperation, targeted encouragement”, etc. The SC-7 agreed to remove “targeted” from these list items because it was already stated that surveillance can be conducted for a specific pest or specific group. The SC-7 noted the comment regarding changing “percentage” to “number”, and agreed to change it to “proportion”. There was discussion regarding the addition of “amateur” entomologist and the comparison of the general public versus hobby entomologists, and how different these reports really would be. The SC-7 agreed to remove “amateur” to show that the reliability of reports from the general public and entomologists would be a better comparison.
- [52] **Verification.** Based on other discussions in the draft regarding verification, the SC-7 discussed adding verification of the data validity to the description of general surveillance section. However, because this is only an overall description of general surveillance, the SC-7 agreed that adding verification was not needed, but it was incorporated to other sections of the draft, such as “Approaches to general surveillance”.
- [53] **General surveillance.** The SC-7 discussed the comment regarding NPPOs verifying information, and it was unclear how this was relevant in the context of general surveillance. The SC-7 agreed to modify the text proposed in the consultation comment with the addition of “the NPPO may need to verify”, which regards to the validity of the data.
- [54] **Specific surveillance.** The SC-7 moved under this section (section “specific surveillance”) the mention on validity of absence data collected and that the most important factor for its validity is the design of the surveillance to stress the importance and for better text flow.
- [55] **Common elements of specific surveillance.** There was a discussion to add a heading above the “Data collection” section titled “Common elements” to clarify that the sections below were common sub-elements of specific surveillance. The SC-7 decided that a separate heading was not needed because all the elements should be kept at the same hierarchical level.
- [56] **Area or site selection.** It was noted that there was an issue with the use of “pathway” in this section, so the text was modified to avoid use of the term. The SC-7 also simplified the text in this section also considering avoiding text repetition elsewhere in the draft standard.
- [57] **Statistical design.** The SC-7 discussed consultation comments on this section regarding statistical analysis and aligning this standard with ISPM 31 (*Methodologies for sampling of consignments*). The SC-7 inserted new text to clarify and align these concepts.
- [58] **Biosecurity and sanitation.** The SC-7 noted it is not clear whether it is the NPPO driving the biosecurity security procedures in place or authorized personal. The SC-7 acknowledged that the procedures should be followed by both, i.e. NPPO officers or other authorized personnel. Thus, the SC-7 agreed including text proposal from consultation comment with modifications.

- [59] **Samples.** The SC-7 discussed the consultation comments regarding changing the head section title to for example “samples handling”. The Steward noted that the proposals were too specific and the title should be more general. The SC-7 agreed to keep the title general and use the title “Samples” hence it would apply for when samples are to be taken and how, including handling of the sample. Additionally, based on a comment, it was noted the first section of this sentence was redundant and could be deleted. The SC-7 agreed and it was deleted.
- [60] **Phytosanitary legislation and policies.** The SC-7 discussed the consultation comment on whether the items under this list would be possible for NPPOs to enforce, and therefore should include language such as “may consider including” or “should include”, etc. The SC-7 also discussed whether the phytosanitary legislation or the NPPO was doing the “considering”. The SC-7 agreed that the NPPOs should include the provisions outlined in this section and text was adjusted to reflect this decision, to enable building a stronger legislation and policies.
- [61] SC-7 revised the mention on entering premises and collecting samples for inspection to clarify the meaning. Consequently, the SC-7 included “the legal power for NPPO officers or other authorized personnel to enter premises and land to inspect plants, plant products or other articles that may be capable of harboring pests or to collect samples for testing.” to make it consistent with previous text.
- [62] The SC-7 noted that there were parts of a list item that, through consequential changes based on other consultation comments, made the item unclear. Therefore, the SC-7 revised the item to ensure it would be more understandable for second consultation.
- [63] **Resources.** The SC-7 discussed the consultation comment changing “staff travel” to “staff movement”. It was noted that more was covered under travel, and that the draft could explain what was meant by “staff travel”, such as daily allowance, transport costs, accommodation, meals, etc.
- [64] The SC-7 discussed the comment suggesting adding that NPPOs can outsource certain activities to qualified individuals or organizations. The Steward had not added this comment due to text incorporated into other paragraphs. However, it was noted that the comment recognized resources are needed, but not where the resources come from. The SC-7 agreed that this comment would help to clarify some issues of resources, so it was incorporated with modifications.
- [65] **Auditing.** The Steward noted that there was a consultation comment to either align with or refer in this standard to ISO:9001. The SC-7 agreed to not include reference to nor align with ISO:9001 in the standard. The SC-7 also clarified this section based on other consultation comments that were incorporated.
- [66] **Communication and stakeholder engagement.** It was noted that “relevant experts” may not always be “stakeholders” so the text was modified from “stakeholders including relevant experts” to “stakeholders and relevant experts”.
- [67] **Pest diagnostics.** The SC-7 discussed changing “may require verification of diagnosis” to “should”. The Steward noted that this section means that if the NPPO requires verification, it may choose to receive a second opinion from a second party. The SC-7 agreed to modify the section for clarity of the concept, and to retain “may”. As previously agreed by the SC-7 on the possibility of the NPPOs to use authorized entities, this concept was also captured in this section, noting that diagnosis by the NPPO or authorized entities may require the verification.
- [68] **Information management systems.** The SC-7 reviewed the consultation comment discussed at the TPG changing “surveillance” to “survey”. The SC-7 discussed the TPG conclusion because the ISPM 5 definition is a protocol, and this draft standard is describing the design of the survey. To resolve the issue, the SC-7 deleted “the” before “surveillance” to clarify that in this context “surveillance” is a program, but overall agreed with the TPG recommendation to retain “surveillance”. The SC-7 noted that some of this information could be placed in the section “Surveillance design”. Therefore, the SC-7 made consequential changes to the section “Surveillance design” by moving the relevant text to that

section, and made some editorials to this section “Information management systems”, based on discussions.

- [69] The SC-7 stressed that information management systems should be a repository or centralized database for all results obtained and that, for analysis, including records for presence and absence of pests. Text was adjusted and incorporated in this section to highlight these elements.
- [70] **Surveillance records.** The SC-7 discussed the consultation comments regarding the list. They discussed whether to include the survey methodology in the surveillance records, and agreed that while it was important, it should not be included in the list because it is not required in the record. They resolved this issue by adding clarifying text to the chapeau of this section. The SC-7 also noted that the comment to add “surveillance records of presence” to the chapeau of the list does not include absence, so “of presence” was not incorporated. There was a suggestion to move this section beneath the section on “Data collection” because it would not be expected that the general public would keep records. Because the SC-7 could not agree, they decided to not move the section “Surveillance records” under “Data collection” but leaving as a separate subsection of “Information Management Systems” in the draft standard.
- [71] **Analysis and reporting.** There were proposals by various contracting parties to make modifications to the end of this section, as for example to follow ISPM 17 (*Pest reporting*). The Steward proposed to delete the paragraph because no specific guidance was provided. The SC-7 agreed to delete the paragraph where it said that “pests that require obligatory reporting may be found”.
- [72] **Transparency.** The Steward noted that there was a consultation comment to provide “more specific” information, but suggested not to incorporate this because the information can be provided upon request. The SC-7 agreed to not incorporate this comment.
- [73] **Potential implementation issues.** The Steward presented the potential implementation issues that were submitted during consultation and noted that the 2016 November SC already had a short discussion on this topic. The steward outlined additional the comments, which suggested the lack of financial and human resources might cause a problem in implementing surveillance programs. The Steward noted that this is a general problem within NPPOs and that this concern may also apply to the current ISPM 6 and mentioned that the Pilot Project on Surveillance could provide a more comprehensive approach about the need of Contracting Parties regarding human resources for the implementation of the ISPM.
- [74] The Steward also noted the comments on additional technical resources to be shared. He was pointed that the development of guidelines for the detection of specific pests may lead to an endless list of pest to standardize field surveillance and without a clear probability of success. A reinforced request or call to share technical resources on the phytosanitary resources page could be performed. It was also highlighted that there is material already available for Contracting Parties on the Phytosanitary Resources pages (e.g. Plant Pest Surveillance manual).
- [75] The SC-7 noted the implementation issues and asked the Secretariat to forward them to the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU).
- [76] The SC-7:
- (4) *approved* the draft ISPM on the *Revision of ISPM 6: Surveillance (2009-004)* as modified in this meeting for submission to the second consultation.
  - (5) *asked* the Secretariat to forward the implementation issues identified during first consultation on the draft ISPM *Revision of ISPM 6: Surveillance (2009-004)* to the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU).

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.phytosanitary.info/>

### 4.3 Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005), Priority 1

[77] The Steward introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documents<sup>6</sup>. He noted that the draft had been prepared by the IPPC Technical Panel on Phytosanitary Treatments (TPPT), and that the SC had already discussed about whether this should be a stand-alone ISPM, or an annex or appendix to ISPM 28: *Phytosanitary treatments for regulated pests*. It was recalled that the SC agreed that this is to be a stand-alone ISPM, so this will not be discussed here. As the Steward's notes was present at the 2016 November SC meeting, it was recalled that the following decisions were made by the SC, in which the SC:

- Reiterated that it had already been agreed that this draft should be developed as a standard and noted that while this standard may not necessarily contain many requirements, the specific temperature treatments that the standard would cover, would have such requirements.
- Agreed to retain the appendix on "Guidance for temperature treatment efficacy studies".
- Agreed that the combination of treatments (temperature and other types of treatments) was an issue that should be addressed where the application of the treatment was also dependent on the temperature.
- Supported the suggestion that the text on compliance agreements could stay in the ISPM but that it should not be a requirement. It was agreed that, unlike the more complex irradiation treatments, temperature treatments should not require compliance agreements and the text should be more flexible.
- Agreed that specific examples of temperature treatments that could result in live but non-viable pests should be included in the draft ISPM in case of retain such concept.

[78] The SC-7 noted the discussions on the draft ISPM *Requirements for the use of fumigation treatments as a phytosanitary measure* (2014-004) at the 2017 May SC meeting, and that the SC requested the SC-7 to try and ensure consistency across these draft ISPMs when relevant. The SC-7 agreed to review the draft first based on consultation comments and then to review the draft to align it with the modifications from the 2017 May SC meeting on the "fumigation" draft standard.

[79] **General comments.** There was a general consultation comment regarding placement of temperature probes and authorization of facilities. The SC-7 agreed to add guidance in the relevant sections. Another general consultation comment noted the possible effects of microwave treatments being carcinogenic, and the Steward asked for guidance on how to move forward with this issue. The SC-7 noted it does not have expertise on this issue, and that this is addressed in ISPM 28. The SC-7 agreed that the standard should not consider the effects of irradiation impacts on human and animal health and a statement was inserted in the scope. The third general consultation comment was that not all countries may have the equipment and training to implement the standard when it is adopted. The SC-7 agreed that this issue is not specific to this standard, and is an implementation issue.

[80] **Scope.** The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section for clarity, due to changes resulting from consultation comments. The SC-7 also added text from ISPM 28 (with editorial modifications) as a footnote to address the general comment that the standard does not consider the effects of irradiation impacts on human and animal health.

[81] **Outline of requirements.** Based on comments made during the 2017 May SC meeting, the SC-7 revised the Outline of requirements section to ensure all text included requirements and made other editorial changes (e.g. removing the word "should"). The SC-7 deleted text stating that the efficacy of a treatment should be demonstrated because that is not a requirement in the standard. Additionally, some text from the Background was moved to the Outline of requirements and vice versa because it was more appropriate in the other section.

---

<sup>6</sup> 2014-005, 05\_SC7\_2017\_May\_Rev1, 10\_SC7\_2017\_May, 07\_SC7\_2017\_May

- [82] **Treatment objective.** The SC-7 discussed the phrase “pest mortality at a specified level of mortality”, and whether it should be “specified level of efficacy”. It was agreed to change it to “efficacy” because it was more accurate and to improve the readability of the text.
- [83] **Treatment application.** It was noted that “required” was used throughout this section, so the SC-7 made editorial changes to reduce the repeated use of this term. The SC-7 also made editorial changes to improve the readability of the section (e.g. reduced the length of sentences). The SC-7 noted that, for the parameters to consider when implementing a temperature treatment, the list was long and may be lost in a paragraph. It was discussed whether to keep it as one long sentence, split into two sentences, or make it into a bulleted list. There was also a discussion on whether this was the appropriate section to include this information, and whether it would be more appropriate to place this information in sections “Temperature and humidity calibration, monitoring and recording” or “Sensor placement for temperature monitoring”. The text was incorporated into the section “Temperature and humidity calibration, monitoring and recording”, making subsequent editorial modifications to this section to eliminate redundancy.
- [84] The SC-7 noted one consultation comment moving text from the vapour heat treatment to this section, with modifications, and whether it was appropriate to be placed here, with the changes. The SC-7 decided whether to move the text here or draft new text based on the consultation comment with the understanding that the comment may be valid, but that specific text may not be appropriate here. The SC-7 agreed to move the text back to the vapour heat treatment section and drafted new, more appropriate text for this section. The SC-7 modified this section to align it to the 2017 May SC “fumigation” treatment draft, making modifications only specific to temperature treatments.
- [85] **Cold treatment.** The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section for clarity, due to changes resulting from consultation comments. There was a consultation comment to include sea containers as an example of cold treatments applied during transport. The SC-7 discussed how to incorporate this and keep the standard in alignment with the definitions and understandings of the concepts of “in-transit”, “during transportation”, etc. The SC-7 agreed to include the example of sea containers with modifications to the consultation comment, and to not include “in-transit” to avoid confusion. The SC-7 replaced the word “fruit” to “commodity”, as having “fruit” could limit the use of temperature treatments.
- [86] **Heat treatment.** There was a discussion about a consultation comment to add clarity that the treatment must reach the treatment temperature, and it should be explained that the treatment cannot go above that temperature. The SC-7 agreed to modify the text to clarify the concept. The SC-7 discussed a consultation comment adding text about heat treatments used in combination with chemical treatments. The SC-7 agreed and amended the comment proposal for clarity. The SC-7 discussed the concept of rapid cooling after treatment and whether it should be a requirement. It was noted that rapid cooling after treatment should be done only if it does not reduce the efficacy of the treatment and this concept was kept, also noting that there were no consultation comments.
- [87] **Hot water immersion treatment.** The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section for clarity, due to changes resulting from consultation comments.
- [88] **Vapour heat and high temperature forced air treatment.** The SC-7 noted the proposal to change the title on this section, and that high temperature forced air (HTFA) treatment is not described in the standard. The SC-7 referred to a 2015 September TPPT meeting paper which described that vapour heat and HTFA are both heat treatments, with different humidity levels (vapour heat has a humidity level over a certain concentration, and HTFA is below that requirement, specifically below the dew point of the fruit to prevent damage to the surface). The Secretariat also noted that the 2015 September TPPT meeting report<sup>7</sup> had agreed that vapour heat is the main treatment and includes HTFA as a separate

---

<sup>7</sup> IPPC TPPT meeting reports: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/expert-drafting-groups/technical-panels/technical-panel-phytosanitary-treatments/>

treatment. The SC-7 agreed to include the TPPT meeting paper explanation as a footnote in the body of the text, and modified the rest of the text as consequential changes.

- [89] **Dry heat treatments.** One SC-7 member noted that humidity is not specified in this section. It was noted that when air is heated, it naturally dries out the air. The SC-7 did not make a change. The SC-7 discussed the changes based on the consultation comment regarding commodities that are effective for dry heat treatment. It was noted that the proposal was not very clear, for example including loss of viability. The SC-7 agreed to reword the proposal for clarity.
- [90] **Temperature and humidity calibration, monitoring and recording.** The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section for clarity, due to changes resulting from consultation comments (see also “Treatment application” above in this report). The SC-7 added text that the equipment should be calibrated in accordance with manufacturer’s instructions – also to align the text with the “fumigation” draft standard revised at the 2017 May SC meeting. Though not a consultation comment, the SC-7 discussed what was meant by “system type”. It was noted that the Outline of requirements and dielectric and heat treatment sections included the phrase “monitoring and recording system”. The SC-7 modified the text by specifying that it is a monitoring and recording system for temperature and humidity.
- [91] **Temperature mapping.** The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section for clarity, due to changes resulting from consultation comments. The SC-7 discussed changing “a person or organization” to “entity” to align the text with the “fumigation” draft standard revised at the 2017 May SC meeting. However, it was noted that in this case, the person conducting the mapping could be from the NPPO or from another organization. Therefore, the change was not incorporated.
- [92] **Probes and sensors.** One SC-7 member expressed concern that there were requirements in the standard on the number of probes and their placement during treatment, and this was provided without technical justification. It was noted that at least three probes could be agreed based on the consultation comments. The SC-7 agreed that the minimum of probes should be three and modified other relevant text in the body of this section as consequential changes. It was noted that the text on additional sensors being installed to compensate for sensor malfunction was unclear. The SC-7 modified the text to clarify this issue.
- [93] **Facilities vs entities.** When discussing “facilities” and “entities”, the SC-7 discussed defining these two words in the “Outline of requirements section” for reference throughout the standard (using the text from the 2017 May SC fumigation standard). The SC-7 agreed overall that for this standard “entities” are authorized and include two components: a) Operators, companies and individuals; b) “Facilities”, which are approved, and include chambers, enclosures, and sea containers
- [94] However, for this draft standard, the SC-7 agreed there was not enough time to do a comprehensive review and compare the standard for the terminology “facilities” during this meeting. The SC-7 also did not want to hold the draft for one year to allow the Steward more time to incorporate the changes outside of this meeting. Therefore, the SC-7 did not add text defining the two words “facilities” and “entities”, nor did they make global changes on these two words.
- [95] The Steward felt the facility was the location where the treatment was performed. It was noted, however, that there are places in the draft standard where facilities was used to include sea containers, but the word ‘facilities’ exclude sea containers, and thus it should be clarified. The SC-7 agreed to describe that in the “Approval of facilities” section, and text was added to clarify that NPPOs may approve procedures applying treatments to sea containers.
- [96] **Approval of facilities.** The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section to remove redundancy. It was noted that the section title is “approval” but the body text refers to “accredited”. There was also mention of whether to use “authorized”. It was agreed that facilities are approved and individuals or organizations are authorized. The SC-7 agreed to use “approval of facilities”.

- [97] **Prevention of infestation after treatment.** The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section, including title change, for clarity due to changes resulting from consultation comments. The SC-7 modified the section title and text to align it to the 2017 May SC “fumigation” treatment draft standard.
- [98] **Monitoring and auditing.** The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section for clarity, due to changes resulting from consultation comments. “Oversight” was changed to “monitoring and auditing”, however, it was noted that due to consultation comments, who is performing the oversight is now not clear in this section.
- [99] **Requirements for treatment facilities.** It was noted that authorization was not included on this list, and the SC-7 added “authorization of entities (treatment company or person)”.
- [100] **Inspection.** It was noted that in the 2017 May SC “fumigation” draft standard, the section “Export inspection” was removed, and that the only section kept was a general statement in a section titled “Inspection” because the deleted information is already included in ISPM 12, and the information was not specific to fumigation treatments. It was also noted that much of this section in this temperature treatments draft standard was taken from ISPM 18 (*Guidelines for the use of irradiation as a phytosanitary measure*), which is the irradiation standard. The SC-7 agreed to delete this section because the text contained is not specific to temperature treatments. The SC-7 modified this section title to align it to the 2017 May SC “fumigation” treatment draft standard.
- [101] **Phytosanitary certification.** As in the “Export inspection” section, it was noted that the 2017 May SC removed this entire section in the fumigation draft because this it describes requirements already included in ISPM 12, and had agreed that, although the issue related to identification of the treated lot is an important point, it is not always possible to retrieve this information, there is not a dedicated place for this on the phytosanitary certificate, and therefore you cannot make it a requirement. The SC-7 discussed whether this issue is relevant to temperature treatments, noting that fumigation for grains is significantly different than a temperature treatment for logs, and the identification of lots is usually recorded for temperature treatments. The SC-7 agreed to retain the section for “Phytosanitary certification”, removing text that is not specific to temperature treatments.
- [102] **Import inspection.** As in the “Export inspection” section, it was noted that the 2017 May SC removed this entire section in the fumigation draft. Based on consultation comments, much of this section was already deleted. The SC-7 agreed to retain the section for “Import inspection”, removing text that is not specific to temperature treatments, and consolidated the text for clarity, due to changes resulting from consultation comments. The SC-7 combined this section with “Export inspection” to align it to the 2017 May SC “fumigation” treatment draft standard, and named this section “Inspection”.
- [103] **Authority.** The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section for clarity, due to changes resulting from consultation comments. The SC-7 discussed responsibilities for treatments performed in transit and how guidance could be provided. It was then discussed whether this text would be most appropriate in this section or elsewhere in the draft. The SC-agreed to keep it in this section and provided the appropriate text.
- [104] **Appendix 1.** In the section Data Analysis, it was noted there were consultation comment on the numbers for control mortality, but it was noted that the comment did not provide any justification to modify the text. The SC-7 agreed to retain the text as drafted by the TPPT because there were no proposed text changes.
- [105] **Alignment of draft.** The Steward expressed concern, centred on the procedure that the SC-7 changing the text without consultation comments, even though the SC had made the changes at its 2017 May meeting. The SC-7 agreed that, according the SC-7 Terms of reference, the SC-7 provides support to the SC, and therefore should do the work as assigned by the SC. Once the SC-7 reviewed the draft entirely for consultation comments, they aligned the concepts in the draft with the 2017 May SC “fumigation” draft standard. It was agreed to cautiously align the draft, noting that this temperature treatment draft would receive more changes and alignment at the 2017 November SC meeting before it

would be approved for adoption by the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM). One SC-7 member suggested to not change some of the sections because the changes should come from second consultation comments. However, it was noted that the fumigation and temperature treatment drafts standards would not be aligned when being sent for consultation.

[106] **Potential implementation issues.** The Steward presented the implementation issues that were submitted during consultation. It was noted that most of the comments were related to resources (e.g. personnel, equipment and training), and additional guidelines. Regarding additional guidelines, it was mentioned that there is an IPPC factsheet on Dielectric heating as treatment for wood packaging materials<sup>8</sup> and that contracting parties and Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs) may submit a request at the next joint call for phytosanitary issues.

[107] The SC-7 noted the implementation issues and asked the Secretariat to forward them to the IFU.

[108] The SC-7:

- (6) *approved* the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005) as modified in this meeting for submission to the second consultation.
- (7) *recommended* to the SC that, the next time the draft is reviewed, issues related to consistency with the other ‘treatment requirements’ draft ISPMs be further considered.
- (8) *asked* the Secretariat to forward the implementation issues identified during first consultation on the draft ISPM on *Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as phytosanitary measures* (2014-005) to the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU).

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.phytosanitary.info/information/factsheet-dielectric-heating-treatment-wood-packaging-material>



#### 4.4 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

- [109] The Steward introduced the draft ISPM and supporting documents<sup>9</sup>. It was recalled that the SC-7 in 2016 had requested the TPPT to further assess the issues raised during the 2015 consultation period and that once completed, the assessment of the TPPT along with their advice should be forwarded to the Steward. The TPPT assessed the issues further at their 2016 September meeting<sup>10</sup> and the explanations by the treatments leads were incorporated at the Steward's notes document for the 2017 May SC-7<sup>11</sup>.
- [110] The Steward had also compared line-by-line this draft standard with the adopted sulphuryl fluoride (SF) Annexes to ISPM 28 (phytosanitary treatments (PTs) 23 and 24)<sup>12</sup> and confirmed the technical aspects of the treatments are in alignment, although some editorial changes may need to be made.
- [111] The SC-7 noted the issues and challenges of having the treatments in this standard being in a different location than the adopted treatments that are Annexes to ISPM 28. They agreed this discussion is not covered under the Terms of reference of the SC-7, though they could have a discussion if time allows, to make a recommendation to the SC or one SC member can develop a paper to be presented at the 2017 November SC meeting. The SC-7 did not discuss this issue further and made no specific recommendations to the SC.
- [112] **Heat treatment using dielectric heating.** The SC-7 discussed whether to open this section for second consultation because of the objection received at CPM-12 (2017) to the draft annex to ISPM 28: Heat treatment of wood using dielectric heating (2007-114). The SC-7 agreed to discuss the changes as modified by the Steward, and to leave the modified paragraphs open for second consultation because these paragraphs were modified based on first consultation comments and the objection data has not yet been reviewed by the TPPT. The SC-7 agreed to the proposed changes based on consultation comments.
- [113] **Sulphuryl fluoride treatment.** The SC-7 discussed the consultation comment to align this treatment to the methyl bromide (MB) treatment to calculate the concentration-time (CT) in the wood whereas the concentration is measured in the ambient atmosphere. The SC-7 agreed to be consistent with the MB treatment in this draft, with editorial changes to provide requirements. Additionally, the SC-7 agreed to make small changes to the MB treatment section to align it with the SF treatment (e.g. changing these "must"s to "should"s), and agreed to only open for second consultation the specific words that were changed, not the entire paragraph in the MB treatment. The SC-7 noticed that, when changing these "must"s to "should"s, the "must"s in the rest of the draft would require to be changed. The SC-7 modified the "must"s and "should"s in the dielectric heating and SF treatment because they are open for consultation, and the MB treatment to align it with the SF treatment, and recommended to the SC that this issue should be considered for alignment of the rest of the draft during a future revision.
- [114] The SC-7 discussed the usefulness of the text regarding the explanation of Table 3, on the Minimum required CT over 24 or 48 hours for wood packaging material fumigated with sulphuryl fluoride. It was noted that this text is in the MB treatment, and may help NPPOs to explain the SF treatments. The SC-7 agreed to not change it here, and recommended to the SC this issue should be considered for alignment of the rest of the draft during a future revision.
- [115] There was a discussion on a consultation comment adding guidance for measuring the concentration of SF in the enclosure. It was noted the text was phrased as a requirement, and also that the other bullets are also stated as requirements (e.g. using "is always measured" and not "should be measured"). It was

---

<sup>9</sup> 2006-010A and 2006-010B, 08\_SC7\_2017\_May, 13\_SC7\_2017\_May, 09\_SC7\_2017\_May\_Rev1

<sup>10</sup> 2016-09 TPPT Meeting Report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/83489/>

<sup>11</sup> 13\_SC7\_2017\_May

<sup>12</sup> Adopted ISPMs: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/ispm/>

noted the chapeau states the following “may be required”. The SC-7 did not change the text, but noted it may cause confusion.

[116] The SC-7 discussed aligning the text for following national label requirements, because the text that went for consultation indicated “should”, which does not align with the chapeau for the list, noting that the other list items do not indicate “should”. The SC-7 did not change the bullet, because the text was not clear if “should” was removed. The SC-7 made editorial changes to this section for clarity, due to changes resulting from consultation comments.

[117] **CPM issue on adopted treatments.** The 2017 May SC asked the SC-7 to consider the fact that some contracting parties during CPM-12 (2017) noted differences between PTs 22 and 23 and the draft revision to ISPM 15 SF fumigation, and asked the SC-7 to align them as needed. The SC-7 considered modifying the table by adding a second column including “Duration (hours)”. However, they did not add the column nor the additional treatment schedule in PTs 22 and 23 because ISPM 15 must be effective against nematodes and insects. Regarding the text before Table 3, the SC-7 agreed the related text in the adopted PTs wording is clearer, so the text was aligned. The SC-7 changed “24-48 hours” to “24 or 48 hours” because the use of a hyphen indicates a range. The SC-7 noted this could be another issue that should be considered when this draft and other treatments are revised.

[118] **Potential implementation issues.** The Steward presented the implementation issues that were submitted during consultation. The SC-7 noted the implementation issues and asked the Secretariat to forward them to the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU).

[119] The SC-7:

- (9) *approved the 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) as modified in this meeting for submission to the second consultation.*
- (10) *recommended to the SC that issues related to consistency in terminology highlighted above be reviewed the next time ISPM 15 is revised.*
- (11) *asked the Secretariat to forward the implementation issues identified during first consultation on the 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) to the Implementation Facilitation Unit (IFU).*

## 5. Other business

[120] There was no other business.

## 6. Close of the meeting

[121] The Chairperson and Secretariat thanked the SC-7 members for their hard work this week, and especially to the Stewards for their work before the meeting on preparing the drafts and reviewing the consultation comments. The Secretariat thanked the report writer work, acknowledging USA’s in-kind contribution.

[122] The Chairperson thanked the participants for the discussions and closed the meeting.

## Appendix 01 - Agenda

| AGENDA ITEM   | DOCUMENT NO.   | PRESENTER /<br>(Secretariat support) |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| <b>1. Opening of the meeting</b>  |  |                                      |
| 1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat   | -  | Brent LARSON                         |
| 1.2 Election of the Chairperson   | -  | Brent LARSON                         |
| 1.3 Election of the Rapporteur  | -  | CHAIRPERSON                          |
| 1.4 Adoption of the Agenda  | 01_SC7_2017_May  | CHAIRPERSON                          |
| <b>2. Administrative Matters</b>  |  |                                      |
| - Documents List  | 02_SC7_2017_May  | Adriana MOREIRA                      |
| - Participants List   | 03_SC7_2017_May  | Adriana MOREIRA                      |
| <b>3. Updates from the Standards Committee Meeting</b>  | -  | CHAIRPERSON                          |
| <b>4. Review of Draft ISPMs</b>   |  |                                      |
| <b>4.1 Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Steward: Laurence <b>BOUHOT-DELDUC</b></li> <li>- Assistant Steward: Ebbe <b>NORDBO</b></li> <li>• TPG Responses to Comments from 2016 Consultation: ISPM 5: Draft amendments to Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)</li> <li>• Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues: Draft amendments to ISPM 5: Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001)</li> </ul>   | 1994-001_Rev1<br><br>14_SC7_2017_May<br><br>12_SC7_2017_May                        | Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC (Eva MOLLER)  |
| <b>4.2 Revision of ISPM 6: Surveillance (2009-004), priority 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Steward: Ezequiel <b>FERRO</b></li> <li>- Assistant Steward: Esther <b>KIMANI</b></li> <li>• Steward's Responses to Comments from 2016 Consultation and to TPG review: Revision of ISPM 6: Surveillance (2009-004)</li> <li>• Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues: Revision of ISPM 6: Surveillance (2009-004)</li> <li>• TPG recommendations on terms and consistency: Revision of ISPM 6: Surveillance (2009-004)</li> </ul> | 2009-004<br><br>04_SC7_2017_May_Rev1<br><br>11_SC7_2017_May<br><br>06_SC7_2017_May | Ezequiel FERRO (Adriana MOREIRA)     |
| <b>4.3 Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005), priority 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Steward: Ezequiel <b>FERRO</b></li> <li>- Assistant Stewards: Eduardo <b>WILLINK</b> and Glen <b>BOWMAN</b></li> </ul>   | 2014-005   | Ezequiel FERRO (Adriana MOREIRA)     |

| AGENDA ITEM   | DOCUMENT NO.   | PRESENTER /<br>(Secretariat support)        |
|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steward's Responses to Comments from 2016 Consultation and to TPG review: Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005)</li> <li>• Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues: Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005)</li> <li>• TPG recommendations on terms and consistency: Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005)</li> </ul>  | <p>05_SC7_2017_May_Rev1</p> <p>10_SC7_2017_May</p> <p>07_SC7_2017_May</p>                                |   |
| <p><b>4.4 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</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Steward: Marina <b>ZLOTINA</b></li> <li>- Assistant Steward: Ezequiel <b>FERRO</b></li> <li>• Steward's Responses to Comments from 2015 Consultation and to TPG review: Draft revisions to ISPM 15 – Annex 1 and 2 (2006-010 A&amp;B)</li> <li>• Steward's additional notes and potential implementation issues: Draft revisions to ISPM 15 – Annex 1 and 2 (2006-010 A&amp;B)</li> <li>• TPG recommendations on terms and consistency: Draft revisions to ISPM 15 – Annex 1 and 2 (2006-010 A&amp;B))</li> </ul> | <p>2006-010A and 2006-010B</p> <p>08_SC7_2017_May</p> <p>13_SC7_2017_May</p> <p>09_SC7_2017_May_Rev1</p> | <p>Marina ZLOTINA<br/>(Adriana MOREIRA)</p> |
| <p><b>5. Other business</b></p>   |  | CHAIRPERSON                                 |
| <p><b>6. Close of the meeting</b></p>   |  | CHAIRPERSON                                 |

## Appendix 02 - Documents List

| DOCUMENT NUMBER         | AGENDA ITEM | DOCUMENT TITLE   | DATE POSTED                   |
|-------------------------|-------------|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>Draft ISPMs</b>      |             |  |                               |
| 1994-001_Rev1           | 4.1         | Draft amendments to ISPM 5: <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms</i>   | 2017-02-28<br>Rev: 2017-03-23 |
| 2009-004                | 4.2         | Revision of ISPM 6: <i>Surveillance</i>  | 2017-02-28                    |
| 2014-005                | 4.3         | Draft ISPM on the <i>Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure</i>   | 2017-02-28                    |
| 2006-010A and 2006-010B | 4.4         | 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) | 2017-02-28                    |
| <b>Documents</b>        |             |  |                               |
| 01_SC7_2017_May         | 1.4         | Agenda   | 2017-04-18                    |
| 02_SC7_2017_May         | 2.1         | Documents List   | 2017-04-18                    |
| 03_SC7_2017_May         | 2.2         | Participants List  | 2017-04-18                    |
| 04_SC7_2017_May_Rev1    | 4.2         | Steward's Responses to Comments from 2016 Consultation and to TPG review: Revision of ISPM 6: <i>Surveillance</i> (2009-004)   | 2017-02-28<br>Rev: 2017-03-23 |
| 05_SC7_2017_May_Rev1    | 4.3         | Steward's Responses to Comments from 2016 Consultation and to TPG review: Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005)   | 2017-02-28<br>Rev: 2017-03-23 |
| 06_SC7_2017_May         | 4.2         | TPG recommendations on terms and consistency: Revision of ISPM 6: <i>Surveillance</i> (2009-004)   | 2017-02-28                    |
| 07_SC7_2017_May         | 4.3         | TPG recommendations on terms and consistency: Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005)   | 2017-02-28                    |
| 08_SC7_2017_May         | 4.4         | Steward's Responses to Comments from 2015 Consultation and to TPG review: Draft revisions to ISPM 15 – Annex 1 and 2 (2006-010 A&B)  | 2017-02-28                    |
| 09_SC7_2017_May_Rev1    | 4.4         | TPG recommendations on terms and consistency: Draft revisions to ISPM 15 – Annex 1 and 2 (2006-010 A&B)  | 2017-02-28<br>Rev1:2017-04-18 |
| 10_SC7_2017_May         | 4.3         | Steward's additional notes: Requirements for the use of temperature treatments as a phytosanitary measure (2014-005)   | 2017-04-18                    |
| 11_SC7_2017_May         | 4.2         | Steward's additional notes: Draft revision of ISPM 6: <i>Surveillance</i> (2009-004)   | 2017-04-18                    |
| 12_SC7_2017_May         | 4.1         | Steward's additional notes: Draft amendments to <i>Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms</i> (1994-001)  | 2017-04-18                    |

| <b>DOCUMENT NUMBER</b> | <b>AGENDA<br/>ITEM</b> | <b>DOCUMENT TITLE</b>  | <b>DATE<br/>POSTED</b> |
|------------------------|------------------------|--|------------------------|
| 13_SC7_2017_May        | 4.4                    | Steward's additional notes: Draft revisions to ISPM 15 – Annex 1 and 2 (2006-010 A&B)                            | 2017-04-18             |
| 14_SC7_2017_May        | 4.1                    | TPG Responses to Comments from 2016 Consultation: Draft amendments to Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms (1994-001) | 2017-04-18             |

### Appendix 03 - Participants List

| Region / Role                      | Name, mailing, address, telephone  | Email address  |
|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Africa Member                      | <p><b>Ms Esther KIMANI</b><br/>           Ag. Managing Director<br/>           Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service-<br/>           KEPHIS<br/>           P.O. BOX 49592-00100, Nairobi<br/> <b>KENYA</b><br/>           Tel: (+254) 356171,<br/>           Mobile: (+254) 0722 226 239</p>   | <a href="mailto:ekimani@kephis.org">ekimani@kephis.org</a> ;   |
| Asia Member                        | <p><b>Ms Thanh Huong HA</b><br/>           Deputy Director of Plant Quarantine<br/>           Division, Plant Protection Department<br/>           149 Ho Duc Di Street<br/>           Dong Da district<br/>           Hanoi City<br/> <b>VIET NAM</b><br/> <b>Tel:</b> (+844) 35331033<br/> <b>Fax:</b> (+844) 35330043</p>   | <a href="mailto:ppdhuong@yahoo.com">ppdhuong@yahoo.com</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:ppdhuong@gmail.com">ppdhuong@gmail.com</a> ; |
| Europe Member                      | <p><b>Mr Nicolaas Maria HORN</b><br/>           Senior Officer Plant Health,<br/>           Netherlands Food and Consumer Product<br/>           Safety Authority (NVWA)<br/>           Division Plant and Nature<br/>           National Plant Protection Organization<br/>           (NPPO)<br/>           P.O. Box 9102<br/>           6700 HC Wageningen<br/> <b>THE NETHERLANDS</b><br/>           Phone: (+31) 651998151</p> | <a href="mailto:n.m.horn@nvwa.nl">n.m.horn@nvwa.nl</a> ;   |
| Latin America and Caribbean Member | <p><b>Mr Ezequiel FERRO</b><br/>           Dirección Nacional de Protección Vegetal -<br/>           SENASA<br/>           Av, Paeso Colón 315<br/>           C.A. de Buenos Aires<br/> <b>ARGENTINA</b><br/>           Tel/Fax : (+5411) 4121-5091</p>  | <a href="mailto:eferro@senasa.gov.ar">eferro@senasa.gov.ar</a> ;   |
| Near East Member                   | <p><b>Ms Shaza OMAR</b><br/>           Phytosanitary Specialist<br/>           Central Administration for Plant Quarantine<br/>           Ministry of Agriculture<br/>           1 Nadi al Said Street<br/>           Dokki, Giza,<br/> <b>EGYPT</b><br/>           Mobile: +201014000813<br/>           Fax: (+20) 237608574</p>  | <a href="mailto:shaza.roshdy@gmail.com">shaza.roshdy@gmail.com</a> ;   |

| Region / Role        | Name, mailing, address, telephone  | Email address   |
|----------------------|--|---|
| North America Member | <p><b>Ms Marina ZLOTINA</b><br/>           IPPC Technical Director USDA-APHIS, Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ)<br/>           4700 River Rd,<br/>           5c-03.37 Riverdale,<br/>           MD 20737<br/> <b>USA</b><br/>           Phone: 1-301-851-2200<br/>           Fax: 1 -301-832-0611</p>   | <p><a href="mailto:Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov">Marina.A.Zlotina@aphis.usda.gov</a> ;</p> |
| Pacific Member       | <p><b>Mr Stephen BUTCHER</b><br/>           Manager Import &amp; Export Plants<br/>           Standards Branch<br/>           Plant, Food and Environment Directorate<br/>           Ministry for Primary Industries<br/>           Pastoral House 25 The Terrace<br/>           PO Box 2526<br/>           Wellington 6140<br/>           NEW ZEALAND<br/>           Tel: (+64) 4 894 0478<br/>           Fax: (+ 64) 4 894 0662<br/>           Mob: (+ 64) 29 894 0478</p> | <p><a href="mailto:stephen.butcher@mpi.govt.nz">stephen.butcher@mpi.govt.nz</a>;</p>          |

*Invited expert or Stewards*

| Name, mailing, address, telephone   | Email address   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Ms Laurence BOUHOT-DELDUC</b><br/>           Seed and plant health section<br/>           Sub-directorate for plant quality health and protection<br/>           Service for prevention of the sanitary risks of the primary production<br/>           General directorate for food<br/>           Ministry of agriculture, agro-food and forestry<br/>           251 rue de Vaugirard<br/>           75732 PARIS CEDEX 15<br/> <b>FRANCE</b><br/>           Tel: +33 149558437<br/>           Fax: +33 149555949</p> | <p><a href="mailto:laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr">laurence.bouhot-delduc@agriculture.gouv.fr</a> ;</p> |



**Others:**

|                     |  |  |
|---------------------|--|--|
| IPPC<br>Secretariat | <p><b>Mr Brent LARSON</b><br/>Standard Setting Officer<br/>International Plant Protection Convention<br/>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations<br/>Viale delle Terme di Caracalla<br/>00153 Rome<br/><b>ITALY</b><br/>Tel: + 39 06 570 55809</p>   | <a href="mailto:Brent.Larson@fao.org">Brent.Larson@fao.org</a> ;                         |
| IPPC<br>Secretariat | <p><b>Ms Adriana MOREIRA</b><br/>Standard Setting Programme Specialist<br/>International Plant Protection Convention<br/>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations<br/>Viale delle Terme di Caracalla<br/>00153 Rome<br/><b>ITALY</b><br/>Tel: + 39 06 570 55 809</p>                                      | <a href="mailto:Adriana.Moreira@fao.org">Adriana.Moreira@fao.org</a> ;                   |
| IPPC<br>Secretariat | <p><b>Ms Janka KISS</b><br/>Standard Setting Consultant<br/>International Plant Protection Convention<br/>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations<br/>Viale delle Terme di Caracalla<br/>00153 Rome<br/><b>ITALY</b><br/>Tel: + 39 06 570 55 809</p>   | <a href="mailto:Janka.Kiss@fao.org">Janka.Kiss@fao.org</a>                               |
| IPPC<br>Secretariat | <p><b>Ms Celine GERMAIN</b><br/>Standard Setting Consultant (in-kind contribution from France)<br/>International Plant Protection Convention<br/>Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations<br/>Viale delle Terme di Caracalla<br/>00153 Rome<br/><b>ITALY</b><br/>Tel: + 39 06 570 55 809</p>              | <a href="mailto:Celine.Germain@fao.org">Celine.Germain@fao.org</a>                       |
| IPPC<br>Secretariat | <p><b>Ms Stephanie DUBON</b><br/>Standard Setting (in-kind contribution from USA)<br/>IPS Deputy Technical Director<br/>Plant Protection and Quarantine<br/>Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service<br/>Department of Agriculture<br/>4700 River Road<br/>Riverdale, MD 20737<br/><b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b></p> | <a href="mailto:stephanie.m.dubon@aphis.usda.gov">stephanie.m.dubon@aphis.usda.gov</a> ; |